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ABSTRACT

Although past scholarship on Leviticus has tended to deconstruct the text into its parts to explore the historical situation behind each source, recent scholarship has explored the literary artistry of Leviticus and aspects of rhetoric in its ritual and legal texts. There has been very little argument articulated, however, as to how Leviticus, as the sum of its parts, displays a rhetorical strategy that achieves a particular persuasive intent. This study addresses this lacuna and, in doing so, engages a critical problem that attends to this task – the text's perceived incoherence. By embedding discourse analysis within a rhetorical-critical framework, this study argues that the global schema of Leviticus is made up of fifteen episodes (Lev. 1–7, 8–10, 11, 12, 13–14, 15, 16, 17–21, 22:1-16, 22:17-33, 23:1-44, 24:1-9, 24:10-23, 25–26, 27). Each episode progresses to the next by sequential connectedness, which is the reason why Leviticus gives the impression of incoherence. The principle in 10:3, בכרב אכדיס עלן פן אלהים אכדיס, provides coherence within Leviticus 1–16 until the refrain אכדיס יהוה אלוהים emerges as the global thematic referent. This study suggests that the sequential connectedness of the global schema is part of the rhetorical strategy to accentuate how YHWH is to be sanctified and glorified first within the ritual domain of the tabernacle in the camp (Lev. 1–16) and then within the ethical and ritual domains in the land (Lev. 17–27). The intent of this strategy is to form the new covenant community at Sinai into a people and priesthood who ensure that YHWH is sanctified and glorified in their midst and so dissuades Israel from persisting in a condition of impurity in the future lest death and exile ensue.
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CHAPTER ONE

Approaching Leviticus as a Rhetorical-Discourse Unit

The task of this thesis is to explore the persuasive intent of the book of Leviticus in its historical situation. A plethora of past studies have deconstructed the text of Leviticus into its constituent parts to reconstruct the historical situation of each source, or to approach one section of the text as an independent corpus. More recently though, studies demonstrating how Leviticus displays a purposeful arrangement, with some even exploring aspects of rhetoric in the ritual and legal texts, are emerging and flourishing. To date, however, there is very little argument articulated as to how Leviticus, as the sum of its parts, might display a rhetorical strategy and persuasive intent. In fact, scholars articulating the possibility of a persuasive dimension have tended to assume that texts in Leviticus, or in the wider priestly narrative, have a rhetorical strategy. This study


4 For example, Bibb, Ritual Words, pp. 39. 54. 59. 77. 82; B. J. Schwartz, 'The Prohibitions Concerning the
demonstrates how a rhetorical strategy shapes the arrangement of Leviticus to achieve a particular intent. To this end, this thesis adopts a rhetorical-critical framework for the overarching argument, while also using insights from discourse analysis and information structures to help analyse the schema of Leviticus' arrangement. This first chapter introduces rhetorical criticism and explores three foundational issues for a rhetorical analysis of Leviticus. The first issue is the presupposition that Leviticus can be approached as a rhetorical-discourse unit. The second is whether ritual has a persuasive function, and the third issue is the historical situation of the text in the life of Israel.

1. Defining a Rhetorical-Critical Framework

Although the formal discipline of rhetoric is as ancient as Plato and his student Aristotle, the re-emergence of rhetorical criticism in biblical studies has seen a great deal of methodological murkiness caused by two diverging agendas. The first agenda, motivated by Muilenburg’s presidential address to the 1967 SBL conference, focuses upon the literary enterprise. The beginning of Muilenburg’s concluding statement exemplifies this agenda,

Perhaps there is no enterprise more revealing for our understanding of the nature of biblical rhetoric than an intensive scrutiny of the composition of the strophes,

---

3 Plato begins his exploration of rhetoric in Gorgias, which he then continues in Phaedrus. Phaedrus is his first dialogue with a concern to refine his articulation of the principles of rhetoric. Plato’s student, Aristotle, then sought to systematise in The Art of Rhetoric his own view of what he perceived to be the universal phenomenon of rhetoric. See Aristotle, The Art of Rhetoric, trans. J. H. Freese, LCL 193, Cambridge, MA: HUP, 1926; Plato, Euthyphro; Apology; Crito; Phaedo; Phaedrus, trans. H. N. Fowler, ed. J. Henderson, LCL 36, Cambridge, MA: HUP, 1914; Plato, Lysis; Symposium; Gorgias, trans. W. R. M. Lamb, ed. J. Henderson, LCL 166, Cambridge, MA: HUP, 1925.

the manifold technical devices for their construction, and the stylistic phenomena which gives them their unity. 

However, Patrick and Scult note,

Although in the hands of Muilenburg’s followers, the method has yielded bold, sophisticated attempts to interpret texts by attending to their rhetorical shape, it has still failed to live up to Muilenburg’s call to encounter texts in their concrete particularity. This failure correlates with the limitation of rhetorical criticism in Biblical studies to stylistic analysis. We believe rhetorical criticism does indeed hold the key to realizing Muilenburg’s vision, but not if it is unnecessarily confined to an analysis of stylistic devices. 

In response, scholars such as Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), Kennedy (1984) and Patrick and Scult (1990), have championed the agenda of rhetoric as the art of persuasion. Within this second agenda, rhetoric is defined as ‘the means by which the text establishes and manages its relationship to its audience in order to achieve a particular effect.’ The efforts of these scholars to return rhetorical criticism in biblical studies to a ‘discovery of the author’s intent and of that [which] is transmitted through a text to an audience’ has prompted a prolific number of Old Testament rhetorical-critical studies aligning with this agenda. Their response to embrace rhetoric as the art of persuasion

---

10 Patrick and Scult, ‘Rhetorical Criticism and Biblical Exegesis’, p. 12. Italics are part of the original text. See also Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation, p. 3, who states, ‘Rhetoric is that quality in discourse by which a speaker or writer seeks to accomplish his purposes.’
leads Barker to conclude unequivocally, 'This focus on the "art of persuasion" is what now
drives rhetorical-critical approaches to the Old Testament.' Indeed, this priority also
shapes the present study, especially building upon George Kennedy’s approach.

Kennedy returns to the rhetoric of antiquity and the basic principles formalised by
Aristotle to form his programmatic framework for the analysis of a rhetorical unit. These
principles are invention ('the planning of a discourse and the arguments to be used in it'),
arrangement ('the composition of the various parts into an effective whole'), style (the
'choice of words and the composition of words into sentences, including the use of
figures'), memory ('preparation for delivery'), and delivery ('the rules for control of the
voice and the use of gestures'). From these principles, Kennedy derives four steps that
have, in various forms, become programmatic for rhetorical criticism in Old Testament
studies, which are:

1. Determine the rhetorical unit, which must be discrete and with clear
   boundaries.  
2. Identify the rhetorical situation that caused the discourse to arise in the first
   instance.  
3. Analyse the arrangement of the text within the rhetorical unit and the devices
   of style. This third step considers the persuasive strategy of how the parts of

References:

Barker, From the Depths of Despair, p. 28.
Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation, pp. 34-37. See also L. F. Bitzer, 'The Rhetorical Situation', Philosophy
the text are organised into an effective whole and how the rhetorical devices then contribute to the overall strategy of the text.\textsuperscript{7}

4. Review the effectiveness of the rhetorical strategy of the unit to meet the exigence of the rhetorical situation.\textsuperscript{8}

Although Kennedy’s four-step rhetorical-critical framework has proven fruitful in Old Testament scholarship, it has not gone without critique.\textsuperscript{9} Black, for instance, notes the tendency of Kennedy’s method to detach the rhetorical situation from the theological and to force texts into ‘elaborate rhetorical schemes of organization’.\textsuperscript{10} Moreover, Black questions the validity of the view that the formal discipline of rhetoric from antiquity reveals the nature of discourse that is universally true of all human communication.\textsuperscript{11} Kern also describes Kennedy’s methodology as a ‘new type of form criticism’ where the task is once again to ‘reach behind the text’ and thus embodies a renewed historical-critical agenda.\textsuperscript{12} He laments the loss of a ‘text-centredness’ approach, which characterised Muilenburg’s agenda where the emphasis was upon the distinctiveness of a particular text.\textsuperscript{13} Another point of critique, proving relevant for this study, is how the task of the rhetorical-critical framework can be achieved when details of the historical situation cannot be known definitively. While the above points of critique are valid, Kennedy’s method still remains a useful framework. One reason for its usefulness is that Kennedy’s rhetorical-critical framework is teleological. The goal is to ask what the persuasive intent of a particular discourse text is within a historical situation and whether the discourse text

\textsuperscript{7} Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation, p. 37.
\textsuperscript{8} Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation, p. 38.
\textsuperscript{10} Black, ‘Rhetorical Criticism’, p. 255.
\textsuperscript{11} Black, ‘Rhetorical Criticism’, p. 257.
\textsuperscript{13} Kern, Rhetoric and Galatians, p. 54.
is effective in addressing the exigency that caused the act of communication in the first instance. Thus, the teleological nature of the rhetorical-critical framework is fitting for a study focusing upon the persuasive intent of the book of Leviticus.

However, two thorny issues arise when applying Kennedy’s rhetorical-critical framework to Leviticus. The first is the lack of internal and external evidence for the existence of the rhetorical situation. Plausible arguments can be posited for dates ranging from the Solomonic era, an Ahaz-Hezekiah situation, an exilic context, or a post-exilic context. Any argument for the persuasive intent of Leviticus within a particular situation of Israel’s

---

25 See Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, pp. 203-205. J. Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22 (Anchor 3a, New York: Doubleday, 2000), p. 1345, is sympathetic to the proposal that H is the work of an emerging generation ‘who radically changed priestly thought’, but in his view only about 95 percent of the H material can be attributed to the product of the eighth century. M. Weinfeld, The Place of the Law in the Religion of Ancient Israel (VTS 100, Leiden: Brill, 2004), p. 23, also commends Knohl’s arguments. N.B. Since Knohl argues that H is a school, the final redaction by H of the Pentateuch extends to the Persian Period (Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, p. 226). However, he still upholds that H was written during, and reflects the concerns of, the Ahaz-Hezekiah era. For positions that hold to H as the editor of the Pentateuch although a post-exilic work, see also Nihan, From Priestly Torah; Otto, E., ‘The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch’ in The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions, ed. S. Shectman & J. S. Baden (AThANT, Zürich: TVZ, 2009), pp. 135-156. Contrary to Stackert, J., ‘The Holiness Legislation and Its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplementation, and Replacement’ in The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions, ed. S. Shectman & J. S. Baden (AThANT 95, Zürich: TVZ, 2009), p. 188.
life in the land would be established on a premise that cannot be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt. Therefore, to hinge an argument upon conjecture should be undertaken with extreme caution. However, Leviticus has two 'levels of communication', at least.\textsuperscript{28} The first is the 'outward level of communication' where an implied (real) author has edited and shaped the book as an act of communication to an implied (real) audience within a rhetorical situation;\textsuperscript{29} this is the level of communication that we simply do not know beyond a Judean situation where Israel is in the land. The second is then the inward level of communication, which are the communication events recalled within the historical setting of the narrative world, which is Israel at Sinai.\textsuperscript{30} These communication acts may vary from a direct act of speaking between YHWH and Moses and/or Aaron (Lev. 1–7, 11–15, 16, 17:1–24:9, 25–27) or indirectly within the narrative (Lev. 8–10, 24:10-23). Irrespective, we are able to explore the situation within the narrative world of the text that caused YHWH to speak to Moses in the first instance (1:1-2α) since Leviticus is edited as part of the wider Pentateuch. This is a similar approach to Adele Berlin's analysis of Zephaniah where she argues that the context of Josiah's reign in Zephaniah 1:1 is 'not necessarily the time that the book was written, but it is the time in which the book is set.'\textsuperscript{31} She continues,

The book clearly presents itself as being set in that period; it is meant to be understood against the background of the latter part of the seventh century B.C.E. An

\textsuperscript{28} I am indebted to Renz, \textit{Rhetorical Function}, pp. 19-22, for the observation that there are a couple of communication levels in the Book of Ezekiel. The principles and language Renz employs is also useful for understanding Leviticus as an act of communication. Thus, I will employ the language of 'level of communication' from this point.

\textsuperscript{29} Renz, \textit{Rhetorical Function}, p. 19, terms this first level the 'outward level of communication.' Also, he helpfully, clarifies the language of 'implied' and 'real' as follows, 'In rhetorical criticism, the “implied author” is the picture the text presents of the sender of the communication. It is the role the real author assumes for himself or herself. Correspondingly, the “implied reader” is the picture of the recipient of the communication that is presupposed in the text' (Renz, \textit{Rhetorical Function}, pp. 19-20).

\textsuperscript{30} This second level of communication is termed differently to Renz's description, 'the communications found in the book' (Renz, \textit{Rhetorical Function}, p. 19).

exegete must take the historical setting seriously, not because it holds the secret to the book’s date, and not even because it is a source for history, but because it is an integral part of the work as it now stands and was perhaps always an integral part of the work. The words of Zephaniah are meant to be read as though they had been spoken in the time of Josiah in the same sense that the events of the Book of Ruth are meant to be understood as having taken place in the days of the Judges.32

Berlin’s logic can also be observed of Leviticus. Leviticus, as noted above, depicts itself as being set within the Israel at Sinai context (e.g. 7:37-38, 25:1, 26:46, 27:34). Apart from the narrative introductions and conclusions, the instruction sustains a future orientation in keeping with the Israel at Sinai situation. This suggests that the book was always meant to be understood within its literary setting, especially since the implied editor did not leave many fingerprints helping us know the rhetorical situation, that is, the real editors, the real audience, and the real exigency.33 Thus, there is one point of conjecture that is likely, which is that the sustaining of the Israel at Sinai situation throughout Leviticus is part of the text’s rhetorical strategy. Berlin observes about Zephaniah, the ‘real author is reinterpreting, in his own words and for his own purpose, earlier prophetic material.’34 This is true too of Leviticus. At a particular point, the ‘real author’ shaped and edited together Mosaic tradition and, in doing so, reinterpreted the tradition to address a real exigency. In choosing to do so, the implied editor sustains the historical setting of Israel at Sinai as the interpretive frame of reference. For the sake of avoiding confusion with the term

33 Joosten, People and Land, p. 46, highlights one such fingerprint when observing that the יראת שמים is a term belonging to the implied author’s context and so ‘the author of H lapses into a mode of speech which is not in tune with the fictional context of H but instead with his own historical context. He expects his audience his audience to understand what is meant by the term [...]’, not because their imagination has followed the projection of the fictional Israel-in-the-desert into a setting in the land, but because they are themselves living in the land’. Similarly, 18:25 uses the wayyiqtol suggesting both the land and inhabitants becoming impure, and the land having vomited the inhabitants from the land, are past events although the conquest is still in the future within the persuasive situation. For further analysis, see p. 204-205 in Chapter Four. These examples seem to suggest that the text was written when the conquest of the land, at the very least, has occurred.
34 Berlin, Zephaniah, p. 38.
'rhetorical situation', I will use the term 'persuasive situation' for the exigence within the life of Israel that caused YHWH to speak to Moses in the situation of Israel at Sinai. This preserves the term 'rhetorical situation' as that which refers to the exigence in the life of Israel causing an editor to shape the book as a communicative event for an implied audience.

The second issue is the prickly task of delimiting Leviticus' structure. As acknowledged above, Leviticus has been edited and shaped from Mosaic tradition and probably from more than one source. The status quo of Levitical scholarship maintains the P and H division where the text is to be approached as two corpora rather than one. While there have been attempts to explore the structure of the whole text or the priestly text, these attempts still maintain the P and H distinctions and very few suggest the possibility of a consistent conceptual basis for the book.\(^5\) Also, Watts' extensive work on the alternation of 'story, list and sanction' within the rhetorical strategy of the Pentateuch suggests that Leviticus' contribution is in its parts within this alternating pattern across Exodus–Deuteronomy.\(^6\) The consequence is that Leviticus' individual units belong to the wider rhetorical strategy of the Pentateuch rather than the book of Leviticus being a discrete unit displaying a rhetorical strategy within the context of the wider Pentateuch. Thus, whether we can approach the text of Leviticus as a rhetorical unit needs to be assessed

\(^5\) For instance, Ruwe, 'Structure of the Book', p. 78, argues for a unifying conceptual framework where '1:1–8:36 presents the preparatory measures that have to be taken in view of the forthcoming revelation of the יהוה כבוד in Israel' and Leviticus 9:1–26:45 'reports on the event of this realisation and offers the Mosaic teaching on the conditions under which the presence of the יהוה כבוד in Israel is a healing one.' From a different perspective, Warning, Literary Artistry, p. 6, also does not deny an author may have edited together different sources but in doing so crafts the text into a 'new literary entity'. He then states the focus of his task, 'its sole focus is to better comprehend the means by which the extant text has been artistically arranged, that is, to detect the distinct literary devices, deliberate terminological patterns which have been created by the writers of the present text.'

before we can progress further. Also, there is a perception that, in Bibb’s words, 'The quest for a coherent literary arrangement of the book of Leviticus is quite difficult, and no constructive rubric will be entirely satisfactory.’ Thus, I will also need to suggest a way to navigate, without diminishing, the complexity.

Therefore, taking into account the brief critique of Kennedy’s rhetorical-critical framework and the two thorny issues that are particular to the book of Leviticus, I will use Kennedy’s rhetorical-critical framework to structure this study’s argument with seven variations. The first variation concerns Kennedy’s second step in his method, which is to identify the rhetorical situation. As noted above, instead of analysing Leviticus' rhetorical situation, I will explore the text’s persuasive situation, that is, within the historical setting of Israel at Sinai consistent with the literary context of Leviticus. The second variation is that I will invert Kennedy’s steps 1 and 2 so that the first step within this study's rhetorical-critical framework is an analysis of the persuasive situation, after which the second step is delimiting the rhetorical unit. The third variation pertains to this second step of delimiting the rhetorical unit. Whereas Kennedy focuses solely upon defining the outer boundaries of the rhetorical unit, I will address both the delimitation of the outer boundaries of the rhetorical unit and the rhetorical unit’s macrostructure that gives shape to the unit's arrangement. The reason for the inclusion of delimiting the rhetorical unit’s arrangement as part of the second step is that the third step of the rhetorical-critical framework analyses the arrangement of the rhetorical unit. This third step assumes that the shape and structure of the arrangement has been derived or, at the very least, is known.

The fourth variation pertains to the third step of exploring the unit’s arrangement. Kennedy suggests that what is needed is a 'line-by-line analysis of the argument, including its assumptions, its topics, and its formal features, and of the devices of style, seeking to

---

37 Bibb, Ritual Words, p. 30.
define their function in context. There are three points to observe about Kennedy's suggestion.

First, the task of analysing the text's 'assumptions, its topics, and its formal features, and of the devices of style' requires other critical methods to be adopted within the rhetorical-critical framework. The purpose of these other critical methods is to enable the analysis of the conceptual and linguistic structures of the text. Just undertaking a literary analysis without identifying how the linguistic structures will be analysed will not suffice. The critical methods that will be employed in this thesis will be identified and justified in section two below.

Second, this 'line-by-line analysis' is eminently possible with one of the Hebrew Bible's twelve Minor Prophets or smaller New Testament texts, which is where Kennedy's interest lies. However, the goal of this 'line-by-line analysis' is worth remembering, which is to identify how the rhetorical unit functions as an effective whole i.e. the sum of its parts. Undertaking this task with any book within the Pentateuch would require a multi-volume work. Thus, to achieve this goal with a book within the Pentateuch corpus requires a global approach and a sample of this 'line-by-line analysis' within a selection of chapters. For this reason, I will adopt a similar approach to Renz's rhetorical analysis of Ezekiel. For the third step in Kennedy's rhetorical-critical framework, Renz analyses the disposition and argument of the book's arrangement by working through each major part of the global text. In this way, he is able to show how each part of the book of Ezekiel coheres as a whole with a particular purpose. Whilst Renz's approach enables an analysis of the sum of the book's parts, it is still an overview with questions arising about how each part achieves its particular argument and purpose that Renz assigns to it. Thus, this study seeks to find a middle-ground by undertaking a similar global approach over two chapters, rather than in

41 See Renz, *Rhetorical Function*, p. 130.
one chapter, as per Renz. This means that an outline and analysis of each ‘part’ of the rhetorical unit can be undertaken in order to understand how those parts function as a whole to serve the rhetorical strategy of the unit to achieve its persuasive intent.

The third point about Kennedy’s suggestion of a ‘line-by-line analysis of the argument’ is that the analysis in the third step of his rhetorical-critical framework is about argument supported by the arrangement, rather than an outline of the arrangement per se. The problem with this approach applied to a book within the Pentateuchal corpus, as observed above, is the sheer breadth of each rhetorical unit. Thus, as undertaken by Renz, this study will seek to explore the logic of each part (an episode) of Leviticus’ arrangement. This will be undertaken in Chapters Three and Four of this study and will primarily be undertaken by the exegesis and literary analysis of the text. However, Chapter Five will undertake a more in-depth rhetorical analysis of select chapters within Leviticus, which will allow an analysis of a ‘line-by-line analysis of the argument’.

However, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by the term ‘argument’ since many would find the application of the term ‘argument’ to Leviticus quite grating. Why the term may be objectionable for some as applied to Leviticus is that there is a tendency to associate the term ‘argument’ with propositional logic rather than with ritual, legal, and narrative texts, of which all three are exemplified in Leviticus. Ritual texts are often repetitive and associated with procedure. Legal texts are often viewed as a list of actions that are either commanded or prohibited, and narrative texts are viewed as fictional retellings of past events disconnected from a real audience. Although ritual texts in Leviticus, such as Leviticus 1–7, may not display propositional argument, there is a particular kind of logic outlining ritual process where the text has chosen to emphasise aspects of the process and exclude other details. This logic is reinforced by repetition as the text progresses from one kind of offering process to the next. This will be evinced in section 4 of this present
chapter and exemplified in Chapter Five. In legal texts, and indeed in some ritual texts, there is a logical argument where reasons are often given for the instructions. For example, in 21:13-15, the text commands the high priest to take a virgin as his wife and prohibits him from taking a widow (v13), a divorced woman, or a woman defiled by adultery (v14a). The following clause begins with the conjunction כי signifying that the following logic is the reason for the instructions just given, namely that the high priest shall take a virgin from his people (v14b). Verse 15a then conveys a prohibition that develops the reasoning for the rationale in v14b, which is that the high priest is not to defile 'his seed'. A second כי conjunction in v15b signals that the following clause is the reason why the high priest is not to defile his descendants, which is that the one who is commanding is YHWH their God who sanctifies 'him' (אני יהוה מקדשו). Thus, while vv13-14a may command and prohibit certain actions, there is a supporting reason supplied, which is, in the view of the implied author, an acceptable premise, which is necessary for an argument. Often where there are lists of commands and prohibitions in Leviticus, particularly within Leviticus 17–22, paraenesis is either integrated within the instruction or framing the instruction. The purpose of the paraenesis is to communicate the reasons why Israel is to walk in the statutes of the nation's covenant God. This fulfils the criteria of an 'argument' in terms of the text aiming to move an audience from one point to another through the progression of the rhetorical discourse. As we will note in the analysis of Leviticus 8–10, this will be true too of the juxtaposition of narratives. Thus, this study will continue to use the term 'argument' to refer to the logic of the text as it progresses from beginning to its conclusion. This will be undertaken by outlining and analysing the arrangement of the text, which requires in turn the ability to analyse the text's shape and structure. For this reason, this study will invest in understanding the text's structures both at the macro- and micro-

---

42 Please see pp. 31-45 for the explanation of this point in section 4 of this present chapter.
43 Kennedy, New Testament Interpretation, p. 16.
levels of the text. How this will be done will be explained in section three of this chapter and also at the beginning of chapter two.

The fifth variation, however, is yet another nuance upon both Kennedy and Renz in relation to the third step of the rhetorical-critical framework. For both Kennedy and Renz, identifying the disposition of the text is a fundamental part of identifying a text's purpose and thus intent. There are three Aristotelian dispositions of a text, namely judicial, epideictic, and deliberative. A critical dimension for each disposition is the time orientation of the text in relation to the audience of the text's rhetorical situation. That is, the judicial disposition seeks to motivate a present audience to decide in judgment about a past event.\(^44\) The epideictic disposition either 'praises or blames' (ἐπιδεικτικοῦ δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐπαινοῦ τὸ δὲ ψόγος) about the present condition.\(^45\) The deliberative disposition concerns the future where the speaker is either exhorting or dissuading about events and actions that are yet to come.\(^46\) As Kennedy highlights, each disposition is related to a particular form or structure of the rhetorical unit in terms of how the unit achieves the intended impact of the rhetorical discourse.\(^47\) Herein lies a problem. Whilst the principles of Aristotelian rhetoric may have a universal application, the particulars that are inculcated within Greek rhetoric may less helpfully be applied to texts that are inculcated within different times and cultures, irrespective of whether the historical era is before or after Aristotle formalised rhetoric as the art of persuasion. As Joosten notes,

\[\text{If we want to apply insights of classical rhetoric to biblical texts, we should of course pay heed to linguistic and cultural differences between the classical and}\]


\(^{47}\) See also Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 23-25.
biblical worlds. We should not attempt to press the biblical data into a classical straightjacket.\textsuperscript{48}

Joosten continues from the above quote to affirm the usefulness of classical rhetoric to 'throw light on biblical rhetoric'.\textsuperscript{49} In his article, Joosten applies the method of classical rhetoric to Judah's speech in Genesis 44:18-34 and, in doing so, observes that 'Judah's speech conforms to the classical teaching on rhetoric to a surprising extent'.\textsuperscript{50} He then observes how Hebrew rhetoric demonstrates characteristics that are not germane to classical rhetoric.\textsuperscript{51} Whilst not denying the productivity of applying classical rhetoric to Hebrew texts, this dissertation does not seek to fit the text of Leviticus into a particular form or structure of Greek rhetoric. Rather, this thesis will apply the rhetorical-critical framework broadly, preferring to apply principles that we can derive from classical rhetoric rather than the particulars of classical rhetoric. This study will work inductively from the structure of the text to deriving its meaning and its persuasive intent. Thus, one such principle that this study will explore in Leviticus is that of disposition i.e. a rhetorical unit has a particular time orientation that is part of the communicator's strategy to achieve a particular impact with the implied audience. In the analysis of each 'part' of the rhetorical unit and also within the analysis of the sum of the arrangement's parts, I will be observing the time orientation of the text and how this contributes to the whole text as a communication event achieving a particular impact. However, this study is limited to the impact of the communication event as it occurs within the persuasive situation i.e. Israel at Sinai.

The sixth variation is that this study will use the term 'rhetorical strategy' within the third step of the rhetorical-critical framework. This term will refer to how the text's structure and the devices of literary artistry that it uses, such as intertextuality, repetition,
paraenesis, prolepsis, analepsis, juxtaposition, discursive redundancy, use of movement and space, enables the text as a communication event to achieve its argument and intent with its audience. This leads to the seventh variation. The final step of Kennedy's rhetorical-critical framework is to review the effectiveness of the rhetorical unit to meet the exigency of the rhetorical situation, yet this is dependent upon Kennedy's first step of identifying the rhetorical situation, which this study will not undertake since any suggestion of the rhetorical situation would be conjecture. To address this problem, my first variation of Kennedy's rhetorical-critical framework is to analyse Leviticus' situation within the literary setting of the Pentateuch, which I have termed the 'persuasive situation'. Thus, given this more foundational change to Kennedy's model, the final step of the rhetorical-critical framework adopted in this study will be suggesting the persuasive intent of the sum of the rhetorical unit's parts and how the rhetorical strategy of the whole unit meets the exigency within the persuasive situation of the text.

In summary, the four-step rhetorical-critical framework that this study will adopt based on the above seven variations to Kennedy's four-step method is as follows.

1. Identify the exigence of the persuasive situation consistent with the literary setting of Leviticus.\(^2\)

2. Determine clear outer boundaries for the rhetorical unit and delimit the macrostructure of the unit's arrangement.

3. Analyse the rhetorical strategy of how the parts of the text are organised into an effective whole and how the rhetorical devices then contribute to the overall strategy of the text. To undertake this third step in a disciplined manner, there are four sub-steps that will need to be undertaken:

i. Explore the arrangement of each 'part' that composes the global rhetorical unit, which includes identifying any significant devices of literary artistry that the text may use to achieve its intent.

ii. Identify the disposition of each 'part' within the whole rhetorical unit with the aim of identifying the disposition of the sum of the rhetorical unit's parts.

iii. Identify the persuasive intent of each part in relation to the whole.

iv. Propose the rhetorical strategy of how the whole arrangement as 'the sum of its parts' functions to achieve the rhetorical unit's intent.

4. Demonstrate how the persuasive intent of the whole rhetorical unit meets the exigency of the persuasive situation.

These four steps of a rhetorical-critical framework will organise the argument of this study. I will undertake the first step of analysing the persuasive situation in the final section of this chapter with the goal of identifying the exigency within the narrative world that caused YHWH to call out to Moses from the tent of meeting in Leviticus 1:1. This will then allow Chapter Two to focus solely upon step two of the rhetorical-critical framework outlined above, namely delimiting Leviticus as a rhetorical unit and its arrangement. As part of this second step, the chapter will conclude by attending to the issue of Leviticus' perceived incoherence. Chapters Three and Four will then explore the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus' arrangement as per the third step of the rhetorical-critical framework. The discussion of each part of the unit's arrangement will develop from analysing the text's structure and aspects of the text's literary artistry to identifying the argument, time orientation, strategy, and intent of each part. The fourth chapter will then conclude by suggesting the persuasive intent of Leviticus' rhetorical strategy. Since Chapters Three and
Four undertake an analysis of Leviticus' rhetorical strategy and thus can only offer a global and thus summative argument, Chapter Five will then demonstrate the depth of analysis of arrangement, rhetorical strategy, and intent at the macro- and micro-levels of the text focusing on Leviticus' beginning and end, Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27. The final chapter will then offer a conclusion about the fourth step of the rhetorical-critical framework, which is to identify the persuasive intent of Leviticus to meet the exigency of its persuasive situation.

2. Embedded Methods for Delimiting and Analysing Leviticus' Arrangement

As observed above, Kennedy envisions the use of literary analysis in step 3 of the rhetorical-critical framework when he states that what is needed is a 'line-by-line analysis of the argument, including its assumptions, its topics, and its formal features, and of the devices of style, seeking to define their function in context.'\(^3\) However, literary analysis does not necessarily access the text's choice of linguistic structures, which impacts the features, shape, concepts, and argument of the text. Furthermore, we need a means of undertaking an analysis that has methodological controls and also works with features of the Hebrew language. Thus, a way forward is needed to undertake a rigorous analysis of the rhetorical unit's arrangement, which in this study is the arrangement of Leviticus.

Apart from the mention of devices of style, Kennedy's outline of how a scholar should engage with the arrangement of a rhetorical unit could also be a loose description of the task of discourse analysis. The concern of discourse analysis is the interaction of linguistic structures in context, whether that be at a sentence, paragraph, episodic, or global level.\(^4\) This, of course, also requires analysis of the syntax of each sentence in order to show the pragmatic function of various syntactic structures in the sentence. Also, discourse analysis and pragmatics has a tendency to borrow insights from cognitive linguistics and


information structures, particularly the theory of clause focus, thematic referents, coherence, and mental representations.

There are three solid reasons to integrate syntactic, discourse, and cognitive linguistic analysis with literary analysis within the third step of a rhetorical-critical framework. First, discourse analysis provides the linguistic method to analyse the argument of the text, enabling the scholar to trace discourse topics and thematicity at a paragraph, episodic, and global level of the text’s macrostructure. Thus, discourse analysis may provide a useful tool to establish a text as a rhetorical unit and to delimit the text’s arrangement. Second, the use of discourse analysis may add another level of understanding to our task since one of its principles is to ask why a particular linguistic structure has been chosen and what meaning is then implied by this decision. This step may help ascertain the persuasive intent of a text’s arrangement by exploring the text’s choice of structure. Third, linguistic structure analysis, both syntactic and pragmatic, is a means of accessing the overall text’s structure and meaning, rather than being an end in and of itself. A rhetorical-critical framework provides that ‘end’. That is, the very nature of a rhetorical-critical framework is that it has a global focus and is teleological i.e. the whole framework moves towards the goal or the end of identifying the persuasive intent of the rhetorical unit within the rhetorical situation, or for this study, the persuasive situation. Thus, literary analysis complemented by linguistic analysis (syntax, discourse, and cognitive linguistics) may be usefully embedded within third step of the rhetorical-critical framework, especially to lend rigour to textual analysis in deriving the arrangement, argument, and intent of each ‘part’ of the rhetorical unit.

Also, there is another reason particular to Leviticus that commends the use of pragmatics and cognitive linguistics. A presupposition of a rhetorical-critical framework, especially the third step of arrangement, is that the rhetorical unit is purposefully shaped into a

---

cohesive whole. This may pose a problem for approaching Leviticus as a rhetorical unit since past Levitical scholarship has a tendency to approach the text as two corpora with two diverging worldviews and whose cohesion is dependent upon the overarching priestly narrative.\textsuperscript{56} While there has been a gradual shift towards exploring how the book of Leviticus might have a purposeful arrangement,\textsuperscript{57} there is still little progress in resolving, or at least navigating, the issues that cause the perception of incoherence. These issues include the prevalence and variation between the narrative introductions and speech formulae, as well as the seeming absence of consistent discourse markers. To these issues, other problems can be added such as the blending of legal instruction, ritual texts, and narrative, the use of different summary conclusions, the double conclusion in 26:46 and 27:34, the relationship between Leviticus 1–16 and 17–26, how Leviticus 27 relates to Leviticus 17–26, and whether there is internal coherence within paragraphs of legal texts such as Leviticus 19. Although progress has been made recently, studies on the composition and structure of Leviticus are at an impasse. Therefore, an attempt to delimit the macrostructure of Leviticus' arrangement, assuming coherence, and then analysing the rhetorical strategy of the arrangement is fraught with difficulty not only because of the obstacles in the text itself, but due to the myriad of tightly-held views about how Leviticus is composed and arranged in its final form. A different approach, such as discourse analysis, may help navigate these obstacles without undermining the possibility that the text is made up of multiple sources.

In summary, the four-step rhetorical-critical method explained above provides an overarching framework that functions to organise the argument of this study. That is, the


\textsuperscript{57} For example, see Douglas, Leviticus as Literature; Nihan, From Priestly Torah; Ruwe, 'Structure of the Book', pp. 55-78; Warning, Literary Artistry in Leviticus.
rhetorical-critical framework is not intended to lead to the conclusions as such. The framework provides steps that structures the study and its argument, rather than deriving the particular conclusion itself. The framework certainly ensures that the study leads to a particular goal which, in this instance, is identifying the persuasive intent of the book as the sum of its parts and how the strategy of the text meets the exigency of the persuasive situation. Kennedy recognises the limitations of the framework by the fact that he requires literary analysis in the third step of his framework, which directly leads to the conclusions. Therefore, other embedded methods are needed to enable the scholar to derive the specific conclusions.

Thus, in order to present a disciplined analysis in steps two and three of the rhetorical-critical framework, this study will integrate insights from discourse and cognitive linguistics with literary and syntax analysis to delimit the boundaries of the rhetorical-discourse unit (Chapter Two), to derive the macrostructure of Leviticus’ arrangement (Chapter Two), to explore the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus’ arrangement (Chapters Three and Four), and as tools for a more detailed analysis of the argument within Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27 (Chapter Five). The conclusions that will be evinced in Chapters Two through Five will directly derive from a complex of methods, namely from an integration of literary analysis with discourse, syntax, and cognitive linguistic analysis. I will suspend explaining the theory and method of discourse analysis and aspects of cognitive linguistics until Chapter Two where I will begin using these methods to delimit the macrostructure of the book of Leviticus. However, before progressing to the first step of the adapted rhetorical-critical framework outlined above – identifying the persuasive situation of Leviticus – I will address two presuppositions of this study. The first assumption is that Leviticus can be approached as one corpus (section 3 below) and the second is that ritual texts function to persuade (section 4 below).
3. Approaching the Book of Leviticus as a Rhetorical-Discourse Unit

Gerstenberger’s perception of Leviticus as a ‘fairly artificial excerpt from a larger narrative and legislative work, sewn together like a patchwork quilt from many different, individual pieces’ could be discouraging to the canonical scholar and exegete.\textsuperscript{38} In contrast though, Rendtorff gives permission to approach Leviticus as a unit stating,

the exegetical task is not to reconstruct earlier levels that always will remain hypothetical and dependent on the respective methodological approach of the interpreter. Rather exeges have to try to understand the biblical text in its given form and shape.\textsuperscript{39}

There are two issues that I will need to tackle within this thesis to establish why Leviticus can be approached in ‘its given form and shape’.\textsuperscript{40} The first is why Leviticus can be approached as a whole text, whilst the second is whether Leviticus can be approached as a discrete unit within the Pentateuchal narrative. This section will demonstrate the first issue, which is the plausibility of approaching the whole book as a rhetorical unit, and the second will be addressed in Chapter Two.

Wellhausen’s argument in the \textit{Prolegomena} decisively changed scholarly approaches to the book of Leviticus. His dissatisfaction with the JED division of his day caused him to champion the \textit{Priesterschrift} as the most problematic document of the Hexateuch.\textsuperscript{41} Furthermore, he describes Leviticus 17–26 as a ‘peculiar little collection of laws, which has indeed been taken up into the Priestly Code, but which in many respects disagrees with it.’\textsuperscript{42} Later, he expands on this point saying that Leviticus 17–26 existed first as a stand-alone corpus that was later ‘redacted and incorporated by the author of the Priestly Code’

\textsuperscript{40} Rendtorff, ‘Is it Possible to Read Leviticus as a Separate Book?’, p. 34.
\textsuperscript{42} Wellhausen, \textit{Prolegomena}, p. 51.
into the Priestly document. Wellhausen’s point about the existence of chapters 17–26 as an independent corpus, which was then blended into the Priesterschrift, begins the move to separate Leviticus 1–16 from Leviticus 17–26. This tendency was then reinforced with Noth’s work. Noth strengthened the separation between P and H by arguing that P, the secondary layer, does not share a relationship with chapters 17–26. According to Noth, Leviticus 1–16 and Leviticus 17–26(27) were created originally as separate entities. The only point of unity between 1–16 and 17–26(27) is that the two parts are placed within the same literary setting and did not exist in its final form apart from the ‘framework of the priestly narrative.’ Thus, Noth argues that Leviticus is composed of two corpora that bear no relationship to each other and that the coherence of the book as a whole depends entirely upon the ‘P-narrative’ in which the book is firmly embedded.

Much later, Knohl continues the legacy of the P and H separation. He begins his argument with four presuppositions. First, four sources comprise the Pentateuch (JEDP). Second, the Priestly Source (P) is made up of writings from two priestly schools, the Priestly Torah (PT) and the Holiness School (HS). The main corpus for PT is Leviticus 1–16, while the focal point for the writings of HS is Leviticus 17–26. Third, the HS corpus is later than the PT corpus; and fourth, the final redactors of the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, as well as the Pentateuch, belong to the HS. Knohl agrees with Wellhausen on two
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68 Knohl, Sanctuary of Silence, p. 1, accepts the status quo of JEDP source division.
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foundational ideas. First, PT and HS (using Knohl's terminology) are vastly different; and second, they both existed at one stage as separate corpora. However, Knohl purposefully departs from Wellhausen at vital points. Knohl's language intentionally differs from that of Wellhausen and his proponents. While Wellhausen uses the language of the priestly source or code, Knohl prefers the terminology of the priestly school called the Priestly Torah (PT). Similarly, instead of the Holiness Code, Knohl talks about the Holiness School (HS). Knohl's reason for preferring the language of PT and HS to represent the two priestly schools is to accentuate the distinction between the theologies that characterise the two schools, rather than two different sources. Furthermore, Knohl argues that HS is an extension of PT. The redaction by HS of the writings from both schools is then the Priestly Source. Thus, while Wellhausen views P and H as two sources, Knohl views PT and HS as two distinct schools of thought which, when edited together, become the source document. During this editing process, the HS redactors add their own paraenetic material into Leviticus 1–16, but still preserve the distinctive ‘imprint’ of PT ideology within the PT materials. The juxtaposition between the preserved PT ideology within Leviticus 1–16 and the HS corpus accentuates the difference in language, worldview, and theology, between the two schools. The implication of Knohl's study is that if Leviticus 1–16 and Leviticus 17–26 represent two corpora with different ideologies, then each part (minus the HS additions into chapters 1–16) is a rhetorical unit, rather than the whole book.
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Joosten, following Knohl’s lead, explores the ‘ideational framework underlying the discourse’ of H. Joosten’s decision to limit his study to the Holiness Code is both for pragmatic reasons to limit the scope of his study and also having been persuaded by Knohl’s justification of the distinction between PT and HS. Joosten summarises Knohl’s argument for the distinctiveness of H as an individual corpus in four points and so provides a helpful starting point to assess Knohl’s argument. The aim is to establish the basis for exploring the whole book of Leviticus as a rhetorical-discourse unit.

Joosten’s first point is that H begins with prescriptions about the ‘place of sacrifice’ and so begins where the other law codes start, such as ‘the Book of the Covenant, P, Deuteronomy, and Ezekiel 40-48’. Leviticus 17:3-7 does indeed instruct about the proper location of sacrifices. There is no ambiguity. Verse 4 places the prepositional phrase אהל—allal in the clause-initial position to accentuate the offence of not bringing קרבן a gift (קרבי) to YHWH. Moreover, this first clause in v4 also ends with a second mention of the location where the Israelite fails to offer the gift before God – before the tabernacle of YHWH (לפני יהוה). While the rest of v4 outlines the penalty for the offence, v5 then gives the reason for the logic in v4, which is that the Israelite will be motivated to bring their sacrifice to the entrance of the tent of meeting for YHWH. This is not the first time in Leviticus that this language occurs, however. The use of the prepositional phrase אהל—allal along with the language of קרב and קרבן in 17:4 echoes the first major and minor cases in 1:2b-3. In 1:2b, the major protasis describes the situation where an Israelite wishes to draw near (קרב) with an offering (קרבי) from the livestock (מקריה), either from the cattle or from sheep (מכירת). The language of קרב and קרבן is then
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80 Please note G. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus*, (NICOT, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979), p. 249, who observes from a different angle that the instructions pertaining to sacrifice in Leviticus 17 ‘have already been discussed in chapters 1-7 [...] this chapter draws together themes that run through the previous sixteen’. 
repeated in the next protasis in 1:3a where an עלה offering is to be brought ממלא. As Knierim notes about 1:3-9, it is the offerer arriving at the location of the entrance of the tent of meeting that then initiates the series of actions set forth in vv4-9. If Knierim is right and the redactor of the gift instructions in 1:1-9 has chosen to include some details to the exclusion of others, then the inclusion of the place where the animal is to be offered is an important detail that is vital to the concept and meaning of the text. Leviticus, therefore, also begins with a concern for the place of offerings and so meets the same criteria for beginning a law corpus that Joosten states for H.

Furthermore, 1:3-9 is a positive prescription for drawing near with a gift at the entrance of the tent of meeting. This presents a contrast to the beginning of H in 17:3-7 where the prescription is negative pointing to the consequence for not bringing the offering to the entrance of the tent of meeting (vv3-4). The beginning of v5 suggests that the purpose of the instructions in vv3-4 is for prevention; that is, to ensure that the sons of Israel bring their sacrifices to the entrance of the tent of meeting as a שלמים offering. Thus, the prescriptions about sacrifice at the beginning of H relate back to the offering prescriptions in Leviticus 1-7. The fact 17:3-7 revisits earlier instructions could suggest that we are not dealing with a beginning of a new corpus within the extant text, but rather the shift in topic from Leviticus 16 to Leviticus 17 signals the beginning of a new episode within the arrangement of the book as a whole.
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83 N.B. While my argument above is only to demonstrate that Leviticus 1 begins with a similar concern as Leviticus 17, B. J. Schwartz, “Profane” Slaughter and the Integrity of the Priestly Code’, HUCA 67 (1997), pp. 15-42, demonstrates that P is consistent with H on the issue of Leviticus 17:3-7. This strengthens the argument above that the whole could be approached as a whole.
Joosten’s second point is that H ends with a ‘chapter of blessings and curses’ (Leviticus 26) similar to the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy. The logic of this point is problematic. The Book of the Covenant does not conclude with a ‘chapter of blessings and curses’. The so-called blessings and curses in Exodus 23:20-33 focus upon YHWH’s action of blessing and Israel’s response; that is, the concern centres upon the issue of divine agency and human response. The asyndetic clause beginning v24 pauses the information flow between the focus upon divine agency in v23 and the command for Israel not to adopt the practices of those nations in v24. The effect is to highlight God’s direct work of destroying the six nations in v23 after which the three sequential prohibitions in v23 express what Israel shall not do, ולא תעשה אתם את אלוהים ולא תעבדו את אלהים תמששים ולא תשתחוה כמעשיהם ולא תעשו. An emphatic clause using the piel infinitive absolute + the piel imperfect of הרס and שבר then follows these three prohibitions conveying their rationale. The effect is to balance what Israel is not to do, which is not serving the gods of the six nations, nor doing what the six nations do, but in contrast they are to destroy them and break down their stone pillars. Verse 25a then highlights whom the Israelites are to serve, אלהיכם יהוה ואעבדתם. The use of the covenant address אלהיכם יהוה is a reminder to Israel of the one to whom they have given their sole allegiance in a binding relationship. The following wqatal ברכו begins a sequence of logic, although not entirely successive, describing how YHWH will respond to his people’s allegiance; he will bless the people in the provision of food and water, turn away sickness amongst them, ensure none miscarries a child, and by acting against their enemies (vv25-31). There are no corresponding curses to how YHWH will act in blessing.
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Exodus 23:23-33 does conclude though with a further two prohibitions in v32a (לא תכרת להם) and 33a (לא ישבו בארץ) together with a warning not to let the six nations cause them, that is Israel, to sin against YHWH. There is a direct relationship in v33 between allowing the people to remain in the land and the gods of those six nations becoming a snare to Israel. Thus, the character of the concluding section to the Book of the Covenant is paraenetic, but not in the sense of setting before Israel the covenant blessings and curses as in Leviticus 26 or Deuteronomy 28–29. There is only one use of the particle אם in v22 introducing the conditional nature of the blessings. A characteristic of the corresponding lists of blessings and curses in both Leviticus 26 (v3, v14) and Deuteronomy 28 (v1, v15) is the use of אם to signal the beginning of blessings in response to Israeliite obedience and curses in response to Israeliite rebellion. The emphasis in Exodus 23:23-33 is upon how YHWH will act on behalf of his people in response to their service to him as their covenant God. Moreover, Durham observes that another characteristic missing from Exodus 23:30-33, which is very much present in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28, is the persistent command to obey the instructions just outlined. This dissimilarity suggests that this epilogue to the Book of the Covenant does not have a parallel function to Leviticus 26 or Deuteronomy 27–28. Therefore, stating how H concludes is not definitive evidence for exploring H as a distinct law corpus, especially since how H concludes is also how the book as a whole concludes. Since the extant text of Leviticus equally begins and ‘ends’ in a similar way to the Holiness Code, this suggests the possibility of approaching the book of Leviticus as one corpus and, therefore, as a rhetorical-discourse unit.


Joosten's third point refers to the presence of paraenetic elements within the Holiness Code where the motivations of the prescriptions are expounded. As stated above, Joosten follows Knohl by arguing that H is the later redactor who places the paraenetic language in 11:43-45 to subvert the ideology of P. Since Joosten is using Knohl's argument at this point, it is worth returning to Knohl's observations about which parts in Leviticus 1–16 are HS additions. Knohl notes that 11:43-45 is not the only H addition within chapters 1–16, but also attributes 3:17, 7:22-36, 10:6-11, 15:31, and 16:29b-33, to the HS redactors.

According to Knohl, there is 'not a single literary unit that may be assigned in its entirety to PT'. So while there may not be any PT paraenetic sections per se, if we use Knohl's own logic, a paraenetic section has been placed within the PT writings to align PT with the HS worldview. Thus, using Knohl's logic once more, the very fact that HS edits and redacts the legal writings of PT into the HS corpus suggests that HS desired the final form of his edited text to be read as a whole in light of HS ideology. Thus, the argument for approaching P or H, rather than the text within its final form, may undermine the intent of the HS in redacting the text of Leviticus 1:1–27:34 together as a whole. The only question that remains is whether 1:1 is the intended beginning and 27:34 is the intended conclusion of the book, which will be discussed in Chapter Two when Leviticus 1:1–27:34 will be delimited as a rhetorical unit.

Joosten's fourth point is that the Holiness Code is distinctive in 'vocabulary, style, and theology' and, although this has been the general consensus, it is no longer definitive. Trevaskis' study focusing upon whether holiness in P contains an implied ethical dimension, which is present explicitly in H, demonstrates the possibility that the conceptual basis of holiness in P is the same as H. Trevaskis notes from the beginning of his work the 'provocative' nature of his exploration 'because of the distinctions generally
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made between holiness in P and H.' Yet he tests whether there is more 'coherence in the concepts of holiness found in P and H than is commonly assumed.' While an assessment of Trevaskis' study is not possible at this point in the thesis, the very fact that he demonstrates the possibility that P and H might share a similar understanding of holiness suggests that this fourth point can no longer be held as a definitive argument until further study can be undertaken.

Finally, Joosten's argument highlights too many similarities between P and H for the two to be treated as two distinct and separate corpora. For instance, Joosten argues that the concept of covenant in H is 'wholly its own' but at the same time is 'typically priestly'. Joosten's work allows for the possibility that the covenant forms a shared conceptual basis between P and H. Furthermore, according to Joosten, where P and H deviate is H's expansion to include the 'demand for sanctity to the entire land, and the entire people.' The question must be asked though whether expanding the sphere of holiness distinguishes Leviticus 17–27 as a separate corpus or whether the expanding spatial dimension is part of the rhetorical strategy of the whole.

Thus, the four reasons Joosten states summarising the arguments for approaching H as a discrete corpus are not conclusive. An assessment of each point demonstrates that it is just as feasible to approach the book in its entirety as a law corpus. Our brief analysis even suggests potential in the notion that there is a unifying conceptual basis for the text as a
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whole, which is that of the covenant. Joosten recognises that a global approach may be
appropriate and may even reveal a number of important convergences between the two
schools. Thus, Joosten's work gives permission to approach the text of Leviticus in its final
form as a rhetorical unit. Having demonstrated the plausibility of this presupposition, the
next section will address a second presupposition that ritual texts have a persuasive intent.

4. An Argument for the Persuasive Function of Ritual and Ritual Texts

A presupposition of this study is that ritual instruction in Leviticus, such as Leviticus 1–7,
has an argument, rhetorical strategy, and persuasive intent may elicit two kinds of
responses. The first response has already been observed above; a disliking of the idea due
to the perception that the function of ritual instruction is only to prescribe ritual
procedure. The second response is of great interest, but slightly sceptical, because of the
debate surrounding where meaning is found within a ritual text. Given that this
presupposition is critical to this present study, it is worth pausing to explain why ritual
texts have an intent to persuade and the implications of this explanation for exploring the
argument and rhetorical strategy of Levitical ritual instruction particularly in Chapter
Five. To explain this presupposition though, this section will explore arguments of ritual
anthropologists who observe what is universally true of ritual. Intriguingly, the notion that
ritual has a persuasive dimension is not disputed by ritual anthropologists, even if by
biblical scholars. To demonstrate the universality of agreement among ritual
anthropologists on this one issue, I will explore representative arguments on a critical
issue that is divisive among ritual anthropologists; namely, the relationship between ritual
and society. Four anthropologists who represent the divisive views are Victor Turner,
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Clifford Geertz, Catherine Bell, and Roy Rappaport. If I can demonstrate, irrespective of their differing views on this issue of ritual and society, that they share one common point about ritual as a means of communication, then worth exploring is whether they share common convictions about the persuasive nature of ritual.

4.1 An Overview of the Four Views on Ritual and Society

The divisive issue, as stated above, is that of the relationship between ritual and society. Victor Turner is representative of a functional-structuralist approach arguing that ritual is the means by which social order within communities is formed, affirmed, and restored. Rappaport takes a similar approach, but differs on one pivotal point. While Turner has a functional and structuralist approach, Rappaport rejects the functional and prioritises the structural. As we will note below, while the symbolic is a critical dimension for Turner, Rappaport downplays the symbolic and argues that the 'metamessage' is derived from the structure of the ritual. In terms of the relationship between ritual and society though, Rappaport argues that ritual is the foil for societal evolution.

On a superficial level, Geertz's view that ritual shapes social order, rather than describing social order, seems to suggest that his symbolic approach agrees with both Turner and Rappaport. However, Geertz argues for a much more 'dynamic complexity' where culture and ritual shape the other. He understands Turner's approach, for instance, to be reducing ritual to a preserving function, rather than ritual having a formative purpose. In complete contrast then is Bell's contention that ritual functions to depict the ideal order of
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culture." Culture forms ritual. In depicting the ideal order, ritual has the effect of preserving order within a society. Again, Bell's argument is a dynamic approach in which society forms ritual and then ritual impacts society by sustaining social order.

Thus, this overview briefly demonstrates that there are vast disagreements between the four ritual anthropologists about the dynamic between ritual and society, including the function of ritual within society. Curiously, irrespective of fundamental differences, each of the four scholars agree on one basic point. Ritual is a means of communication.108

4.2 Ritual as a Means of Communication

Since Turner, Rappaport, Geertz, and Bell, agree that ritual is a means of communication, I will explore below how the four ritual-anthropologists compare and contrast within this one issue.

Turner argues that ritual is a process where symbols communicate values and beliefs that represent an ordered community. The means of communication, for Turner, is the structure of symbols within the communicative process.109 Geertz agrees with Turner's idea that the means of communication is through symbol, but quite unlike Turner's argument, communication is not through ritual structure. Instead, the mode of communicating the symbolic is through performance.110 Turner would not disagree with Geertz on this point, but rather emphasises the role of structure in the communicative process. For Geertz, the ritual message that the performance communicates is a particular understanding of the 'general order of existence'.111 Geertz strongly critiques the notion that ritual describes order, as per Turner; for Geertz, ritual shapes social order.112 Thus, as we have seen briefly,
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despite some key differences, both Turner and Geertz agree that ritual is a means of communication.

Rappaport, however, has a vastly different starting point to both Geertz and Turner. Rappaport begins with the presupposition that ritual is not just one option out of many for communicating a particular message; rather, ‘certain meanings and effects can best, or even only, be expressed or achieved in ritual.’ He then extends his argument by noting that ritual is both auto-communicative and allo-communicative. Ritual acts are auto-communicative in that ‘the transmitters of ritual’s message are always among their most important receivers’. The performer and the receiver of the ritual message are one and the same. A performer, however, also conveys to the corporate gathering that he or she is aligned to the universal order that the ritual is depicting. This social act is allo-communicative. While Rappaport is careful to balance the roles of the sender and the receiver within the communicative process of a ritual, Bell focuses her argument upon the canonical message, assuming the auto-communicative aspect. For Bell, ritual acts to articulate the ‘socio-cosmic order’, which is ‘the way things really are and ought to be.’ Thus, although there are different emphases between the four anthropologists, especially as to whether ritual shapes society or society shapes ritual, each views ritual as an act of communication to be essential to what makes a ritual by definition a ritual.

As we have already noted above, both Turner and Geertz prioritise the symbolic dimension in how they understand rituals to communicate, which is not a conviction or a methodological decision that either Rappaport or Bell share. We have observed above that Turner describes how the mode of communication in a ritual is through the arrangement of symbols within a ritual’s structure. For Turner, the symbol is the most basic building
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block of a ritual. Symbols are placed together to form a phase within a ritual and each phase is organised and shaped into a complete ritual process. A symbol derives its 'significance from the system as a whole.' The implication being that the same symbol could be used at different points or phases within a particular process of a ritual and have different meanings in its different positions. While Geertz rejects the structuralist approach that Turner represents, he still has a high view of the use of symbols within ritual. Like Turner, Geertz understands symbols to have a persuasive dimension within the ritual, he just chooses a different emphasis to that of Turner. For Geertz, symbols are to be physical representations of the abstract whether they be 'ideas, attitudes, judgments, longings, or beliefs.' The role of ritual then is for humans and the symbolic to meet. Thus, for Turner and Geertz, the symbol has a vital role within the communicative process of a ritual.

Rappaport, relative to both Turner and Geertz, downplays the symbolic dimension of a ritual. Rappaport rejects the notion that ritual as a means of communication is efficacious, while Turner and Geertz view the symbolic within ritual to be efficacious. In contrast to Turner and Geertz, Rappaport argues that symbolism is present only in a particular kind of message. In Rappaport's view, ritual communicates two kinds of messages, the self-referential and the canonical. The self-referential is when participants aim to convey 'information concerning their current physical, psychic, or social states to themselves and to other participants.' Often the self-referential message will make a statement about the status of a person or a community. In Rappaport's understanding,
the self-referential message does not communicate via the symbolic; rather, the canonical message ‘rests upon symbols’. The canonical, then, acts not to convey information about the status of the participant, but rather is a message that ‘represents the general, enduring, or even eternal aspects of universal orders’. While the self-referential concerns the ‘here and now’, the canonical transcends the immediate. Rappaport argues that ritual is ‘not merely a mode of communication in which two sorts of information may be transmitted. It is, rather, a very complex form in which the two classes of messages are dependent upon each other.” As said above, Rappaport states unequivocally that ‘canonical messages are and can only be founded upon symbols’. He defines a symbol as a ‘sign which refers to the object it denotes by being really affected by the object.” Furthermore, the symbols are a result of encoding within the invariance and formalism of a ritual; the symbolic is inherent in the ritual that the participants undertake. The participants themselves do not encode the symbolic aspects of ritual. Thus, while Rappaport might not view the symbolic to be the primary means of communicating the whole message of a ritual, he does understand symbols to be the means of communicating the canonical message.

Just as Rappaport seems to diminish the significance of symbols in comparison with Turner and Geertz, so too Bell does the same by placing the use of symbolism on the same level as the other five dimensions of a ritual. However, looking at her understanding of symbolism beyond a glance, she has a higher view of the efficacy of symbolism than that of Rappaport. True enough, for Bell, the symbolic is one of six dimensions of the communicative process, rather than being the primary means of communication. The
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difference, however, lies in the purpose of symbols within a ritual. According to Bell, there are three functions that symbols play. The first is the totalising where the symbol 'invokes the interrelationship of the microcosm and the macrocosm'.\footnote{Bell, \textit{Ritual: Perspectives}, p. 159.} Bell finds this use of symbolism to be powerfully effective because they 'contain worlds of associations within a condensed image, in regard to which people can act out their sense of personal and corporate involvement.'\footnote{Bell, \textit{Ritual: Perspectives}, p. 159.} The second purpose that a symbol can then have is one that 'summarises' in that symbol condenses human experience.\footnote{Bell, \textit{Ritual: Perspectives}, pp. 159-161.} This differs to the third function, an elaborating symbol, which is to help humans understand experience.\footnote{Bell, \textit{Ritual: Perspectives}, p. 159.} Thus, while the symbolic loses distinctiveness in Bell's six dimensions, she views the symbol as vital in the communicative process since the symbolic allows the participants to access information in a way that either involves them in the universal order, or helps them condense or sort through human experience.

Thus, while all four scholars acknowledge the use of the symbolic to varying degrees within ritual, what is evident is that irrespective of their differences, each acknowledges the use of the symbolic within the communicative process of a ritual.

\textit{4.3 The Structural Arrangement of Ritual}

Before proceeding, however, to a discussion about the effect a ritual has with the participants of the ritual, worth observing is that Turner, Rappaport, and Bell share a conviction about the structural arrangement of a ritual. As said above, Geertz rejects structuralism as an approach and so for this reason Geertz will not be considered here. For Turner though, the structure of a ritual is just as critical to the communicative process as the symbolic. The structure of a ritual is made up of stages where each phase is composed by placing symbols together in a particular pattern. Each phase is then shaped into the ritual process. What is vital to Turner's understanding of structure is that each phase of the
ritual process has an "end' and the sum of the phases is a 'means to the final end'." Rituals are, therefore, telos-oriented. Thus, for Turner,

There is a consistent relationship between the end or aim of each phase in a ritual, the kind of symbolic configuration employed in that phase, and the senses that become paramount in multivocal symbols in that configuration."

While Turner emphasises the goal of the ritual, Rappaport's emphasis upon structure tends towards the aspect of formalism. Structure or form, according to Rappaport's definition, is "the arrangement of contents", which is imposed on a ritual through the process of formalism. The form brings a rigidity to the ritual process. The role of the participants is to adhere to the form. Later, Bell builds on the dimension of formalism. Formalism, as defined by Bell, is an 'organised set of expressions and gestures, a 'restricted code' of communication or behaviour'. Formalising how a participant speaks and acts asks the participants and the audience to take on roles that are 'more difficult to disrupt' and thus 'reinforces the larger social status quo.' By restraining patterns of speech and behaviour to predetermined patterns, formal behaviour can 'communicate complex sociocultural messages very economically, particularly messages about social classification, hierarchical relationships, and the negotiation of identity and position in the social nexus." Again, the very characteristic of formalism points to the essential nature of ritual as a communicative act. Furthermore, Bell observes that these formal actions teach those involved to independently reproduce 'a set of moral and social rules that define what it means to be human in a particular culture." Thus, formalism
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contributes towards the persuasive function of a ritual. By the ritual communicating through the means of predetermined behaviour, the ritual conveys social norms representing cultural order and thus moral order in a way that teaches participants to reify that order. As Bell notes,

Formalization as the use of restricted codes of speech and movement also suggests some of the ways in which ritual can engage, consent, and promote the internalisation of overarching social values by means of fairly discrete and specific acts.  

Thus, although three of the four anthropologists share the conviction that the form or structure of a ritual is primary to ritual as a communicative process, each has a difference emphasis. While Turner argues that structure serves to bring the participant to the goal of the ritual, both Rappaport and Bell accentuate the process of the ritual. For Rappaport, formalism serves the invariance of the ritual process, but for Bell, the formalised patterns of ritual action enable the participants to embody the social and ethical order that the ritual communicates.

4.4 The Impact of Ritual

If ritual does have a persuasive dimension, then there must be, by the very definition of the art of persuasion, an effect that the ritual is intended to produce as a result of the communicative process. To varying degrees, all four anthropologists uphold the argument that ritual has an effect in, at the very least, the participants. This is certainly true of Turner who observes ritual as having two main purposes. The first is the cognitive function that makes visible the 'unknown with the known'. The process of 'ritual symbolisation', therefore, is 'to make visible, audible, and tangible beliefs, ideas, values, sentiments, and psychological dispositions that cannot be directly perceived.' He also observes that while

---
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symbols have a cognitive purpose, they also have an 'oretic function', which is the point where the ritual is efficacious in changing the behaviour of a person or a community towards a desired outcome.\textsuperscript{151} Symbols within the ritual 'elicit emotion and express and mobilize desire.'\textsuperscript{152} Thus, as the participants submit to the ritual process, as each phase and the sum of the phases as a whole moves towards the goal, the participants move from one state to another more desirable state at the end of the ritual.\textsuperscript{153} For example, if there is conflict that could or is introducing discord within a community, then ritual actions function to provide the means of confession and, in doing so, the participant's attitude 'conforms once more to the public mores.'\textsuperscript{154} Thus, the intended effect of a ritual is to align an individual to the social norm, that is, to the particular view of order within that particular culture.

While Turner has an individualistic view of ritual and its effect within the context of community, Geertz emphasises the communal nature of ritual.\textsuperscript{155} Geertz also understands there to be two effects of the ritual process that results from the participants and the symbolic coming together.\textsuperscript{156} The first effect is that the motivations, which the symbols are intended to produce, are engendered within the participants; and second, the order of the world that the symbols communicate transform 'one's sense of reality.'\textsuperscript{157} Thus, the effect of the ritual is both motivational and cognitive. Ritual acts to 'shape the spiritual consciousness of a people' by the fusing together of the motivational and the cognitive.\textsuperscript{158} This shaping of the consciousness then continues beyond the ritual by colouring how participants define 'cosmic order' and the 'established world of bare fact.'\textsuperscript{159} Herein lies the

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{151} Turner, Forest of Symbols, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{152} Turner, Forest of Symbols, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{153} Turner, Forest of Symbols, p. 54.
\textsuperscript{154} Turner, Forest of Symbols, p. 50.
\textsuperscript{155} Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, p. 89.
\textsuperscript{156} Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{157} Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{158} Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, p. 113.
\textsuperscript{159} Geertz, The Interpretation of Cultures, pp. 118, 119.
\end{footnotesize}
major point of contention between Turner and Geertz. Turner views the effect of ritual to be conforming individuals to a particular social order, whereas Geertz views the effect of ritual to be upon the society by changing the reality of a people group. The difference is between ritual describing social order and ritual shaping social order. Yet despite these two diverging views of how ritual and society relate, each scholar agrees that ritual does have an intended effect that is persuasive.

At first glance, Rappaport’s monolithic work on ritual and religion seems to argue against the notion that ritual produces an effect. He states very strongly that ritual is not efficacious; its function is ‘informative rather than powerful’. The medium of the information is both word and action. Yet, despite this emphasis, he does admit that ritual influences the emotions of both the participants and the observers, and ‘may seem persuasive’. Bell, in contrast to Rappaport, observes the efficacy of the ritual process, although departing from the emphasis on the symbolic of both Turner and Geertz. For Bell, the very fact that ritual is a means of communication assumes that ritual has an effect. This effect is to reinforce values, restrain disorder, and convey order. Moreover, as an efficacious form of communication, ritual is by nature persuasive and the performance of the ritual is the means of persuasion.

All four anthropologists, irrespective of their fundamental differences agree that ritual is a means of communication, which communicates on a cognitive and, at the very least, an emotional level. The differences, however, are in the detail. Turner argues that ritual communicates the values of societal order and the means of communication lies within

---

163 Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives*, p. 160, understands the communicative act of a ritual to be a powerful means of transforming a person’s understanding, ‘the ritual-like nature of performative activities appears to lie in the multifaceted sensory experience, in the framing that creates a sense of condensed totality, and in the ability to shape people’s experience and cognitive ordering of the world.’
both the symbolic and the structure of the ritual. Geertz, however, argues that only the symbolic is the means of communication and the effect of the ritual is to align the values of a people with the cosmic order. In contrast, Rappaport emphasises that ritual communicates both self-referential and canonical messages; the self-referential by nature being purely informational, while the canonical is communicated by the symbolic. Rappaport explicitly states that ritual has a persuasive function. For Bell, a ritual communicates the socio-cosmic order to the participants and in turn produces an effect of inculcating those values in their lives. Thus, this overview demonstrates that there is no dispute amongst ritual anthropologists about whether or not ritual persuades. The persuasive dimension of ritual is in fact a common theme among the four ritual anthropologists.

4.5 Ritual Instruction as Rhetoric and the Implications for this Study

Three observations need to be true if ritual is to be considered rhetorical. First, ritual needs to be a means of communication. Second, there must be a communicator and a recipient of the communicative act. Third, the ritual as a communicative act must have an intended effect or impact upon the receivers of the communicated message. We have already observed that the four anthropological approaches explored above affirm these observations, irrespective of their fundamental differences. If ritual is a communicative act that is intended to have an effect on the participants and perhaps even the observers, then ritual by nature is rhetorical. But I would be amiss if I did not highlight a vital difference between the rituals the four anthropologists observe and the rituals biblical scholars then examine. The four anthropologists examine living ritual. They observe performance and how the ritual is enacted. The Levitical scholar does not observe ritual enactment, but rather a text that instructs about a particular ritual. Ritual anthropologists observe one
level of communication, which is the ritual they are witnessing. The biblical scholar focusing upon Leviticus 1–7, for instance, observes at least three levels of communication. The first level of communication occurs within the text, which is the speaking event of YHWH to Moses, who in turn is then to mediate YHWH’s words to the sons of Israel (1:1-2α). We do not have the mediation event recalled within the text between Moses and Israel. The second level of communication is the five rituals that makes up the content of the message communicated to Moses in Leviticus 1–7, which are the עולה gift (1:2αβ-17, 6:2-11), the מנחה gift (2:1-16, 6:12-16), the זבח sacrifice (3:1-17, 7:11-34), the חטאת atoning (4:1-5:13, 6:18-23), and the אשם offering (5:14-5:26, 7:1-10). The third level is the object that we observe, which is the text edited by an implied author to an implied audience; by extension of the fact that there is an implied editor and audience, there is also an intentio operis that shapes the text. Given that the text of Leviticus is the object of interpretation in this study, and we do not know the identity of the implied editor and audience, I will focus upon the edited text of Leviticus within the persuasive situation, that is, with the literary setting of the book as the interpretive frame of reference. The implication of this methodological decision is that this study will not seek to reconstruct ritual procedure, but rather explore the logic of the ritual instructions as they have been shaped and structured within the final form of the text.

There are, however, five general implications arising from the above comparison of the four ritual-anthropological views for this study, which are:

1. An exploration of the arrangement of ritual texts will seek to understand the structure of the ritual process within the text’s arrangement where applicable.

2. An analysis of the argument of ritual instruction may need to be sensitive to how the text is shaping the ritual being described.
3. An exploration of ritual process within the text may need to allow for the use of symbolism and so may need to explore the symbolic dimension of the text.

4. The argument of a ritual text may not be propositional, but rather describe the values and worldview that the ritual process as shaped by the text is communicating and thus seeking to inculcate within the text’s audience.

5. When exploring the persuasive intent of the ritual instruction, a question to be asked is whether the ritual instruction seeks to form order, maintain order, restrain disorder, or restore order from disorder.

While these five points will shape the considerations and conclusions made in exploring Leviticus’ global arrangement in Chapters Three and Four of this study, the impact of these implications to the fullest extent will occur in Chapter Five where an in-depth analysis of the argument, rhetorical strategy, and persuasive intent of Leviticus 1–7 will be undertaken. For now, it is enough to observe that ritual anthropologists agree that ritual has a persuasive dimension and so there is a good case for the presupposition of this study that ritual instruction can be approached as rhetoric. Thus, having established the two fundamental presuppositions of this study, which is that we can approach Leviticus as a rhetorical unit and ritual instruction may have a persuasive dimension, we can now progress to the first step in the rhetorical-critical framework, which is establishing the persuasive situation of Leviticus.

5. The Persuasive Situation of the Book of Leviticus

The aim of this final section is to undertake the first step in the rhetorical-critical framework outlined above, which is to identify the exigence of the persuasive situation consistent with the literary setting of Leviticus. Thus, the task is to explore the particular situation motivating YHWH, in so far as we know, to call and speak to Moses in 1:1-2α
with instructions that he is then to mediate to the sons of Israel. If we can determine the possible reason(s) within the persuasive situation, then we can gain insight into the exigency addressed by Leviticus in the situation of Israel at Sinai. There are six observations about how the narrative progresses within Exodus 19–40 that contribute to a plausible exigency.

The first observation is the danger that exists to the people of Israel with God's presence having descended upon the mountain in Exodus 19–24. In 19:10-11, the reason why YHWH commands Moses to consecrate the people is that he, YHWH, will come down upon the mountain in the sight of all the people. Given this significant narrative development, YHWH instructs Moses to set up boundaries for the people so that no one can either approach or touch the mountain, for to do so would incur the death penalty. The danger of God's presence is heightened further in vv20-22. Verse 21 repeats the sentiment of v11 with an additional warning to the priests in v22 that they must also set themselves apart. The consequence, if they do not, is that God might break out against them. Danger exists to the people of Israel, including the priesthood, with YHWH's presence coming down and the people remaining before the mountain. Thus, the invitation for the leadership to ascend the mountain in 24:1 heightens the tension caused by God's presence on the mountain. After the leadership comply with YHWH's request and ascend, the implied author makes a point of relating that the leadership see (ראַה; v10a) and perceive (חָֽצֶּ֫ה; v11b) God, feast before him, and yet YHWH chooses not to act against them (v11). Kürle

__________________________

66 N.B. From this point in the thesis, I will use the term of address 'sons of Israel' to reflect the text's particularity. This is not to deny the inclusion of women as recipients of the communication events, but rather to acknowledge that the worlds of both the persuasive and rhetorical situations within the Ancient Near East reflect different societal values than perhaps the western 21st century context in which this thesis has been written. Joosten's explanation for the use of יהושע ב in H is true too for P. He summarises, 'in the concept of H, the audience of the law are the Israelite men, who are thus made responsible for their own behaviour. Although women are made subject to the law, it is the men that are made responsible for their observance of the laws. The intention behind the use of the phrase [...] is not, therefore, to exclude women – as if they should not hear or keep the laws – but rather to subsume them under the person of the man in whose households they live' (Joosten, People and Land, p. 31).

67 The nature of this feast in Exodus 24:11 has caused much discussion. However, the outcome does not affect the central task of this section. The overview of the issues offered by J. A. Davies, Royal Priesthood: Literary
observes how the feast of the elders signifies the ideal is already complete. Yet the note in v11 that YHWH did not send his hand against them suggests that danger exists when the leadership are in close proximity to God, which cannot be ignored, especially given the emphasis in Exodus 19:20-21. An ideal situation is where danger is either not in existence or has been overcome so that it no longer threatens. At this point, there is restraint, rather than the danger removed.

The second observation is the escalation of this tension with YHWH’s intent for the meeting place between heaven and earth to dwell amongst Israel. After the covenant-sealing ceremony between Israel’s king and his vassal nation in Exodus 24, YHWH invites Israel to willingly display their allegiance to their covenant king by giving a contribution for his dwelling place in 25:2b-7, which is then programmatic for Exodus 25–31. No longer is YHWH’s presence, and thus the meeting place between heaven and earth, to be upon a mountain, and thus distant from the sons of Israel; this meeting place is now to dwell among the people (v8). A problem emerges. If the people need to be warned in Exodus 19–24 about the consequence of the death penalty in the event that anyone approaches God’s presence distant on the mountain, how can the meeting place be in the midst of the nation and the people live? A problem exists even before rebellion escalates the urgency of this exigency.

The third observation is that the offence of the golden calf in 32:1-6 distorts the relational order of the covenant between YHWH and Israel. There are three points within 32:1-6 that

---

and Intertextual Perspectives on an Image of Israel in Exodus 19.6 (JSOTS 395, London: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 124-136, effectively considers each of the main views ranging from whether the meal is a victory feast, a covenant meal, a fellowship meal, or a feast of worship, and in doing so, observes the strong covenant motif and an emphasis primarily on the presence of God. This is a view contrary to T. B. Dozeman, God on the Mountain: A Study of Redaction, Theology and Canon in Exodus 19-24 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1989), p. 114, who highlights ‘we should note that covenant is not mentioned in this account’ and yet the term בְּרִית occurs in v7 and v8.
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accentuate this twisting of relationship. First, making a gold image as an object of worship (32:3-4) is an act of breaking faith with YHWH after assenting obedience to the covenant stipulations (24:7). These covenant stipulations encompass the Decalogue in 20:1-17 where the first two prohibitions in 20:2-6 address the issue of idolatry, which is raised again in 20:23. Foundational to the covenant relationship is that YHWH is the God who redeemed Israel from Egypt and thus desires that his people will not make (אלהים) gods of gold (20:23). At the most basic level, the Israelites break faith with YHWH when the people's demand, Aaron's actions, and their proclamation in 32:1-4, did what was prohibited in 20:2-6 and 20:23. Second, 32:1-4 represents more than a breaking of faith, but inverts relational order in the covenant, which can be observed by how אלהים is used in 32:1-4 compared with 25:8-9. Central to the people's demand in 32:1 is that Aaron makes 'for us' (אלהים) gods. Their demand displays a desire for tangible אלים to be present amongst them. Irrespective of whether their intent was for a representation of YHWH to be made, their purpose was for these אלים to go before them as they travel to the land.  

Ironically, this is a similar intent that YHWH has for his sanctuary in 25:8-9. His sanctuary would be the tangible symbol of his presence in the midst of his people. Moreover, YHWH's

---

*There is contention as to what the calf represents and opinions range from the calf symbolising divine victory, a god from pre-Yahwistic religion, or to physically represent YHWH or even Moses. A second issue, related to the first, is that if the idol represents YHWH, then are the Israelites breaking the second commandment only or have they indeed broken both the first and second commandments? What is clear in the text, at the very least, is Aaron proclaims a festival to YHWH in 32:5 after he has set the golden calf before the altar. The text's logic suggests the intent for the calf to be a visible and tangible manifestation of YHWH. The irony is that the visible manifestation of YHWH's glory and his presence on Mt Sinai is to dissuade them from committing offence (see Ex. 20:22). However, in making the golden calf, although their intent may have been to make a representation, they have made another god contravening Exodus 20:12 and 20:23. R. W. L. Moberly, *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* (JSOTS 22, Sheffield: SOT, 1983), p. 49, also supposes that the implied author meant for the reader to understand that the first two commandments have been broken since 'it is likely that for the writer the first two commandments were regarded as in practice inseparable.' For arguments that the calf represents a divine victory rather than cultic fertility, see J. G. Janzen, 'The Character of the Calf and Its Cult in Exodus 32', *CBQ* 52 (1990), pp. 597-607. For an argument that the idol represents a god that is from a pre-Mosaic era, see L. R. Bailey, 'The Golden Calf', *HUCA* 42 (1971), pp. 97-115. For the view that the calf was made to represent YHWH, see P. Enns, *Exodus* (NIVAC, Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003), pp. 569-571; Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, pp. 46-49. See M. S. Suh, *The Tabernacle in the Narrative History of Israel from the Exodus to the Conquest* (SBL 50, New York, NY: Peter Lang, 20-33), p. 85, for an argument that the golden calf was intended to replace Moses as the 'intermediary between Yahweh and Israel.'
instruction in 25:1–9 reflects relational order when he invites the people to willingly gift gold to him and serve their covenant king by making his sanctuary. However, where YHWH gives permission for the people to make ‘for him’ (אָדָם לְיהוָה) his tabernacle from their gifts in 25:8–9, the people demand Aaron to make ‘for us’ these אָדָם לָהֶם in 32:1. Where the order of covenant relationship in 25:8–9 is for YHWH to invite the Israelites to make his sanctuary, the people’s command in 32:1 demands Aaron to serve their desire. Even before the priesthood are consecrated, Aaron as the representative of the priesthood fails in his leadership. He becomes a servant of the golden calf and the people’s demand, rather than waiting to be set apart as a servant of YHWH. Third, gold is the first kind of gift that YHWH mentions in 25:3 for the building of the tabernacle. When Aaron acquiesces to the people’s demand in v2, he asks the people to bring their gold, which they do in v3, and then makes (אָדָם) the idol Israel demanded, proclaiming, ‘Israel, these are your gods who brought you from the land of Egypt’ (v4). Their actions and proclamation demonstrate their fickle allegiance to YHWH and misplace the attribution of who has redeemed them, and thus to whom they belong. Furthermore, while the people desire a tangible symbol of the ‘contact between people and God’, which is what the tabernacle is intended for, I would argue that the people are misplacing their allegiance and desiring a symbol in their midst that is non-threatening.\(^{26}\) In misplacing their trust, they displace the holy and dangerous with what is tangible and hand-made.\(^{27}\) As Timmer observes,

\(^{25}\) Enns, Exodus, p. 569, observes, ‘In light of the repeated references to gold in the tabernacle section, it is hard not to see the connection. By building the calf out of gold the people want what the tabernacle was intended to do – provide a concrete point of contact between the people and God.’ While I might not disagree with Enns on this point, my point above is an added dimension to the people’s request that Enns’ explanation does not consider.

\(^{26}\) An issue arising from Exodus 32–34 is who replaces whom. Moerly, At the Mountain of God, p. 46, observes that the intent of the people is to replace Moses and his physical leadership with the הרפורים. He notes, ‘Two points, rather, are clear. The first is that Moses is the one who uniquely mediates Yahweh’s guidance and leadership to the people. It is in and through Moses that Yahweh is known and his saving deeds experienced. The second is that the calf is a challenge to Moses’ leadership; it is a rival means of mediating Yahweh’s presence to the people.’ See also Childs, Exodus, p. 364. While there seems to be a relationship in v1 between the demand of the people to make gods who will go before them and Moses’ leadership, Moses is still YHWH’s prophet and thus rejection of Moses’ leadership is directly a rejection of YHWH’s leadership. See also D. C. Timmer, Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:2–17; 35:1–3 in Exegetical
In short, the whole of 32:1-6 portrays not only the breaking of the covenant's stipulations, but the enacting of a religious scheme diametrically opposed to its essence. The motive for this apostasy runs contrary to honouring Yahweh as covenant suzerain and omnipotent sanctifier, and attempts to bring about his immediate "presence" in the image of the calf. Almost inexplicably, Israel by and large is driven by corrupt desires for a tangible "god" and a cult that is base and degrading. The stage is set for the horrible analysis and verdict of God in the following section.\textsuperscript{177}

The fourth observation then is that YHWH's assessment of Israel's offence in vv7-9 exposes the relational distance between God and the nation. This distance is implied when YHWH uses the second person in v7, 'your people whom you brought up from the land of Egypt'. Even after YHWH sends a plague against the people (32:35), the repetition of the second person in 33:1, 'the people you brought up from the land of Egypt' (cf. 32:7) sustains the relational distance, which is intensified by God's refusal not to go with the people (33:3). YHWH's rationale for refusing to let his presence go with Israel is significant; they are stiff-necked and he might consume them on the way to the land of promise (33:5). It seems that the previous instructions for the tabernacle in Exodus 25–31 are now to be abandoned, since YHWH refuses his presence.\textsuperscript{178} As Kürle notes, 'The obvious sinfulness and 'stiff-neckedness' of the people (32:9; 33:3.5; 34:9), however, is in conflict with the divine presence'.\textsuperscript{179} This is problematic since YHWH's presence with his people makes Israel distinctive from the nations. After Moses appeals to this fact in 33:16, God relents and grants what Moses asks, he will go with the people. However, a question still remains about how YHWH will grant Moses' request, and go with the people, considering the

\textsuperscript{177} Timmer, \textit{Creation}, p. 105.
\textsuperscript{179} Kürle, \textit{Appeal}, p. 215.
danger God's presence represents when Israel is obedient, let alone when they provoke him to anger by their rebellion.

The fifth observation concerns the absence of forgiveness (سة חל) being granted in 34:10-26. While YHWH grants Moses' request to go with the people in 33:17, Moses then repeats this appeal in 34:8-9 adding the plea for YHWH to forgive (סה חל) Israel's iniquity and offence (34:9). The use of סלח implies the overcoming of a fracture in relationship, and thus differs from the concept of 'lifting up sin' that נשא conveys in 34:7. Central to the self-revelation of YHWH's name in 34:6-7 is his justice where he lifts up ( נשא) iniquity, transgression, and offence, but does not clear guilt. Moses' request in 34:9 is asking for more than what YHWH reveals about his character in 34:6-7. Furthermore, as Stuart notes, Moses is asking 'for nothing less than complete acceptance of the nation' at the end of v9, והלא י והמלה עלינו והפשעים והחלות. There is an order to the use of סלח and נשא. Moses appeals for reconciliation before the request that YHWH takes the nation as his possession. YHWH's response in 34:10-26 assumes that he will take Israel as his possession, but he does not say explicitly that he will grant Moses' request of forgiveness. Instead, the response in 34:10-26 is a summary of the terms of the covenant that Israel is to obey to fulfill the nation's part of the covenant relationship (v11).

Timmer suggests that the problem of Israel's offence has been overcome in the text of Exodus 33–34 by the fact that the people repent (33:4-6), God relents graciously on the basis of Moses' intercession, and the fact that YHWH speaks the words that Moses is then to write on the tablets (34:27-28). For Timmer, these points suggest the issue of sin has been explicitly addressed. Yet these are cumulative points that still rely upon the fracture in the covenantal relationship being overcome. I am not denying that the issue may be dealt with implicitly, but rather the text does not explicitly address the issue. While 34:5-6

---

**See Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 245; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 346.**

**Stuart, Exodus, p. 719.**

**Timmer, Creation, p. 126.**
discloses YHWH's essential nature as one who 'lifts up iniquity' (נשא) and does not clear the guilty, God is silent in Exodus 34 about whether or not he has forgiven (סלח). This is the ambiguity of Exodus 34 that leaves an unresolved question as to how the purpose of the tabernacle can be realised when Israel has introduced disorder into the covenant relationship. Furthermore, 34:10 still suggests that relational distance between YHWH and Israel is plaguing the narrative by use of the second person, 'I have made a covenant before all your people' (כל עמי) and then referring to Moses being in Israel's midst by the emphatic use of אתה (אשראתך בקרבה). Although God will go with them, Moses will be in their midst, not YHWH, which is a distortion of the intent for the tabernacle. Thus, the issue of overcoming the fracture in relationship may not have been addressed as neatly as Timmer supposes. An unresolved issue now exists in the text, which is how the danger of God's presence is to be alleviated if he is to be present among a people whose relationship with him is fractured and not whole. Kürle argues,

The divine 'inclination' to be merciful, together with the honest confession of sin, opens up the possibility for the existence of an inherently sinful Israel (cf. Exod. 32:9) in the presence of Yhwh. While YHWH's grace is a priority and acts to temper his punishment of guilt, the point of Exodus 34:6 is that he cannot leave the guilty unpunished; he cannot, on the basis of his grace, allow a sinful people to live in his presence because their impurity would profane his presence. This uncompromisingly leads to death. The desire for YHWH to consume will still be present and if Israel is rebellious again, God consuming Israel may be inevitable. Therefore, there is ambiguity existing in the text, which remains unresolved.

---

183. D. R. Davis, 'Rebellion, Presence, and Covenant: A Study in Exodus 32-34', *WTJ* 44 (1982), p. 75, also observes, 'Please note: there is not one word about forgiveness in this section. The only success with which Moses' intercession meets is Yahweh's withdrawal of threatened total extinction. The text itself gives no ground whatever for inferring any idea of forgiveness or restoration to favour. Such must be read into the text, and commentators commonly do just that as can be seen via their comparisons of this section with 32:30ff.'

The sixth observation is that with YHWH’s glory filling the tabernacle in 40:34-35, and with the purpose of the sanctuary being realised (cf. 25:8; 29:43, 46), the physical distance between Israel and the place where heaven and earth meet is no longer present. The problem existing previously in Exodus 19–24, and already heightened with God instructing Moses about the tabernacle in 25:1-9, now escalates with God’s glory dwelling amongst his people. The exigency inherent in the narrative development of 40:34-35 is how the tabernacle’s purpose can be fulfilled and for God not to consume his people. The narrative chooses not to resolve this problem, but rather to accentuate Israel’s obedience.

The emphasis in Exodus 39:42–40:33 upon Moses and Israel completing the work ‘as YHWH commanded’ (יהוה צוה אשר) stresses the obedience of the Israeliite community to God’s command. This leads to YHWH’s acceptance of the tabernacle implied by his glory filling the tent. Israel’s actions and YHWH’s fulfilment of his purpose for the sanctuary displays relational order. The danger existing in Exodus 32–33 of YHWH consuming his people if he is to go with them to the land of promise seems to be assuaged when there is obedience to command. Yet the warning of Exodus 19–24 cannot be forgotten, which is that even where there is obedience, nearness to God’s presence is dangerous for Israel. When there is obedience, God chooses to restrain his holiness so that there is life in his presence, but how can YHWH overcome the fracturing of relationship when offence recurs and not consume his people? YHWH’s statement about the nature of his people being stiff-necked (32:9, 33:3, 5) suggests that future failure is inevitable.

---

45 Contrary to T. Hieke, Levitikus 1–15 (HTHKAT 4b, Freiburg: Herder, 2014), p. 51. Hieke argues that the conflict within Exodus 32, which leads to the purpose of the tabernacle being endangered – YHWH’s presence amongst his people – is resolved by the Tent of Meeting not having a dwelling function, but rather as a place of revelation.


47 Again, Kürle, Appeal, p. 215, suggests that Exodus 35–40 reflects the ‘ideal’ Israel stating, ‘An ideal Israel, holy and pure, would find no difficulties in realising Yhwh’s presence in its midst’. While this is true, the command-fulfilment formula that is repeated throughout this last phase of logic in Exodus is not exuding an ideal, but accentuates what is right relational order that enables the purpose of the tabernacle to be realised.
Therefore, given the heightened tension caused by YHWH’s glory filling the tabernacle at the end of the book of Exodus, it is feasible that the book of Leviticus is edited between Exodus and Numbers to address the problem of how YHWH can live among a people who have the propensity to commit offence and break faith with him and for YHWH not to consume them.\textsuperscript{188} However, this is not the chief exigency. The reason why this problem exists is due to the danger when YHWH’s holiness is profaned; death is the consequence.

Thus, the exigence within the persuasive situation that caused the inclusion of the book of Leviticus within the Pentateuchal narrative has two levels. The first level is to address the problem of how Israel can live with the immanence of a holy God and not profane his holiness. The second level, caused by the propensity of the newly-formed nation towards offence as exemplified in Exodus 32–34, is to resolve the problem of how YHWH can be present amongst Israel and not consume the offending community or individual, both presently in the situation of Israel at Sinai and in the future as Israel travels to and resides in the land. When offence profanes the holiness of YHWH, God will consume and no longer choose to restrain his holiness. In the camp, death is the consequence, but in the land, exile will be the penalty.

Therefore, the presence of a holy God creates a double-edged exigency that was present before the breaking of the covenant, but which is heightened when offence fractures relationship. The goal of the provisions in Leviticus, therefore, is to mitigate the danger of YHWH’s presence in the midst of his people (Lev. 1–7, 11–15, 16). This understanding represents a different emphasis to Morales who argues that the central exigence is, ‘How can Israel dwell with YHWH?’\textsuperscript{189} Morales’ exigence mistakes the relational dynamic of Leviticus; it is not so much ‘how can Israel’, but rather ‘how will YHWH’. Morales suggests that the book is about the ‘reconciliation between God and humanity through the

\textsuperscript{188} The relational dynamic suggested above is different to Morales’ argument that Leviticus is included within the Pentateuch to resolve the issue, ‘How can Israel dwell – have fellowship – with YHWH?’ (Morales, \textit{Who Shall Ascend}, p. 109). Italics are part of the original.

\textsuperscript{189} Morales, \textit{Who Shall Ascend}, p. 110. Italics are part of the original.
Reconciliation is certainly one aspect, but as I will argue in the forthcoming chapters, YHWH's provision is much more complex and encompasses more than reconciliation. Furthermore, while the provisions act to mitigate and so preserve the life of God's people, Leviticus does not diminish the need for obedience if there is to be life in the presence of God and not death (Lev. 8–10, 17–27).

6. Conclusion

Approaching the book of Leviticus as a rhetorical-discourse unit is a complex task, although the challenges are certainly not insurmountable. The text of Leviticus is undoubtedly a result of an editorial process using Mosaic tradition, yet the implied author and audience cannot be determined definitively from the text suggesting that the real editor(s) desired the real audience to understand Leviticus within the Pentateuchal narrative as the interpretive frame of reference; sustaining the historical setting of Israel at Sinai is perhaps even part of the text's rhetorical strategy. Thus, this thesis explores the persuasive intent of the book of Leviticus within its persuasive situation, that is, within the situation of Israel at Sinai. Based on six observations from the narrative development within Exodus 19–40, I have suggested that the nature of the exigency characterising the persuasive situation is where Israel's rebelliousness threatens to profane God's name and his sanctuary, which places Israel in danger of suffering the penalty of death since YHWH's presence now dwells amongst his people. Identifying this exigency of the persuasive situation is the first step in the rhetorical-critical framework outlined above, which enables the remaining chapters to focus upon delimiting the text's arrangement in Chapter Two (step 2 of the rhetorical-critical framework) and then undertaking an analysis of the global text's arrangement in Chapters Three and Four (steps 3-4 of the rhetorical-critical framework). Chapter Five will then demonstrate the conclusions of

---

Chapters Three and Four at a more detailed level by exploring the rhetorical strategy of the beginning and end of the book, namely Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27.
CHAPTER TWO

The Macrostructure of Leviticus' Arrangement

The task of delimiting the macrostructure of Leviticus is the second step in the rhetorical-critical framework shaping the approach of this study and is a necessary precursor for exploring the logic and strategy that shapes the text's arrangement. For Leviticus, however, this is not a straightforward task. Structural analysis of Leviticus is a relatively recent development due to the lasting impact of the P and H division. Attempts have offered detailed structures that generally reflect four (1–7, 8–10, 11–15, 16, 17–27), five (1–7, 8–10, 11–15, 16, 17–27), six (1–7, 8–10, 11–15, 16, 17–26, 27), eight (1–7, 8–10, 11–15, 16–17, 18–20, 21–22, 23–25, 26–27), or fourteen sections (1–10, 11–15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21–22, 23, 24:1–9, 24:10–23, 25, 26, 27). The formal markers used to create these divisions

---

1 Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 76.
3 S. E. Balentine, Leviticus (Interpretation, Louisville: WJK, 2011), pp. xi-xv; Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, pp. 1364-1367; Noth, Leviticus, pp. 10-14; F. H. Gorman Jr., Divine Presence and Community: A Commentary on the Book of Leviticus (ITC, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 2-3, proposes a similar five-fold structure in comparison with Balentine, but rather than chapter 16 being a distinct unit, Gorman includes Leviticus 16 with chapters 11–15. Where Balentine, Leveitcus, pp. 143-144, includes chapter 17 within chapters 17–27, Gorman proposes Leviticus 17 to be a standalone unit. Also, while Watts, ‘Rhetorical Strategy’, pp. 16-17, previously had implied a four-fold division, more recently he argues for a five-fold arrangement using the following outline: chapters 1–7, 8–10, 11–16, 17–22, 23–26 (27). See Watts, Leviticus 1–13, p. 19.
4 Elliger, Leviticus, pp. 7-8; Hartley, Leviticus, pp. xxxiv-xxxv; R. Péter-Contesse and J. A. Ellington, A Handbook on Leviticus (UBS Handbook; New York: UBS, 1992), p. 1. Although Douglas, Leviticus as Literature, pp. 225-229, 242-244, uses a ring structure, she still follows the traditional six-fold division with a slight difference of seeing the fifth unit being chapters 18–24, while chapters 25–27 form the concluding unit. See also Douglas, ‘Poetic Structure’, pp. 247-256. Also, Ska, ‘La structure’, pp. 347-348, proposes six units within two major sections. The first section (Lev. 1–10) concerns ‘the inauguration of the cult’ (my translation) and the second section (Lev. 11–27) focuses upon instruction for Israel and the priesthood in YHWH’s presence. The six sections within these two thematic movements, which differ to the proposals above are Leviticus 1–7, 8–10, 11–15, 16, 17–24, 25–27.
5 See Gerstenberger, Leviticus, pp. 18-19; J. Sklar, Leviticus (TOTC, Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2014), pp. 77-84, also follows an eight-section division, but differs from Gerstenberger by distinguishing chapters 16 and 17 as two units. Sklar then includes chapter 24 with chapters 21–23 to form a coherent unit, which then leaves Leviticus 25–27 as the concluding chapters.
6 Hieke, Leviticus 1–15, pp. 54-55, proposes this breakdown based on content.
are speech formulae; summary conclusions, compliance reports, similar content, or thematic coherence. Where past approaches tend to struggle is with the role of Leviticus 27 within the book's arrangement. Another question is whether the text of Leviticus has coherence, which is still unresolved. Thus, the second step towards exploring the strategy of Leviticus' arrangement is to propose how the text of Leviticus has coherence. To achieve both the delimitation of the text as a discourse unit and to suggest how the text of Leviticus has coherence, I will use insights from cognitive linguistics and discourse analysis. Thus, in this chapter, I will first define the method of discourse analysis that I will employ to delimit Leviticus' macrostructure and address the issue of coherence.

---

7 The major introductory speech formula occurring in 11-2a is made up of the narrative phrase ידבר ההוד יאמר barcode אֱל֖וֹהִים יאֵלָמָר together with the inclusion of Aaron and his sons together with the sons of Israel as the addressees of the communication event. For 11-2a as an introductory speech formula, see Hartley, Leviticus, p. 3. For 173-2a as an introductory speech formula, see Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 39, and Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, p. 145. Variations of this speech formula, which also are thought by scholars to delimit sections, occur in 111 and 161. For the introductory function of 113, see Hartley, Leviticus, p. 152, and Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, p. 645. Contrary to Gerstenberger, Leviticus, p. 128; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 161. For 161 as an introduction to a new unit, see Hartley, Leviticus, p. 217; W. C. Kaiser Jr., 'The Book of Leviticus' in NIB (Vol. 1, Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994), p. 1113; Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, p. 1031. It is worth noting that the introductory speech formula recurs throughout the book using a shorter variant. D. Luciani, Sainteté et pardon: structure littéraire du Lévitique (vol. 1, BETL 185; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), pp. 9, 11-13, and Warning, Literary Artistry, pp. 22, 37, 38, offer two different structural proposals based on the use of the speech formulas.


9 See Hartley, Leviticus, p. 232, for the concluding function of the compliance notice in 16:34b.

10 For example, Sklar's structure is based on grouped content rather than any formal structural markers. For instance, he observes that Leviticus 1-7 is concerned with defining the major offerings, while Leviticus 8-15 concerns the beginning of Israel's public worship by setting apart the priesthood (Sklar, Leviticus, p. 143).

11 For example, Leviticus 11-15 is often viewed as a thematic unit focused upon the distinction between cultic purity and impurity. The shared theme then distinguishes Leviticus 11-15 from its surrounding context. See Gerstenberger, Leviticus, p. 211; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 161. See also, C. Smith, 'The Literary Structure of Leviticus', JBL 70 (1996), pp. 23, 26, who argues that the basic foundation for a seven-fold structure is four collections of laws, organised by their thematic unity: chapters 1-7 (offerings), 11-15 (purity), 17:1-249 (holiness), and 25-27 (redemption).

12 The exception is Smith, 'Structure', pp. 24-25, who groups chapters 25-27 together and endeavours to approach the literary unit with integrity.
I. The Application of Discourse Analysis to the Book of Leviticus

The approach to discourse analysis adopted in this thesis is highly influenced by the works of Robert Dooley, Knud Lambrecht, Stephen Levinsohn, and Katsuomi Shimasaki. In the following explanation, I endeavour to bring together insights from all three scholars and I will, at significant points, highlight the differences between the three scholars insofar as those differences will affect the methodological decisions in this thesis.

1.1 Discourse Units and Schemas

In the first chapter of this thesis, I defined the task of discourse analysis as assessing why a particular linguistic structure is being used within the context of a particular discourse unit. A discourse unit can be defined as a unit of written text that ‘can be represented conceptually in a single, unified mental representation’ and for this mental representation to occur, the unit must be ‘organised around a schema.’ There are two kinds of schemas in a discourse unit, the linguistic schema and the conceptual schema. A coherent discourse unit is where an addressee's mental representation of the unit aligns the linguistic schema with the conceptual. This coherence is conditional upon the addressee being able to identify where a discourse unit begins or concludes. Furthermore, a discourse unit can be

---

10. Dooley, Explorations, p. 141; see also Dooley, Explorations, pp.13-15, 24-25.
12. The implication of this notion of coherence is that incoherence is perceived by the addressee when he or she is not able to align, in their mental representation of the discourse unit, the linguistic and conceptual structures. When this occurs, the recipient is given the impression of disorganisation. I would like to propose that this is partly what has occurred in past approaches to the book of Leviticus. Past readers have successfully identified coherence in parts such as Leviticus 1–7, while struggling with how the linguistic structures correspond to the conceptual structures with other parts of the book, such as in Leviticus 19 and 27. There is perceived inconsistency that gives the ‘patchwork’ effect.
13. Dooley, Explorations, p. 27, and Robar, Verb and Paragraph, p. 39. A coherent discourse unit does not need
part of a sequence of discourse units. The term 'schema' implies that a particular discourse unit is made up of embedded discourse units and that even the discourse unit being explored may be an embedded unit of a wider discourse unit. This embedding of discourse units that make up a schema forms a hierarchical structure. Dooley identifies three levels of discourse units that make up a unit's macrostructure or, for our purpose, the unit's arrangement. The first level of a macrostructure is the global level, which is the 'whole text as we receive them'. The global level schema is made up of a sequence of episodes. The second level is then the episodic level where each episode as a subunit of the global level is a coherent discourse unit. It is possible that episodes can be embedded within episodes. The episodic schema is composed of paragraphs, which is the third level and most basic discourse unit in a macrostructure. The paragraph is made up of a sequence of 'micro-level units' or 'steps'. In terms of linguistic structures, the steps in a paragraph are made up of a sequence of sentences and, in turn, a sequence of clauses is the constituent of a sentence. Conceptually though, each step is made up of one idea. As I have noted above, for coherence to be present, the linguistic and conceptual schemas must converge. The implication is that at every level of a macrostructure, the linguistic and conceptual hierarchy should also align for global coherence to exist. Moreover, Robar highlights that although a discourse unit may have a hierarchical schema, the discourse as markers to indicate both the beginning and end of a discourse unit. Often there is a beginning marker that heads the schema, which is then continuous until the next onset marker. Alternatively, a discourse unit's schema is closed by a boundary marker, which allows a new discourse space to begin without a formal onset marker. At the very least, either the beginning or close of a unit needs to be marked.

---

19 See Robar, *Verb and Paragraph*, pp. 15-16. Robar, *Verb and Paragraph*, p. 15, defines a schema as 'an organized whole whose internal structure can be described as a sequence of sub-units.' Italics in original.

20 Dooley, *Explorations*, p. 57. Please note that Robar, *Verb and Paragraph*, pp. 30-31 fn. 8, also briefly acknowledges the levels of discourse units within a unit's macrostructure, but she does not develop the implications for the global or episodic levels of discourse since the scope of her work is upon schematic continuity and discontinuity at the paragraph level.


23 See Robar, *Verb and Paragraph*, p. 37, 'Each step is intended by the author for the reader to construe as a single new idea, whether or not that comes naturally to the reader.' Italics in original.
a communicative event is a linear process. The reason why the communicative event is linear is due to the nature of reading and speaking, which develop linearly.\textsuperscript{24}

Thus, the theory of discourse structures and coherence will shape how I approach an analysis of the discourse structures in Leviticus. At some point, a real editor shaped the book of Leviticus as part of the Pentateuch corpus to be, in his mental representation of the edited text, a coherent discourse that he intended to be communicated to real addressees. Furthermore, the implied editor assumed that the implied addressees, whether they are hearing or reading Leviticus, would be able to make sense of the coherence of the discourse, and thus the meaning and intent of the text as a means of communication.\textsuperscript{25} Thus, I am starting with the presupposition that the text of Leviticus is a coherent discourse unit. Our task in this chapter is to derive the hierarchical arrangement, or the macrostructure, of the book of Leviticus. To achieve this task, I will need to address a further two issues. The first is clarity about the key terms 'focus', 'topic', and 'prominence' within discourse structures. The second issue is identifying onset and closure markers that indicate schematic continuity and discontinuity at each arrangement level.

1.2 Topic and Theme

The first term 'topic' is fundamentally concerned with being 'about'.\textsuperscript{26} In a sentence, the topic is what a clause, or sentence, comments about, while a topic of a discourse unit is the conceptual point that a schema is organised around.\textsuperscript{27} In either case, the rest of the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Robar, \textit{Verb and Paragraph}, p. 33.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Dooley, \textit{Explorations}, p. 28, notes that even an implicit schema, which is not necessarily 'considered strongly coherent – but a schema nevertheless' can be perceived as coherent after time is given for cognitive processing. The implied schema is still considered a schema, according to Dooley, \textit{Explorations}, p. 28, 'since it represents how addressees, after the necessary processing, would likely come to think of how the discourse unit is organized, what the speaker is communicating in that unit.' Moreover, Dooley, \textit{Explorations}, p. 56, notes, 'Returning to the hierarchical scale composed of paragraphs, episodes, and whole discourses, off the top end of this scale the discourse is seen as a communicative act along with other acts in which speakers and addressees are involved, hence it fits into a larger pattern of social interaction and meaningful behavior'.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Dooley, \textit{Explorations}, p. 71
\end{itemize}
sentence or the discourse should ‘increase the addressee’s knowledge of this referent.’\textsuperscript{28} Dooley notes further that a topic in a discourse can have one of two functions, which is either as an access referent or as an integration referent.\textsuperscript{29} When a topic is an access referent, it is often introduced at the beginning of a sentence or paragraph and is the point that allows the addressee to begin building a cognitive representation of the unit. However, what seems to be the topic at the beginning is sometimes the starting point to introduce another referent.\textsuperscript{30} This second referent is what the whole unit seems to focus upon and the schema acts to increase the addressee’s understanding about. This second referent would then be a topic of the discourse that has an integration function.\textsuperscript{31}

An example is the schema in Leviticus 1:2b-9. The clause-initial constituent אדם, at the beginning of the major protasis in v2b, suggests that ‘a man’ who is from among the Israelites is the topic. Indeed, the case in v2 is about an Israelite who wishes to offer a gift from the livestock where the apodosis then acts to explain which type of livestock the Israelite can offer as his gift. Thus, אדם fulfills the criteria of ‘aboutness’ that a sentence topic requires. Yet v3 also has a clause-initial constituent, which is theעלה, and each step in the schema centres upon what is done with the עולה animal. The man who offers the gift is not the referent for the schema since the priest takes a significant part in the offering process. Thus, אדם in v2 is an access referent that enables the reader to enter the discourse space, and is also the sentence topic for v2, while the clause-initial constituent עולה at the beginning of v3 acts as an integrating referent and is thus the discourse topic for 1:3-9.

Building on Dooley’s work, Robar raises the possibility that since the topic in a clause is often in the clause-initial position and that a topic is often an access point into a discourse unit, then a ‘sentence topic is the cognitive starting point of a sentence’ and the discourse

\textsuperscript{28} Lambrecht, Information Structure, p. 131.
\textsuperscript{29} Dooley, Explorations, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{30} This understanding of access referent and topic referent follows the work of Dooley. Dik, Functional Grammar, pp. 141-142, observes the same idea but labels the active referent as a ‘theme’ and the topic referent as ‘topic’.
\textsuperscript{31} Dooley, Explorations, p. 73.
topic is the cognitive starting point for a discourse. While Robar's concise explanation is useful, her definition misses Dooley's emphasis that a topic in a discourse is a point of coherence for the schema. It is not merely a 'starting point'. Thus, I will align the use of the term 'topic' more towards Dooley's emphasis. A sentence topic is the starting point and is what the rest of the sentence comments upon, while a discourse topic is the referent (although not necessarily the starting point) around which the schema coheres. To avoid confusion about whether I am referring to a sentence or discourse topic, I will adopt the same convention as Levinsohn and Robar by referring to the sentence topic as a 'topic' and the discourse topic as a 'theme'.

1.3 Focus and Prominence

Focus and prominence are both concerned with what is important, yet the terms are also distinct. Runge observes that the dynamic of discourse, which is termed 'natural information flow', is that every clause presents new information, which in turn becomes old information in the next clause. This new information in each clause is focused. Thus, Dooley and Levinsohn's definition of focus is helpful here when they state, 'the focus of an utterance is that part which indicates what the speaker intends as the most important or salient change to be made in the hearer's mental representation'. Dooley and Levinsohn then observe, 'The SCOPE OF FOCUS for a given sentence can vary with the context'. That is, in Hebrew, new information about a proposition or a topic can be found at the beginning and end of a clause since Hebrew has a natural tendency towards placing the verb in a

---

32 Robar, Verb and Paragraph, p. 25.
33 See Levinsohn, Self-Instruction, 24; Robar, Verb and Paragraph, p. 25.
34 Runge, Discourse Grammar, p. 189. The term 'natural information flow' as described by Runge is preferred here to avoid the danger that Lambrecht, Information Structure, 16-17, highlights, which is depicting unmarked information as 'pragmatically neutral'. The danger of viewing some structures as 'pragmatically neutral' is that linguists then fixate on 'figuring out which 'special constructions' are in need of a pragmatic interpretation' (Lambrecht, Information Structure, 16).
35 Runge, Discourse Grammar, p. 189. See also Lambrecht, Information Structure, 209, who states, 'focus is identified with new information'.
37 Dooley and Levinsohn, Analyzing Discourse, p. 62. The use of capitalisation is part of the original text.
clause-initial position (V[S]O); that is, the predicate as well as other constituents can be focused.\(^{38}\) Thus, V[S]O word order in non-copular clauses is termed in this study as 'pragmatically unmarked'.\(^{39}\) That is, a clause that is pragmatically unmarked represents natural information flow and so is 'neutral' with respect to having a particular pragmatic function in its context.\(^{39}\) An example of an unbroken sequence of pragmatically unmarked clauses is Leviticus 1:3αγ-7, which follows below with each line representing a clause within the overall sequence and where each finite verb is underlined.

This particular sequence begins with a *yiqtol* verb in an initial clause that exemplifies V[S]O word order, after which the sequence flows through a series of clauses with an initial *w.qatal* that accentuates sequence. The initial predicate in each clause enables the succession of the schema and thus each clause is pragmatically unmarked since each in context enables natural information flow. Furthermore, each verb is new information within the schema and the object or indirect object in most instances is the topic of the schema. This affirms that the V[S]O clause represents natural information flow and so has

\[^{38}\] This differs to Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, p. 190, who states 'The default expectation of natural information flow is that focal information will be placed as close to the end of the clause as the typology of the language allows.'

\[^{39}\] See Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 16-17. N.B. Lambrecht's argument mostly concerns observations from English, French, and German, where there is a pragmatically unmarked pattern of SVO word order for copular clauses. However, the same theory applied to Hebrew suggests that V[S]O word order is the pragmatically unmarked information structure. The reason why S is in brackets is due to the tendency of the subject being implied within the verbal form. Thus, the subject may or may not be explicit. See B. L. Bandstra, 'Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew Narrative' in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. W. R. Bodine (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 115. This, however, does not affect the function of V[S]O word order being pragmatically neutral in its linguistic context.

\[^{40}\] Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 17.
a pragmatically neutral function in context. Worth noting, however, is that the above
discussion is for non-copular clauses, which is prototypical for biblical Hebrew.

Prominence occurs when a communicator wishes to mark certain information,
established or unestablished, as worthy of attention." He or she achieves marking
information for prominence by moving information to a clause-initial position that would
break the neutral pattern of natural information flow. In a non-copular Hebrew clause,
highlighting information would occur by placing constituents in a pre-verb position. Thus,
the function of a pre-verb marked position is, in Runge's words, 'to take what was already
the most important part of the clause (i.e. newly asserted, focal information) and to attract
even more attention to it by moving it from its default position to a marked one." This
prominence is termed pragmatic markedness since moving information to a pre-verb
position no longer has a neutral function within the clause's context and so displays a
particular pragmatic feature. The following is an adapted text of 1:3-7 that displays this
theory. As per the above, the finite verbs are underlined and each line represents a clause.

### Hebrew Text

1. יִקְרֵיב יְהֹוָה לְפָנָיו לְרָצוּנוֹ אֶתְוֹ
2. וָסָמֵךְ הָעָלֶה עַל יְדוֹ
3. וָנָרְצֵחַ יְהוָה לְפָנֵי הָבָרֵךְ אֶת־בֵּן הָכָהָן אָהָרֹן
4. וּבְנֵי יַקְרִיבוּ אֶת־הָדם
5. וְזָרְקֵו מוּדֵע׃ אֵהל אֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר־אָפֵא אֶל־הָמְזָבִחַ אֶת־הָדם
6. וְהָפַשֵּׁיט אֶת־הָעָלֶה
7. וָנָתֵךְ לַנְּתָךְ׃ יַהֲנֵיהּ
8. הַכָּהָן אָהָרֹן וּבְנֵי יַתִּנוּ אֶל־הָמְזָבִיחַ אָשֶׁר
9. וַעֲרַכֵו עַל־אָשֶׁר׃
10. רוֹבֵּא הַצֶּרֶךְ יֹתוּ אֵל־הָמְזָבִיחַ

### Notes

Lines 1-4 progress unhindered through each clause with each beginning with a V[S]O
word order and thus are pragmatically neutral in their context. In line 5, however, this
pattern changes with the subject being moved to the pre-verb position. The new
information is placed in the second clause position and the known referent of the 'sons of

---

* Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, pp. 13-14. See also K. Callow, *Discourse Considerations in Translating the word of

Aaron the priests' is placed in the clause-initial position. In this context, the use of SVO word order has a pragmatic feature and thus exemplifies a pragmatically marked clause. In this instance, by moving הכהנים אהרן ובני to the pre-verb position, the text is highlighting the identity of those who approach with the blood and who then sprinkle the blood upon the altar. Lines 6-8 resume the successive nature of the schema through pragmatically unmarked clauses until, once more, line 9 suddenly places הכהנים אהרן ובני in the pre-verb position. By breaking natural information flow, the text pragmatically marks the subject ofحديث as prominent. Again, in this instance, the pragmatic feature that the markedness highlights is the identity of the one who 'puts' fire upon the altar. Furthermore, the unmarked nature of line 9 in the original text (יתנו בר אהרן מבנו אש על המזבח) is only neutral in pragmatic terms relative to the potential of what a marked version of the clause (above) may convey. That is, the marked version יתנו בר אהרן מבנו אש על המזבח has a pragmatic feature, which is not the case for the unmarked version יתנו בר אהרן ובני אש על המזבח. Thus, focus is part of natural information flow and is pragmatically unmarked in a discourse schema, unless there is a decision to move a non-predicate constituent to a pre-verb position within a non-copular clause in which case the focused information is now pragmatically marked for prominence.

This distinction between focus and prominence, however, is contrary to the work of Shimasaki. Where Lambrecht and Runge argue that focused information is not necessarily a pragmatic marked structure (Lambrecht) or marked for prominence (Runge), Shimasaki states that the function of focus is 'to mark an item as a prominent piece of information'.

Contextualising Lambrecht's three focus structures in Biblical Hebrew, Shimasaki demonstrates that there are three focus structures at a clause level, which are the predicate-focus structure (Px), argument-focus structure (Xp), and clause-focus structure (XP). Shimasaki argues further that the way the Hebrew text marks focus is by word order

---

43 Shimasaki, *Focus Structure*, p. 42.
44 Shimasaki, *Focus Structure*, pp. 50-52. See also Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, pp. 221-238. Levinsohn also takes into account Lambrecht's three focus structures. However, he sharpens the theory of where focus
and that ‘the clause initial position is marked for focus.’\textsuperscript{45} Shimasaki’s work in the three focus structures is helpful in identifying where the focus is placed in each type of clause, but these three focus structures can still achieve their pragmatic functions without the need to define focus as being marked for prominence. The weakness of equating focus with prominence is that when analysing a paragraph, for instance, every clause will have marked information and makes distinguishing ‘the wood from the trees’, so to speak, quite a challenge. Furthermore, a weakness in Shimasaki’s work in adapting Lambrecht’s information structures for biblical Hebrew is that he fails to take into account the difference in pragmatically neutral (or default patterns) of word order between biblical Hebrew and Lambrecht’s three languages that he has chosen to study. Shimasaki adopts Lambrecht’s SVO word order pattern for both copular and non-copular clauses, rather than applying the principles Lambrecht is demonstrating using English and French. This is a significant problem since Hebrew’s pragmatically neutral word order is that of V[SO]. It is possible to apply Lambrecht’s theory of information structures and, in particular, clause focus structures, without replicating the same neutral word order patterns in Hebrew as per English or French.

To address the problems identified above and to also recover the significance of pragmatic unmarkedness and markedness within clause focus structures, one of the clause focus structures that Shimasaki identifies must reflect the order of natural information flow. I have noted above that Hebrew seems to have a VSO unmarked pattern for non-copular clauses, which aligns with Shimasaki’s predicate-focus (Px) structure. Thus, every non-copular clause that exemplifies a predicate-focus structure is pragmatically unmarked.

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{45} Shimasaki, \textit{Focus Structure}, pp. 42-43.
although containing focused information. The implication is that the remaining two focus structures where a non-predicate constituent is moved to a pre-verbal position, the argument-focus structure (Xp) and clause-focus structure (XP), are devices to indicate pragmatic markedness or information marked for prominence. That is, the Px structure is pragmatically unmarked since the word order represents natural information flow within a non-copular clause, whereas an Xp or XP structure is pragmatically marked since each breaks the neutral pattern and so suggests that there is a pragmatic feature in the clause. Since Shimasaki’s focus structures, which are based in Lambrecht’s theory of information structure, are referred to frequently in this thesis, and this theory forms the basis of the onset and closure markers that I use to demonstrate schematic discontinuity within Leviticus’ global schema and thus arrangement, the next section will summarise each focus structure briefly, beginning with the predicate-focus (Px) structure.

1.4 Three Clause Focus Structures

In my proposed adaptation of Shimasaki’s definition of focus and prominence, I have suggested that the predicate-focus structure (Px) is the unmarked structure for a non-copular clause. The predicate-focus structure is where the clause-initial constituent is the predicate (P) and thus the pattern is Predicate (P) - Argument (x) where the argument is a non-predicate constituent. The following three sequential clauses from Leviticus 1:4-5a all follow the Px pattern (predicate is underlined):

וסמך chiếu ראשו על ידו

ויתרעת לא לכמר וילע

ושחט יהוה לפני הבקר את בן

And he will press his hand upon the head of the

and it will be accepted for him for ransom upon him

and he will slaughter the bull before YHWH

N.B. The predicate can be a nominal predicate in a copular clause as well as a verb in a non-copular clause. The argument refers to constituents such as ‘noun phrases, pronouns, various kinds of tensed or non-tensed subordinate clauses, and certain adverbial phrases’ (Lambrecht, Information Structures, p. 75). See also Shimasaki, Focus Structure, pp. 44-46.
Each of the three clauses above are non-copular clauses and the predicate in the clause-initial position is the main verb that is then followed by an argument. As stated above, these clauses from Leviticus 1:4-5a are pragmatically unmarked structures and thus are neutral in terms of not displaying pragmatic features in their context. For a copular clause to exemplify a Px structure, the predicate and subject (x) must contain referents that are already established. When the predicate contains unactivated referents, the Px copular clause no longer represents a pragmatically unmarked structure. The P will often act like a subject even though it is the grammatical predicate. In these instances, the grammatical Px clause focus structure will be represented as XP* and takes on the same function as an XP structure as detailed below. Worth clarifying is that the copular Px and XP* structures are identical in syntax. The difference though is that the XP* structure has a pragmatic feature because of where it occurs in its linguistic context by containing unknown information. If the information in the grammatical predicate is known, then the clause has no pragmatic feature and is a pragmatically neutral or unmarked structure represented by Px. Usually, for both non-copular and copular Px clauses, the function of a Px structure is to comment upon a topic, which is the reason why a Px structure is deemed part of natural information flow since 'commenting upon' is not necessarily a pragmatic feature.

The first marked structure is the argument-focus structure where an argument is the fronted constituent followed by the predicate. This structure displays an Argument (X) - predicate (p) pattern. The first two clauses in Leviticus 26:2 exemplify an argument-focus (Xp) structure where the fronted argument is underlined:

אגדש תשו"ם
My Sabbaths you shall keep

ומקדשי תיירא
and my sanctuaries you shall revere

In each clause, the argument in the clause-initial position is the object and the predicate then occurs in the second-clause position. The pragmatic feature or function of an Xp
structure is to identify. For instance, in the two clauses above, the Xp structure draws attention to what in particular the Israelites are to keep and to revere, namely 'my Sabbaths' and 'my sanctuaries'. Thus, each clause has the pragmatic feature of highlighting the identity of what is to be kept and revered. If say the two verbs were in the clause-initial position, then attention would be drawn to the act of keeping and revering rather than the objects of what is to be kept and revered. Therefore, an Xp structure is a pragmatically marked structure that has the feature of identification. A Px clause with the same constituents would be pragmatically neutral relative to the potential of a pragmatic feature conveyed by the use of a Xp clause.

The second pragmatically marked structure is the clause-focus structure where both the initial argument and the predicate in the clause second position are focused. Thus, the pattern exemplifies an Argument (X) - Predicate (P) pattern. The pragmatic function of an XP focus structure is to topicalise a schema, to highlight a particular announcement or declaration, or to report an answer to a question. For example, the opening case in 1:2bβ, 만ь־הבהמה лиוהוה קרבן מכם כי־יקריב אדם את־קרבנכם׃ תקריבו万ן־הצאן 만ן־הבקר, places אדם in the clause-initial position, which could be to draw attention to the identity of the one who draws near, but this is unlikely due to the context of 1:2bβ being at the beginning of a speech and thus at the beginning of a discourse schema. Moreover, none of the information in the clause is activated yet and thus the whole clause is focused and so displays a XP pattern. The pragmatic feature or function in its context is to topicalise the following discourse schema. However, as said above, another pragmatic function or feature of an XP clause is to highlight an announcement or declaration. Whilst at this point it would be helpful to provide a prototypical example of an XP non-copular clause that has a declaratory pragmatic function, these are rare in biblical Hebrew and therefore not prototypical. More often than not, an XP structure with the declaratory function is a
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47 Shimasaki, *Focus Structure*, pp. 42-43 notes other functions such as exclaiming, a statement of surprise, or contrasting a whole proposition.
copular clause. A rare instance though of an XP non-copular declaratory clause occurs in Exodus 32:10a. In context, the initial second person independent pronoun pronoun לַחֲנָה refers to Moses and YHWH is the active speaker. The placing of לַחֲנָה in the pre-verb position does not draw attention to the identity of the one who is to leave God’s presence since in the conceptual context of the clause, Moses is the only one actively present in the narrative since Moses is the only one Yahweh is speaking to directly. Thus, it does not have the pragmatic feature of an Xp (argument-focus) clause. Neither does the clause have a topicalising function since it does not occur at the beginning of a discourse schema. Moreover, the verb הניח is an imperative and the clause in its context has the force of a declaration. Thus, the clause in its context has a pragmatic function of highlighting the command as a declaration with both the subject לַחֲנָה and the verb הניח being focused and prominent within its context.

However, as noted above, a non-copular XP clause with a declaratory function is rare whereas a copular XP clause with a declaratory function is relatively more typical. An instance of a copular XP clause with this proclamatory function occurs in Exodus 6:6-8.\(^4^8\) In the first instance, the pithy XP clause יהוה אני begins a speech that Moses is to mediate to the sons of Israel. The rest of the verse is a sequence of Px clauses that describe who Yahweh is by virtue of his works on behalf of Israel. Thus, the initial XP clause יהוה אני is a proclamation of who is speaking. The identical XP clause also occurs in 6:8 at the conclusion of the speech. The reason why both instances retain the pragmatic function of a proclamatory XP clause, although they occur at different points in the discourse schema, is that they are both exclamations and, as Shimasaki observes, are ‘out of the blue’.

Another instance is Aaron’s proclamation in Exodus 32:5, which undoubtedly is a declaration within its conceptual and linguistic contexts and each part of the proclamation is focused. Thus, a copular clause where both the initial constituent and

\(^{48}\) Shimasaki, Focus Structure, p. 150.

\(^{49}\) Shimasaki, Focus Structure, p. 150.
the predicate has focused information and where the conceptual structures suggest that
the clause is a declaration or proclamation could be an example of an XP clause, which
may have a particular pragmatic function in its context.

However, what is evident is that an argument-focus structure (Xp) and clause-focus
structure (XP) are grammatically identical. Their differentiation, therefore, lies in their
pragmatic function in the context in which the structures occur. As Shimasaki notes, the
functions are “detected by the context: where, how, and to whom it is uttered.” An
argument-focus structure (Xp) is more likely to occur within a schema and with activated
referents where the clause-initial constituent is highlighting identity, whereas a clause-
focus structure (XP) is more likely to occur at the beginning of a discourse schema if there
is a topicalising function or is clearly a declaration or answer to a question if the structure
occurs within the schema. Thus, pragmatic function is dependent upon the conceptual
and linguistic contexts of the structure to determine whether a particular structure is an
argument-focus structure (Xp) or a clause-focus structure (XP).

1.5 Markers of Schematic Discontinuity

In Biblical Hebrew, continuity within a coherent schema tends to occur at the micro-level
and is signaled by the use of sequential clauses joined by conjunctions, primarily the \textit{vav}
conjunction. As we have noted above, a pragmatically unmarked schema develops by the
use of sequential non-copular predicate-focus clauses, connected by \textit{vav} consecutives, as
part of natural information flow. Instances of asyndeton breaks this flow and has a
particular pragmatic function. However, to delimit the boundaries for where a particular
schema may begin or end, irrespective of whether the discourse unit is an episode or a

\footnotesize
30 Shimasaki, \textit{Focus Structure}, p. 43.
31 See also J. S. DeRouchie, \textit{A Call to Covenant Love: Text Grammar and Literary Structure in Deuteronomy 5-11}
32 N.B. If a clause does not begin with a conjunction, then there is a break in the natural information flow and
thus an instance of asyndeton may signal the beginning of a new discourse unit, whether it be a paragraph or
an episode. See DeRouchie, \textit{A Call to Covenant Love}, pp. 120-121.
paragraph, we need to identify two kinds of discontinuity markers, onset and closure markers.\textsuperscript{53} The strength of Shimasaki's work is his demonstration of how clause-focus structures (XP) can have an onset function, while an argument-focus structure (Xp) may have a concluding function.

Shimasaki observes three main onset functions of an XP structure. The first function is to initiate or to introduce a topic of a new schema.\textsuperscript{54} This often occurs when the topic being introduced at the beginning of a schema has a high activation cost for the addressee since the referent of the topic is either new or non-active.\textsuperscript{55} In this instance, a clause-focus structure (XP) may introduce the topic at the beginning of a new schema. However, Shimasaki also notes that a clause-focus structure may begin a new schema without announcing a new topic. When this occurs, the clause-focus structure acts to initiate a new paragraph or episode, but does not need to topicalise as well.\textsuperscript{56} However, an XP structure at the beginning of a discourse schema may have the pragmatic function of both initiating and topicalising the schema. An example of a topicalising XP structure that also functions to initiate at the beginning of the schema is 4:2aβ, אשר יהוה מצות מכל בשגה כי־תחטא נפש נשא inexplicable，则耶和華設立了從從全部的錯誤因為—他會為他得罪的靈魂將要承受。The clause-initial constituent נפש is in the pre-verbal position, the whole clause contains unactivated information, and the context of the clause occurs at the beginning of a schema since it represents a topic shift from Leviticus 1–3. Each of these three points suggests that 4:2aβ fulfils the criterion of being an XP clause with the pragmatic function of topicalising and also initiating the schema. The topic is the person who has sinned unintentionally since the discourse schema presents cumulative cases where a person or a community of people have sinned unintentionally and each case concludes with restoration of relationship. Moreover, 4:2aβ also initiates the episodic schema by virtue of this particular clause occurring at the beginning of a protasis and so enables access into

\textsuperscript{53} An onset marker is a kind of discontinuity marker since its purpose is as an access point into a new schema and thus, in doing so, signals that one unit has closed and another begins.

\textsuperscript{54} See Shimasaki, Focus Structure, pp. 148-149, 163-168.

\textsuperscript{55} See Shimasaki, Focus Structure, pp. 148-149.

\textsuperscript{56} Shimasaki, Focus Structure, p. 164.
the rest of the episodic schema. Thus, an XP clause can have a pragmatic onset function as a type of schematic discontinuity marker.

The second onset function of an XP clause-focus structure is as an introductory formula where the predicate being presented is the topic of the schema. By virtue of presenting the topic of a schema, this particular clause needs to be located at or near the beginning of a discourse. An example is the introductory formula used throughout Leviticus 6–7, אֱלֹהֵי אֶרֶץ, where א is the offering that the following instructions then speak about (6:2b, 6:7a, 6:13a, 6:18b, 7:1a, 7:11a). The demonstrative pronoun in this particular introductory formula is always cataphoric referring to the instruction that is forthcoming.

The third onset function is for contextualisation where a fronted temporal phrase provides a temporal or spatial frame for a new text unit. An example is Exodus 19:1,

בְּהֵדַע תַשְׁלֵיהוּ לַצאת בָּנָי בָּרִי שָׁלֹשִׁי בְּנִי־ירֵא לֵאמֹן וּבְבִית סֵינֵי׃

The fronted temporal reference in 19:1a, which is a clause-focus structure, provides the temporal reference for the episode in Exodus 19–40. The second clause in 19:1b then sets the temporal framework for an embedded episode in Exodus 19–24. While the demonstrative in 19:1b is anaphoric, the predicate is focused, presenting new information about the Israelites' arrival in the wilderness of Sinai 'on that day', and thus also displays an XP pattern.

Other than the three onset functions of an XP clause structure outlined above, there are a further two onset markers, which are both Px structures. The first Px onset function is minor and occurs at the paragraph level. This Px structure at the beginning of a paragraph is 'still united with other subsections under the same topic', while also 'still commenting

---

57 Shimasaki, Focus Structure, p. 149.
59 For an alternative view, see Ruwe, 'Structure of the Book', p. 58, who argues that that the two travel notices in Exodus 19:1 and Numbers 10:11-12 delimit the boundaries of the priestly narrative. In Ruwe's argument, the two temporal notices would act to set the framework on a global level for the priestly narrative.
This Px onset function is called a 'thematicizing' structure, which is the fourth onset marker more broadly within this section. Although Px structures form the backbone of a schema, this does not mean that a Px structure cannot initiate a new discourse unit, whether it is an episode or a paragraph. The second Px onset function is the היה clause (Px). The היה clause acts similarly to the contextualisation onset function of the clause-focus structure. The temporal use of היה initiates a new phase of logic and thus begins a new schema. The view that a היה clause (Px pattern) could act as an access point into a schema is not contrary to my argument about the use of Px structures in natural information flow. For instance, Leviticus 9:1α is a היה clause where היה is fronted and the temporal phrase 'On the eighth day' forms the temporal frame for Leviticus 9:1–10:7. Thus, the היה clause in this context initiates a new paragraph within the episodic schema of Leviticus 8–10. Thus, the היה clause can be included as a fifth onset marker.

The above five onset markers, three XP structures with pragmatic onset functions and two Px structures with pragmatic onset markers, are all markers of schematic discontinuity. By the very nature of beginning a new discourse unit, the previous discourse unit ends. However, there is also a sixth marker. Rather than being an onset marker, this sixth marker has a closing pragmatic function signalling the conclusion of a schema. This closure marker is an Xp structure where the X is an anaphoric demonstrative and the predicate is an already activated topic and the thematic referent for the discourse schema. An example of this kind of discontinuity marker is Leviticus 11:46, כולם והעוף והבמה של תורה מתורת זאת על־הארץ והשרצת ובכל־נפש במים הרמשת החיה נשיא. The initial demonstrative זאת in one sense refers to the list of topics that immediately follows (cataphoric function), but pragmatically in the context of the discourse schema, the demonstrative refers back to the
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60 Shimasaki, *Focus Structure*, p. 99.
62 Shimasaki, *Focus Structure*, p. 113.
63 Shimasaki, *Focus Structure*, pp. 138-141.
instructions that have been given throughout the episodic schema beginning in 11:1-2 and so is anaphoric. Neither is it a coincidence that the list of topics in the predicate of 11:46, reactivates the topics of the episodic schema in Leviticus 11. Thus, the pragmatic closure function of this particular Xp structure displays this feature due to it recalling already activated topics of the discourse schema. By restating already known topical referents, the Xp structure consolidates the mental representation of the discourse unit and thus closes the episode.

However, a discerning reader would observe that the above Xp closure marker and the second XP onset marker have similar or even identical grammatical structures. The difference lies in their pragmatic function, which is dependent upon context. For example, Leviticus 11 exemplifies both of these schematic discontinuity markers at the onset and closure of the discourse schema as follows:

a. Leviticus 11:2αβ על־הארץ׃ אשר מכל־בהמה תאכלו אשר החיה זו היא
c. Leviticus 11:46 במים הרונשת החיה נשימה וכל העוף באת הנפש והבראת самостоя

Both clauses in 11:2αβ and 11:46 share similar syntactic structures, but they exemplify two different pragmatic functions and thus focus structures by their place in their conceptual and linguistic contexts. The XP structure in 11:2αβ is at the beginning of the speech and there has been no instruction yet about the living creatures which are to be eaten from any living animal that roams upon the earth. Thus, the whole of 11:2αβ is an unactivated referent. The clause structure is an XP structure since every constituent is focused information, it initiates the episodic schema, and also topicalises the first paragraph of the episodic schema. Furthermore, the initial demonstrative is cataphoric referring to the forthcoming instructions. Therefore, 11:2αβ is an introductory XP clause. However, the demonstrative in the clause-initial position in 11:46 is anaphoric, referring to the instructions that have just been conveyed in that episode in Leviticus 11. Moreover, the predicate recalls activated referents from the discourse schema. On this basis, although 11:46 has a similar grammatical structure to 11:2, it has a closure function due to the
context that it occurs, and thus has a distinct pragmatic function relative to the XP clause in 11:2αβ.

In summary, a discourse schema can be discontinued by use of an onset and/or closure marker. This section has identified six markers for schematic discontinuity. Five of these markers have pragmatic onset functions: an XP topicalising/initiating clause, an XP introductory clause, an XP contextualisation structure, a Px thematising structure, and a Px היה clause. The sixth marker of schematic discontinuity is an Xp closure marker where the predicate recalls already activated topics of the discourse schema. Each of these six markers of schematic discontinuity are employed throughout Leviticus and will be the major guides for delimiting the macrostructure of Leviticus later in this chapter.

1.6 Summary

In this section, I have outlined the principles of discourse analysis that I will use to delimit the arrangement of Leviticus in the remainder of this chapter. I have noted that a discourse unit is one that can be represented conceptually in one unified mental representation and that coherence of a unit relies upon the aligning of linguistic and conceptual structures. Furthermore, an arrangement of a discourse unit may exemplify a hierarchical structure of embedded discourse units that comprise a text's macrostructure. The three levels of a text's macrostructure are the global, episodic, and paragraph levels. Furthermore, I noted above that each discourse unit has a schema that coheres around an integrating theme. The purpose of natural information flow within a schema is to comment upon the topic and to increase the addressee's knowledge of the discourse theme. However, in any given schema, there will be information given that ensures the progress of a schema and helps build the recipient's mental representation of a theme, while other information may be prominent. Prominence within a schema occurs when the natural information flow, often through a chain of non-copular Px clauses, is broken or halted, and there is a change in information structure that places the significant information in a pre-verbal position. Marking information for prominence may have a
text-structuring function. Therefore, although the clause belongs naturally to the micro-
level of a discourse unit, clause information structures have significant text-structuring
functions, particularly as onset and closure markers. Thus, in the remainder of this
chapter, I will apply the principles and theory of discourse analysis and information
structures to delimiting the macrostructure of Leviticus' arrangement at the global,
episodic, and paragraph levels.64

2. A Delimitation of the Global Level of Leviticus

Although the Pentateuch is historically understood to be composed of five books that
‘reflect a specific understanding of the coherence and unity of each book’, this historical
argument no longer suffices within Pentateuchal scholarship.65 As I have noted in the first
chapter, the prevailing arguments of source criticism have led to the view that Leviticus 1–
16 is inseparable from the priestly narrative in Exodus 19–Numbers 10, while the
remaining section in Leviticus 17–26 is a discrete unit.66 More recently, scholars such as
Watts have argued that the ‘literary boundaries are less obvious’ in a delimitation of
Exodus 25–Numbers 9.67 I have already argued in the first chapter why approaching
Leviticus as a whole text is just as feasible as approaching Leviticus 17–26 as a discrete
unit. However, in light of questions about the relationship between the text of Leviticus
and its surrounding context, whether it can be analysed as a coherent text or as an
inextricable part of a wider discourse unit, I will need to justify approaching Leviticus as a
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64 As I will also note below, the exception will be the delimitation of Leviticus 17–21, which I will undertake at
a global level, that is, a delimitation of episodes only. Please see Appendix A (pp. 316-327) for the delimitation
of each episode and embedded episode within Leviticus 17–21 and also Appendix B (pp. 328-335) for how this
delimitation translates into the episodic schema for Leviticus 17–21.
65 Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, p. 70; See also B. S. Childs, *Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture*
66 I acknowledge that there are exceptions such as V. Wagner, ‘Zur Existenz des sogenannten
„Heiligkeitsgesetzes”‘, ZAW 86 (1974), pp. 377–386, who rejects the idea that H existed independently from
67 Watts, ‘Rhetorical Strategy’, p. 16. See also Lee, *Between Law and Narrative*, pp. 273-281. I have noted in fn. 66
above that Wagner, ‘Zur Existenz’, pp. 313-314, views Leviticus as being part of Exodus 25–Leviticus 26 as the
wider unit.
discrete text by establishing the global boundaries for Leviticus as a rhetorical-discourse unit. This is the first part of undertaking the second step in the rhetorical-critical framework of this study, which is to delimit Leviticus as a rhetorical unit. To achieve this, I will examine the Exodus 40:34-38/Leviticus 1:1-2 seam before addressing the problem of the two discontinuity markers in 26:26 and 27:34.

The text of Exodus, as we have already noted in the second chapter, concludes with the tabernacle's purpose being realised (Ex. 40:34-35) and a summary statement (40:36-38). YHWH's glory filling the tabernacle in 40:34 is the climactic event of Exodus 25–40, although interrupted purposefully by the golden calf narrative (Ex. 32–34). Verse 35 conveys that YHWH's glory filling the tabernacle prevents Moses from entering while the repetition of the Xp focus structure in v34b and v35b, identifies what precisely hinders Moses from entering the tabernacle, which is YHWH's glory. This prominence draws attention to a significant narrative development, which is Moses' inability to enter into the Tabernacle. After the focus upon YHWH's glory in vv34-35, there is a theme shift in vv36-38,

And when the cloud was taken away from the tabernacle, the sons of Israel set out on all their journeys, but they did not set out until the day it was taken away. For the cloud of YHWH was upon the tabernacle each day

---

68 While I employ DA to argue for Leviticus as a discrete unit, Auld, 'Leviticus: After Exodus', p. 53, takes a different line of argument although deriving a similar conclusion stating, 'The proposal is simply that in conception the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers are more different from each other than would be expected of three parts of a larger whole; and that they were conceived one after the other and not together' (italics in the original text). For his wider argument, please see Auld, 'Leviticus: After Exodus', pp. 41-54.

69 See also Nihan, From Priestly Torah, pp. 90, 158, who observes Moses' separation from YHWH’s presence as a significant narrative development and is also the problem the book of Leviticus addresses, namely the separation between God and man.
and fire was in it at night in the sight of all the house of Israel in all their journeys.

The temporal (XP) clause in v36aα (underlined) is purposefully placed in a pre-nuclear position 'to set the stage for the main action that follows' and thus its purpose is contextualisation. The focus is upon the cloud being removed from the tabernacle and the sons of Israel setting out on their journeys. The place of the temporal clause in the clause-initial position in v36aα allows for the contrast between v37a and v37b emphasising when the sons of Israel set out on their journeys and when they do not. After the two Px structures in v37, there is a break in the information flow caused by an Xp + Xp sequence signaling that the information in v38 is significant. The Xp structure in v38a places the focus upon the cloud of YHWH upon the tabernacle, while the following Xp structure in v38b highlights the fire being in the cloud, at night, in the sight of all the house of Israel. The initial כי in v38a suggests that the sentence supplies the reason for the sons of Israel to set out only when the cloud is lifted; the cloud, and the fire in the cloud, are visible to the whole house of Israel. This is significant in the narrative progression of the book of Exodus. Rather than the fire being visible, distant on the top of Mt Sinai (Ex. 24:17), the visible fire is now in the midst of the camp, which is in the cloud covering the tabernacle. Thus, there is a change in perspective between vv34-35 and vv36-38. No longer is the schema in vv36-38 progressing by the narration of commands being completed, which leads to the purpose of the tabernacle being realised, as in 40:1-35; rather, there is now a 'whole camp' orientation where the implied author introduces the next phase in Israel's life, which is the journey to the land of promise. The text begins to anticipate the fulfilment of the long-term goal of the exodus event (see Ex. 3:8, 17). Thus, the shift in orientation between vv34-35 and vv36-38 provides a coherent closing summary for the text and is thus an effective boundary for the text of Exodus.

70 See the brief discussion of the third onset function of an XP clause on p. 73 above.
71 See Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 105.
72 M. Smith, ‘The Literary Arrangement of the Priestly Redaction of Exodus: A Preliminary Investigation’, CBQ
Since there is an effective boundary that signals the close of the text of Exodus, although questions arising from the narrative progression in Exodus 25–40 still remain unresolved, the text of Leviticus does not necessarily need to begin with a formal discourse onset marker. However, irrespective of this, how Leviticus begins is significant.\(^*\)

\[
\begin{align*}
1:1a & \text{יקרא אלሚשה} \\
1:1b & \text{וידבר יהוה אל משה מ '..', לאמנים} \\
1:2a & \text{דבר אליבni ישראל} \\
1:2bα & \text{ואמר אלוהים} \\
1:2bβ & \text{אמר משה ממך דבריהם} \\
1:2by & \text{אמר משה ממך דבריהם} \\
1:2bγ & \text{אמר משה ממך דבריהם} \\
1:2bδ & \text{אמר משה ממך דבריהם} \\
1:2bε & \text{אמר משה ממך דבריהם} \\
\end{align*}
\]

And he called to Moses
and YHWH said to him from the tent of meeting,
"Speak to the sons of Israel
and say to them,
'When a man offers from you a gift to YHWH from the livestock,
From the cattle and from the flock you will offer your gift.'

Joosten notes that a beginning \textit{wayyiqtol} in an initial clause can be used to signal the beginning of a new unit.\(^*\) Furthermore, he observes that the purpose of beginning a new discourse space with an initial clause with a fronted \textit{wayyiqtol} is to introduce background information so that the forthcoming event would then be prominent.\(^*\) Applying Joosten's logic, the initial \textit{ויקרא} in 1:1α above can legitimately begin a new discourse space.

Moreover, the narrative introduction anchors the divine speech report in 1:2bβ–7:34 first by continuing the narrative from Exodus 40:35 and second, by providing the information

---

\(^{58}\) Joosten exemplifies his point from 2 Samuel 12:1 (Joosten, \textit{Verbal System}, pp.164-165).

\(^{71}\) Joosten, \textit{The Verbal System of Biblical Hebrew: a New Synthesis Elaborated on the Basis of Classical Prose} (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 13, Jerusalem: Simor, 2012), p. 165. He notes, 'The corpus of classical Hebrew prose presents itself as one long story stretching from the creation of the world to the exile of Judah. Apart from Gen 13, there are hardly any absolute beginnings. This makes it hard for the grammarian to determine how the beginning of a Hebrew narrative was constructed. The few embedded discourses that can unambiguously be qualified as a narrative (as opposed to report) do not commence with \textit{WAYYIQTOL}'.

\(^{57}\) Joosten, \textit{Verbal System}, p. 165.

\(^{59}\) N.B. The indenting is to suggest subordination where a new level of speech occurs. That is, 1:2a begins the recalled divine speech and 1:2bβ begins the speech that is to be mediated to the sons of Israel. Each level of speech is therefore subordinate to the previous level of discourse.

\(^{58}\) (1996), p. 34, also concludes his explanation, 'The result is that the bracketing function of Exod 40:36-38 signals a break between the books of Exodus and Leviticus'.

---
that YHWH spoke to Moses from the tent of meeting. However, the absence of an explicit subject for the initial wayyiqtol must be noted. The initial clause in 1:1a has relatively low information coding suggesting that the implied author did not think it necessary at first to clarify who was calling Moses; there is also low cognitive effort needed to understand that it is YHWH who calls. This assumption is then justified in the second clause with the naming of YHWH as the one who speaks to Moses from the tent of meeting. Thus, this suggests that 1:1 continues the narrative from Exodus 40:35 since there is no need to clarify who was calling in the first instance. However, Leviticus 1:1 continuing the narrative from Exodus 40:35 does not necessarily preclude Leviticus 1:1 from beginning a new rhetorical discourse unit. The way the text of Exodus ends, with the fulfillment of the tabernacle’s purpose and previewing Israel journeying to the land, acts to provide closure to the mental representation of Exodus as a coherent text unit. Given Exodus’ coherence as a discourse space, this allows the text of Leviticus to begin a new discourse unit. Thus, Leviticus 1:1 is a discourse boundary, initiating a new discourse space, at the global level of the text.

Defining when the text of Leviticus closes as a discourse unit, however, is more complex due to the presence of two conclusions in 26:46 and 27:34. The presence of two major conclusion summaries at the close of the text raises the question as to whether the edited text should conclude after the blessings and curses in Leviticus 26 or whether Leviticus 27 should be included as part of the coherent discourse unit. The first conclusion summary in

---

76 See Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 134, and Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 159, for the argument that the absence of a subject is because of the narrative accentuating continuity from Exodus to Leviticus.


26:46 has an initial Xp structure where the initial demonstrative acts anaphorically to refer to instructions that have been given previously, while the relative clause is a Px structure,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Xp} & \quad \text{ Px} \\
\text{آلלה החקים והמהשים והתרות} & \quad \text{ಆಶר נתן להוה בנים בני ישראל בחר סיני ביד משה:}
\end{align*}
\]

These are the statutes, the ordinances, and the instructions, which YHWH set between him and the sons of Israel at Mt Sinai by the hand of Moses.

At first the Xp + Px structures seem to summarise the discourse text of Leviticus 1–26. This perception is achieved by the use of the anaphoric demonstrative that assumes the referents of the statutes, ordinances, and instructions being active in both the implied editor’s and implied recipient’s mental representations of the discourse unit. Also, 26:46 closing a wider unit than an episode is feasible because of the heavy information coding in the relative Px structure. There is an explicit subject of נתן, the mention of the location at Mt Sinai, as well as an explicit agent of the instructions (‘by the hand of Moses’). Dooley notes that when there is a hierarchical processing function ‘cost increases at the beginning (and sometimes slightly at the end) of a discourse unit’. Thus, knowing that an Xp structure with an anaphoric demonstrative has a closing summary function together with the high coding of information in the relative clause suggests that Leviticus 26:46 marks the closure of a discourse unit. Two questions emerge, however. The first is whether the high coding, or even over-coding, of information has another function and the second is whether 26:46 closes an episode or the global level of the discourse text. To partially answer the first briefly, the choice of language in the conclusion summary is important. First, the implied author has chosen to identify three kinds of instructions given, rather than one inclusive term (cf. 27:34). Second, the relative clause uses language of YHWH setting (נתן) the three kinds of instructions between him and the sons of Israel at Mt Sinai, rather than keeping with the emphasis of Leviticus where YHWH has commanded (צוה) the sons of Israel (cf. 7:38, 27:34). The emphasis upon YHWH setting instruction between himself and Israel

---

80 Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 471, notes that the use of the three law terms in 26:46 summarises the whole book.
accentuates the nation's covenant responsibility, which is not a coincidence considering the episode focuses in part on the covenant blessings and curses (26:3-44). Thus, given the choice of language in 26:46 it is feasible to suggest at this stage that the purpose is to heighten Israel's obligation to the statutes, ordinances, and instructions that YHWH is placing between himself and Israel, rather than solely functioning as a closing marker. Therefore, returning to the second question of whether Leviticus 26:46 functions to close Leviticus 1–26 as a discourse space or as an episode within Leviticus 1–27, I am going to suggest that 26:46 is the closing summary for the episode in 25:1–26:46, rather than having a closing function at the global level.\(^a\) Moreover, the first Xp closing summary in 7:37-38 has a Px relative clause, which has even higher coding than 26:46, and yet we do not insist that 7:37-38 closes the macrostructure altogether. Thus, viewing 26:46 as concluding an episodic schema is possible.

There are two implications of 26:46 functioning as a closure marker for Leviticus 25–26. First, Leviticus 27 is part of the discourse space at a global level and second, 27:34 closes the global level schema and thus consolidates the whole as a rhetorical-discourse unit. Like 26:46, 27:34 has an Xp pattern where the initial anaphoric demonstrative requires low cognitive effort to recall the referent. Also, the subordinate Px clause has high information coding.\(^b\) However, since the main clause אֲלֵי הַדְּבָרִים only has one full noun, which is less than the three in 26:45, the summary in 27:34 requires relatively less cognitive effort to close the discourse space. This is especially so since the Px subordinate clause in 27:34 uses familiar verbal language of צוה that tends to be characteristic of Leviticus. Thus, 27:34 is a satisfying conclusion summary that draws Leviticus as a

\(^a\) Contrary to Auld, ‘Leviticus at the Heart of the Pentateuch?’, p. 45; Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 471.

\(^b\) Four full noun phrases are used in 27:34 with an explicit subject (יהוה), explicit object (משה), an explicit indirect object (בני ישראל), as well as the mention of the location (בָּהֵרָה סֵן).
discourse unit to a close. This, in turn, allows Numbers 1:1 to begin a new discourse space by resuming the overarching narrative framework.

In summary, there are two points of schematic discontinuity delimiting Leviticus as a discrete unit. The first is the summary conclusion in Exodus 40:36-38 enabling Leviticus 1:1-2bζ to begin a new discourse space, and the second is the discontinuity marker in Leviticus 27:34, which enables Numbers 1:1 to begin a new macrostructure. The only question is whether the linguistic and conceptual schemas align so that there is coherence in the text of Leviticus. I will address this question after I delimit the global and episodic levels within the macrostructure of Leviticus’ arrangement. The exception will be Leviticus 17–24 where, due to the breadth and nature of the text, I have chosen to delimit the global schema only.

3. Delimiting Leviticus 1–7 as an Episode

The beginning narrative introduction in 1:1-2bζ, made up of a circumstantial frame and two sequential quotative frames, allows the recipient to access the speech report that then follows in Leviticus 1:2bζ–7:36. The speech report begins with a concise major case in 1:2bζ.

---

85 Also, while 26:45 uses the three law terms, 27:34 uses only one, מvation. A feasible suggestion for this difference is that מvation could be collective for all the commandments that HWH has commanded not only in Leviticus 27, but also in the book as a whole. see also M. F. Rooker, Leviticus: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture (NAC 3a, Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 2000), p. 329. Contrary to Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 486, 573; Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 471, 485; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 334.

86 Similarly, Hieke, Levitikus 1–15, p. 51, observes the parallelism between Leviticus 11 and Numbers 11 where each refer to YHWH calling from the tent of meeting. In Hieke’s view, both Leviticus 11 and Numbers 11 are introductions and thus Leviticus forms one book. Also, Rendtorff, ‘Is it Possible to Read Leviticus as a Separate Book?’, p. 27, notes that the inclusion of the date in Numbers 11, as well as the subtle change in geographical location, sets Numbers 11 apart from Leviticus 27:34.

87 Please see pp. 316-327 in Appendix A for the delimitation of the episodic schemas in Leviticus 17–24 and also pp. 328-335 in Appendix B for how this delimitation translates into an arrangement outline.

88 I recognise that the idea of the two frames forming an introduction to Leviticus 1–7 as a whole is a contested idea. The dominant view is that 11-2bζ introduces the מvation, מנהלה, and the מvation מuania in Leviticus 1–3, while a second narrative introduction + divine speech formula in 41:2a introduces the two offerings, the מנחה and the קרבן, in 41:5–26. See also Knierim, Text and Concept, p. 5; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 134, 228; Noth, Leviticus, p. 36; R. Rendtorff, Leviticus 1.1–10.20 (BKAT, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2004), p. 17; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, 156, pp. 299-300.
When a man offers you a gift to YHWH from the livestock,
From the cattle and from the flock you will offer your gift.

The first clause, the protasis of the major case, is a XP structure where both the subject in the clause-initial position and the predicate is marked as prominent due to the fact that both constituents convey unestablished information. As noted above, a major purpose of an initial XP structure beginning an episode is to topicalise. In this instance, the topic is an Israelite man offering a gift to YHWH from the livestock. The apodosis in 1:2bγ then identifies which livestock are acceptable, namely from the cattle and from the flock. The topic, however, shifts in 1:3a with the minor casuistic construction introducing a new referent, which is the first type of offering, the עולה. As we have mentioned above, the discourse in 1:3-9 coheres around the theme of the עולה gift as the schema moves from the offerer selecting the gift from the cattle with the right characteristics (v3) to the עולה being caused to smoke as a soothing aroma to YHWH (v9). The [X]P clause ריח־ניחוח עולה ליהוה signals the completion of the ritual process and thus completes the mental representation of the discourse space, which in turn allows a new discourse space to begin in v10αα.

---

87. Please note the inclusion of מה־הבהמה as part of the protasis, rather than the apodosis. See also Lee, *Between Law and Narrative*, p. 221. This is contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, p. 145, who states that the prepositional phrase should be part of the apodosis since this is where the Masoretic text has placed the accent. Yet reading the text with the inclusion of the prepositional phrase within the protasis makes more sense of the case being when the Israelite brings an offering from the livestock and then the apodosis gives the law for what kinds of livestock are acceptable. This is also contrary to Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, p. 235.

88. The meaning and translational value of the term עולה has caused much discussion and suggestions vary. For example, Watts, *Leviticus 1-10*, pp. 184-185, argues for the meaning of ‘rising offering’ on the basis of the verbal root עולה meaning ‘to cause to rise’. Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 5, notes the verbal idea ‘to rise’, but chooses the functional translation ‘burnt offering’ since the whole offering is ‘consumed in its entirety’. See also Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, pp. 172-174. Since there is little consensus, we will refer to the offering untranslated simply as the עולה.

89. The [X] represents the omission of an independent pronoun that would be expected to occur before the predicate. The [X] notes that the independent pronoun is, therefore, implied.
The "אם" marker in v10α signals the beginning of a new minor case where the "אם + XP*" structure has the grammatical pattern of a Px structure and yet the grammatical predicate is functioning as the pragmatic subject. Thus, in this instance, the grammatical Px clause has the same pragmatic function as an XP clause-focus structure, which topicalises a new discourse space (paragraph). In this instance, the focus is upon the flock being the offerer's gift. The schema in vv10-13 then coheres around the process of an exemplar from the flock, which closes with the refrain (XP* clause). Again, the clause-initial grammatical predicate functions as the pragmatic subject and so the clause has a pragmatic function of an XP declarative clause. Verse 14 then introduces a third minor protasis, although in this instance the structure is "אם + XP" since the prepositional phrase in the clause-initial position is a new referent (X) and is neither the predicate or the subject. Thus, the protasis as a whole topicalises the third paragraph, while the fronted argument highlights the kind of gift that is to be offered in this situation as an "עלה". This paragraph uses the same closing XP* refrain as v13, "עלה יהוה ניחח רוח אשה הוא עלה", which consolidates the ritual process by declaring it to be an "עלה" and so closes the paragraph schema. However, a second major protasis in 2:1 shifts the theme to a different type of offering and thus marks schematic discontinuity of 1:3-17 with the major topic shift. Thus, the coherence of the semantic and pragmatic structures suggests that the three minor protases in 1:3, 1:10, and 1:14, mark the beginning of paragraphs within the episodic schema. Each minor case coheres around a topic referent, namely the type of offering and/or animal being offered.

Nonetheless, the question of how the first major case in 1:2b relates to the episode of the "עלה" gift in 1:3-17 still remains unresolved.97 We have noted that 1:2bβ introduces the topic of an Israelite offering a gift to YHWH from the livestock, while the initial conditional

---

97 There is a question as to whether 1:2b is an overarching case law for the offerings in Leviticus 1–3 (Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 3, 4; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 1–16, p. 144; Watts, *Leviticus* 1–10, pp. 159–164), for Leviticus 1–7 as a whole (Rooker, *Leviticus*, p. 81.), or applies to the "עלה" offering in 1:3-17 only (Knierim, *Text and Concept*, p. 11). My argument above is for the major case topicalising Leviticus 1–3.
frame in 1:3 represents a topic shift to focus upon the first kind of gift. The focus is still upon an Israelite offering a gift from the livestock, but the protasis in 1:3 is more narrowly defined as the עֶלֶל. Thus, 1:2b β topicalises a new episode where 1:3α represents the onset of the first embedded episode. The embedded episode in 1:3-17 does not conclude with a discontinuity marker that consolidates the episodic schema; rather, the familiar refrain ליהוה ניחח ריח אשה הוא עֶלֶל consolidates the paragraph schema (vv 14-17; see also v 9, v 13). However, the major protasis, an XP structure, at the beginning of 2:1α signals the onset of a new discourse space and, in doing so, also marks the discontinuity of the schema in 1:3-17. Thus, while the first major case in 1:2β topicalises the discourse space as an access referent, the thematic shift in 1:3 to the עֶלֶל suggests the beginning of an embedded episode.

As observed above, 2:1α initiates a new schema, but it is curious as to why 2:1α uses a major case marker, rather than a minor case marker comparable to the עֶלֶל case beginning in 1:3α. While both protases in 1:2β and 2:1α front the subject identifying who is the one offering a gift to YHWH, אָדָם in 1:2β and נפש in 2:1α, there are also some significant variations. Whereas the protasis in 1:2β focuses on an offering of livestock, the major conditional frame in 2:1α introduces a specific kind of offering, the מנחה. The first offering is introduced in the first minor protasis in 1:3a, which is a pattern repeated once more in Leviticus 3:1. Also, the protasis in 2:1α is the governing situation for the exemplar process of the מנחה, which is a gift of semolina flour, oil, and incense (2:1-3). While 1:2β topicalises the episode, encompassing the עֶלֶל and the זֶבַח שלמים, this still leaves the question of why the instruction is arranged between the עֶלֶל and the זֶבַח שלמים since the מנחה does not concern livestock. The rationale for this arrangement is an issue for discussion in Chapter Five when we explore the strategy of the text's arrangement in detail.92 For the moment though, I will note only that Leviticus 2:1α is the

91 Contrary to Levine, Leviticus, p. 5, who argues that 1:2b is the general case law with the three specific cases in v 3a, 10a, and 14a giving the more specific cases to the general rule.
92 Please see pp. 267-268 in Chapter Five.
beginning of a second embedded episode at the same level as the עולה Instructions in 1:3-17 i.e. the עולה Instructions close and the מנחה Instructions begin.

While 2:1a acts to initiate and topicalise a new episode, the protasis also begins a paragraph schema cohering around the referent of a person bringing a gift of a מנחה. The [X]P structure in 2:3c, праздшение священных святых, is a declaration that the portion given to the officiating priest is most holy from the food offering to YHWH and pragmatically completes the mental representation of the discourse space in 2:1-3. After this first paragraph describing the process for the raw מנחה, a further four cases follow, which outline the ritual process for the מנחה depending upon how the gift has been prepared (v 4, vv 5-6, vv 7-10) or its purpose (vv 14-16).

Similar to 1:3-17, the minor protases in 2:4-16 share both a semantic text-structuring purpose, signalled by the minor case marker, and a pragmatic text-structuring function where the clause of the protasis either initiates or topicalises a new discourse space. For instance, the Px structures in 2:4a and 2:14aα initiate situations where the מנחה is either an oven-baked gift (v 4) or is offered as a first-fruits gift (vv 14-16), while the Px copular clauses in 2:5aα and 2:7aα highlight how the gift has been prepared. Each kind of מנחה forms the theme of the paragraph schema. Thus, the syntactic text-structuring devices, which are the minor and major case markers, cohere with the pragmatic text-structuring devices that mark the beginning of new paragraphs.

---

93. N.B. The independent pronoun as the subject needs to be supplied, which is the reason why the clause-initial argument is in brackets. The clause has the same pragmatic function as a non-copular declaratory XP clause.

94. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, p. 185.

95. N.B. The protasis in 2:4 is unusual since it does not have a fronted subject preceding the כי conjunction. There are, however, two minor cases that follow using the בα marker in v 5 and v 7. This deviation suggests that the protasis in v 4a is not meant to have the same structural value as 2:1a. This is contrary to Watts, Leviticus 1-10, pp. 229-230, 249, who does not take into account this difference between the major casuistic construction in 2:1a and the case formula in 2:4a. He understands 2:4a as having the same structural function with the consequence that 2:4a functions as the major case under which the minor cases using בα in vv 5-6 and vv 7-10 are subordinate.
However, the paragraph schema focusing upon the pan-cooked מנהה (vv7-10) does not immediately progress to the paragraph focusing upon the first-fruits מנהה (vv14-16); rather, a so-called 'digression' in vv11-13 interrupts the information flow from one case to the next. While I will explore the pragmatic effect and rhetorical function of vv11-13 in Chapter Five, worth noting is the function of the divided XP clause in 2:11, which topicalises the paragraph schema in vv11-13 and thus begins a new discourse space. The shift to the final מנהה case in 2:14א pamphlets the discontinuity of vv11-13 as a paragraph.

Based on the coherence of the syntax and discourse markers that I have identified above, Leviticus 2 can be viewed as an embedded episode with six paragraphs within its schema. The episode’s discontinuity is marked by a topic shift in 3:1 to the ב mężו, which closes the mental representation of Leviticus 2 as an embedded episode. The following table identifies the onset and closure markers for the episodic schema of Leviticus 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>נפש בור ירחיב קרן מנהה ליהוה</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>2:1αα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וי קרן קרן כל מה פגומת נון</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>2:4αα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואספנותה על המנהה קרן</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>2:5αα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואספנותה מחרשת קרן</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>2:7αα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גל י훼 נון השכר ירחיב היצא מה כל מה פגומת נון</td>
<td>Topicalisation X[Px]P</td>
<td>2:11α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואספנותה נון המנהה היצא מה כל מה פגומת נון</td>
<td>Thematising</td>
<td>2:14αα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Onset Markers in Leviticus 2:1-16

The topic shift in 3:1αα to the ב mężו is what appears to be an initial אס+Px clause, and in doing so begins a new episode on the same level as the על and המנהה instructions in 1:3-17 and 2:1-16 respectively. However, this initial אס + Px clause is an instance where the grammatical predicate is the pragmatic subject (ב המנהה). The effect is what I will

---

86 While I disagree with Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, p. 260, that Leviticus 2 has a chiastic structure, I agree vv11-13 breaks the schematic continuity of the chapter. He notes quite rightly, 'The careful word choice and arrangement of these verses show that this digression from the structure and contents of the rest of the chapter was nevertheless composed for maximal rhetorical impact' (Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, p. 261).

87 Please see pp. 260-261 in Chapter Five for further explanation about the rhetorical function of 2:11-13.

term here a pragmatic XP* structure; the clause-initial constituent is the thematic referent for the episodic schema and thus has the pragmatic function of topicalisation. The following אֶרֶץ Xp structure in 3:1aβ then highlights the kind of animal, an exemplar from the cattle, to be offered as a שלמים, which becomes the thematic referent for the paragraph schema.99 The remaining paragraphs in the schema are initiated in 3:6a, 3:7a, and 3:12a by further בָּשׁ + Xp or אֶרֶץ + XP* structures, which introduce the referent for each paragraph schema focusing upon the kind of gift from the flock (v6), lamb (vv7-11) or goat (vv12-17), as per the table below.100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אֶרֶץ שלמים קרובנו</td>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td>E-Episode¹⁰⁰</td>
<td>XP*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶרֶץ מקיבר הוה מקיבר</td>
<td>Topicalising</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶרֶץ מקיבר ווֹאֲזָה שלמים לוה הוה</td>
<td>Topicalising</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>XP*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אֶרֶץ מקיבר והוא וואֲזָה</td>
<td>Topicalising</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Xp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והוא קרובנו</td>
<td>Topicalising</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>XP*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Onset Markers in Leviticus 3:1-16

A remaining question though is whether the final two minor cases in vv7-11 and vv12-17 are subordinate to the case of the flock in 3:6a.102 Nevertheless, while discourse is hierarchical, it also progresses linearly. The recipient hearing the discourse would include the instructions for the flock in v7 into the mental representation of the episode and repeat the same process with the cases of the lamb (vv7-11) and the goat (vv12-17). As we will observe later in Chapter Five, the progression of logic between v6, vv7-11, and vv12-17, establishes the characteristics of the gift from the flock (v6), after which the ritual processes for the lamb (vv7-11) and the goat (vv12-17) are described.103 Moreover, there

---

99 Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 35-36, 39, acknowledges that v1 has a ‘dual heading’ where, ‘The first דָּנ clause introduces the entire regulation and ties back to 1:2. The second דָּנ clause heads the first segment of this regulation’ (Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 34).

100 The asterisk in this paragraph and in Table 2 marks the grammatical Px structure as a pragmatic clause-focus structure (XP*) i.e. where the grammatical predicate functions as the pragmatic subject.

101 From this point in the thesis, an embedded episode will be marked in a table as ‘E-Episode’.

102 For arguments that the cases of the lamb (vv7-11) and the goat (vv12-17) are subordinate to v6, see Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 34-37; Rendtorff, *Leviticus 1.1–10.20*, p. 117; Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 104; Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, p. 284.
are no differentiating pragmatic or semantic structures that may signal subordination. Thus, for the present study, I will maintain a four-paragraph episodic schema (vv1-5, v6, vv7-11, vv12-17) focusing upon the שלמים זבח.

The two sequential quotative frames in 4:1-2αζ disrupt the progression of the gift instructions. Furthermore, the quotative frames are redundant since there is no change in speaker or in recipient. The pragmatic function of the two quotative frames is to signal a break in the information flow and so highlights the speech report that follows. Generally, the speech report uses both syntactic and pragmatic markers consistent with Leviticus 1–3. Embedded episodes are introduced by a major protasis, using an XP structure, with the subject in the clause-initial position (4:2αβ, 5:1, 5:15, 5:21). These initial XP structures topicalise the episodic schema and focus upon the situation that prompts the offering of the gift; in this instance, the situation is where an offender has either sinned against a command of YHWH unintentionally (4:2-35, 5:1-13) or has broken faith with him (5:15-19, 5:21-26). This is evident by observing the change in verbal roots between the major protases in Leviticus 1–3 and those in Leviticus 4–5. While the protases in 1:2b and 2:1a use the verbal idea קרב, the protasis in 4:2α uses חטא, which marks a change in motivation of the offerer. The major verbal idea changes again in 5:15a and 5:21a where מעלה is used together with חטא. The common use of חטא throughout both the חטאת and the אשם offering instructions provides some conceptual unity within Leviticus 4–5.

---

103. Please see pp. 265 in Chapter Five.
104. For a three-fold division consisting of vv1-5, vv6-11, vv12-15(17), please see Rooker, Leviticus, p. 100, and Wenham, Leviticus, p. 74. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 268, 271, has a slight variation to the three-fold structure. He views vv12 as the concluding verse of the second section allowing vv13 to begin a third unit concluding at vv16. Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 35-36, who argues for two sections within the substructure; vv1-5 focusing upon the cattle offering and vv6-16 concerns the flock, including both the lamb (vv7-11) and the goat (vv12-16). See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 202-203; Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 76-77; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 101.
105. Contrary to Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 300-301, who does not recognise the beginning construction subject+כנ-verb in 5:3 as signalling the beginning of a major section.
106. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 228; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 109; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 328.
The onset marker for most paragraphs within Leviticus 4–5 is a minor protasis using an חטא
+ XP structure (4:3, 4:13, 4:27, 4:32, 5:7, 5:11, 5:17) or רשע + XP structure (4:22) where each XP structure initiates a paragraph and also focuses on the identity of the offender.\textsuperscript{107} The exceptions are 5:7 and 5:11 where the minor protases use an חטא + Px structure to thematise each paragraph to focus upon the provision where a poor man cannot afford a lamb (5:7) or a pair of birds (5:11). The single redundant quotative frame that occurs in 5:14 and 5:20 acts to highlight the speech that follows, which in this instance are the major cases of the חטאת offering.\textsuperscript{108} Thus, given the two sequential, redundant, quotative frames in 4:1-2α, I would like to suggest that 4:2αβ initiates and topicalises an episode that is made up of a further three embedded episodes (5:1-13, 5:15-19, 5:21-26), where each begins with a major protasis with an XP clause.

So far, I have argued that Leviticus 1–5 is made up of two episodes, Leviticus 1–3 and Leviticus 4–5. The first episode focuses upon an Israelite wishing to offer a gift to YHWH (1:2βα). I have noted that Leviticus 1–3, as the first episode, has three embedded episodes (1:3-17, 2:1-16, 3:1-17) focusing upon the ritual instruction for the זבח, מנחה, עלי, and the שלמים. The second episode in Leviticus 4–5 also has a further three embedded episodes in 5:1-13, 5:15-19, 5:21-26. There is conceptual coherence in Leviticus 4–5 with the theme of each being either when an offence has been committed against a command of YHWH

\textsuperscript{107} For example, after the major case in 4:2αβ, five minor cases using the חטא marker then follow in vv3-12, vv13-21, vv22-26, vv27-31, and vv32-35. The semantic structures cohere with the pragmatic where each minor case has a fronted subject in a XP clause, which initiates each paragraph schema and, in doing so, focuses upon the identity of the offender. Thus, each minor case, with the exception of vv32-35, narrates ritual process according to who committed the sin unintentionally: the priest in vv3-12, the congregation of Israel in vv3-21, a leader in vv22-26, and an individual from the people of the land in vv27-31. Verses 32-35 narrate the process where a lamb is the offering, rather than a bull or a goat. Thus, the major case in v2αβ acts as a preface to the minor cases that follow by introducing the general situation where someone, individually or corporately, has unintentionally sinned.

\textsuperscript{108} Watts, Leviticus 1–16, p. 367, notes that the speech formula (what I have termed a single quotative frame above) signals a new phase in the arrangement, which in this instance is a change in offering. This is true of 4α, but is not consistent with either the חטא or the שלמים. He is perhaps right to note that the repetition of the divine speech formula in 5:20 ‘followed by more regulations for guilt offerings shows that the speech formula does not always mark major divisions in content: This is confirmed by our analysis of the pragmatic function of quotative frames above. Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 319, who views the divine speech formula as a ‘new heading indicating a new topic.'
(4:2-35, 5:1-13) or where an offender has broken faith with God (5:15-19, 5:21-26).

Significantly though, there is no major discourse marker that closes an episode or embedded episode; the next discourse space is initiated by a theme shift. Thus, as yet, there has been little consolidation of the mental representation at an episodic level. Furthermore, as each episode flows from one offering or situation to the next, each embedded episode is added into the cognitive space of the previous offering and the same occurs at the episodic level. Thus, as the discourse space of each episode progresses, the cognitive representation is expanding to include the next offering or the next situation. The mental representation of the discourse space within Leviticus 1–5 can, therefore, be depicted as per the diagram below.

```
Illustration 1: Mental Representation of Leviticus 1–5
```

The two sequential quotative frames in 6:1-2α mark a significant point of departure from Leviticus 1–5. The second quotative frame, לאמר ואת בניו את אהרן צוה, changes the verbal language from דבר to צוה and also shifts the addressees to Aaron and his sons. This interrupts the information flow to a greater degree than the previous (redundant) quotative frames (see 4:1-2α). The schema proceeding from the quotative frames in 6:1-2α is then relatively straightforward. The text-structuring device in Leviticus 6:1–

---

199 See also Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, p. 390, who notes, 'צוה imperative "command" appears here in the place where אמר "say" is used in the previous regulations addressed to all Israel (1:2; 4:1). Perhaps the stronger term appears here because the recipients are priests'. The escalation of the verbal language from דבר to צוה also accentuates the seriousness of what is commanded in the following speech report.

200 N.B The structural pattern is broken in 6:12-13a by the use of a singular quotative frame (highlighting
7:21 is an XP onset clause following the formula א תורות זאת, where א is a type of offering (6:2b§, 6:7az, 6:13az, 6:18b§, 7:1az, 7:11az). Each XP structure with the cataphoric demonstrative marks the onset of a paragraph.

The recurrence of two sequential quotative frames in 7:22-23a shares a similar function to 6:1-2a. The first quotative frame in 7:2a gives access to the second quotative frame, which changes the recipients to the sons of the Israel (7:23a). Moreover, this speech report focuses not upon a specific case or situation, but instruction about what the Israelites cannot eat from the livestock gifts, namely the fat and the blood (7:23-27). The schema is interrupted by another recurrence of two sequential quotative frames in 7:28-29a, which are, in this instance, redundant. There is no change in the speech's addressee, which suggests that a minor topic shift ensues and that the speech is significant. Moreover, there is no break in the schema until 7:35. This suggests that the quotative frames in 7:22-23 break the information flow so that the XP clause in 7:23aβ can initiate a new episode. This episode has two paragraphs in 7:23aβ-27 and 7:29-36. Thus, the macrostructure of the final two episodes in Leviticus 6:1-7:36 can be delimited as per the table below.

---

function), although still followed by an XP structure א תורות זאת. Thus, the continuation of the XP pattern א תורות זאת in 6:18 acts to recover the structural order after the continuity of the schema is broken.

See also Rendtorff, Leviticus 1:1-10.20, pp. 258-259, for a similar observation but with an emphasis upon the literary dimensions, rather than the pragmatic and syntactic.


Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 257, suggests that the change of addressees to the sons of Israel 'seems clearly distinct from the previous one'. Yet he also observes, 'However, careful examination suggests that this section is also related to 6:1–7:21 and serves as a complement.' I do not disagree with Nihan at this point; my argument is a way forward to help preserve the topic shift between the two episodes in 6:1–7:21 and 7:22-36, while noting that the two episodes are sequential and share a conceptual relationship. An individual episode does not necessarily intimate schematic isolation.
So far within the text, there has been no concluding marker consolidating the mental representation of the discourse space at an episodic level. The Xp structure in 7:37 has this function. The anaphoric demonstrative precedes the list of offerings that the instructions in Leviticus 1–7 encompass. Thus, the Xp structure in v37 consolidates the mental representation of the instructions in Leviticus 1–7 and so consolidates the whole as an episode. The diagram below represents how the mental representation expands to encompass the whole.
Illustration 2: Mental Representation of Leviticus 1–7

However, the summary conclusion beginning in 7:37 also encompasses a circumstantial frame in 7:38. This subordinate step in 7:38 conveys background information, which anchors the offering instructions in the overarching Pentateuchal narrative. It recalls when the instructions were given to support the purpose of the instructions being spoken, which is so that the Israelites can bring their gifts in the Sinai wilderness. This parallels the function of 1:1–2 at an episodic level. Thus, 1:1–2 and 7:37–38 frame Leviticus 1–7 to form an episode. The implication is that Leviticus 1–7 has three episodic levels. The first level is Leviticus 1–7 as a whole, while the second level is the first level of embedded episodes in 1:2β–3:17, 4:1–5:26, 6:1–7:21, and 7:22–36. The third level of the episodic schema is then the second level of embedded episodes, which are the individual offering instructions within 1:3–3:7 (1:3–17, 2:1–16, 3:1–17) and 4:1–5:26 (4:1–35, 5:1–13, 5:15–19, 5:20–26). Thus, although there are three episodic levels, Leviticus 1–7 exemplifies coherence as a

---

I understand there to be coherence between v37 and v38, which together forms the conclusion summary. There is no substantial evidence to suggest, contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 439, that v38 is a later addition intended to 'harmonise the discrepancy between two contiguous pericopes commanded by God from separate locations...'

There are differing views about which section 7:37–38 concludes. There is a view that 7:37–38 forms a conclusion for Leviticus 1–7 and the instructions to the priests in 6:1–7:36. For this 'double' conclusion argument, see Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 436; Péter-Contesse and Ellington, Handbook to Leviticus, p. 106; Rendtorff, Leviticus 1.1–13.20, p. 78. Other scholars prefer to argue that it concludes either Leviticus 1–7 or 6:1–7:36. Those who argue for 7:37–38 as concluding Leviticus 1–7 as a unit include Gerstenberger, Leviticus, p. 24; Gorman, Divine Presence, p. 52; Hartley, Leviticus, p. 3; Rooker, Leviticus, p. 137; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 16. For 7:37–38 concluding 6:1–7:36 only, see Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 145; Levine, Leviticus, p. 47; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 139.
whole episode, although this coherence at a conceptual level only occurs at the point of the concluding summary in 7:37-38.

4. Delimiting Leviticus 8–10 as an Episode

The beginning of the new discourse space in Leviticus 8:1-2 is unmarked by the now familiar quotative frame. The command in 8:2-3 is a significant point of departure from the previous episode in Leviticus 1–7. Specifically, the point of departure is Moses receiving a command that he himself is to enact (8:2αα), rather than receiving instructions that the sons of Israel and the priesthood are to enact (Lev. 1–7). This strengthens the argument for Leviticus 8:1-3 beginning a new episode. The narrative schema in Leviticus 8 is completely continuous through sequences of Px clauses enabling the narrative to progress. This continuity is not even broken by the series of Xp clauses in vv32-35 since there is no instance of asyndeton within vv31-36. This suggests a continuous schema in 8:1-35 as a paragraph unit.

However, the temporal frame in 9:1α, which is a היה (Px) clause, marks discontinuity. The reference to the eighth day signals to the recipient that the events just about to unfold occur after the seven-day restrictions given to Aaron and his sons in 8:33. Like 8:1-36, there is schematic continuity throughout 9:1–10:7 with no pragmatic or semantic features suggesting a text structuring function at a global level. Schematic discontinuity occurs in 10:9 where the reported speech, introduced by a single quotative frame in 10:8, instructs about the behaviour and task of the priesthood. This confirms that the previous schema beginning in 9:1 closes at 10:7. I recognise, however, that most scholars delimit Leviticus 9

---

a6 Contrary to Ruwe, ‘Structure of the Book’, p. 61 who argues that the 1:1–7:38 and 8:1–10:20 division is forced by traditional arguments.

a7 See also Kaiser, ‘Leviticus’, p. 1056; Levine, Leviticus, p. 48; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 452.

a8 Contrary to Ruwe, ‘Structure of the Book’, pp. 61-77. Ruwe argues that the temporal marker יהי שמיני ביוام in 9:1 has an ‘analogous function for structuring Leviticus’ as Exodus 19:1, Exodus 40:17, Numbers 1:1, and Numbers 10:11-12. Ruwe suggests that 9:1 marks the beginning of the second part of the book of Leviticus and thus acts to decisively divide Leviticus 1–8 from Leviticus 9–27. He recognises that this two-fold division departs from the traditional division of chapters 1–7 and chapters 8–10, but in his view, this is a break ‘imposed on the book’ (Ruwe, ‘Structure of the Book’, p. 61).
and Leviticus 10 as two distinct units.” One reason for this decision is the determination that parts of Leviticus 10 are later additions. The semantic continuity though between 9:24 and 10:1 suggests the division between Leviticus 9:24 and Leviticus 10:1 to be based on narrative development rather than linguistic structures. Also, scholars such as Hartley and Nihan seem to have a concern for delimiting Leviticus 10 as a chiasm, which would not be possible if 9:1–10:7 is maintained as a discourse unit. However, my goal is to seek the coherence of discourse and semantic markers and thus will approach 9:1–10:7 as a paragraph in the episodic schema.

The topic shift, after the single quotative frame in 10:8, also suggests the beginning of a new paragraph. This paragraph extends to 10:11, after which another quotative frame in v12, which has higher information coding (five participants), suggests a break in the information flow. This is affirmed by the resumption of the narrative until 10:20. The onset markers present in 11:1-2 mark discontinuity of the discourse schema, rather than a formal concluding marker at the end of 10:12-20. Thus, 10:12-20 is the final of four paragraphs within the episodic schema of Leviticus 8–10 (8:1-36, 9:1–10:7, 10:8-11, 10:12-20).

5. Delimiting Leviticus 11–15 as Four Episodes

Traditionally Leviticus 11–15 is delimited as one thematic unit that finds coherence in the theme of separating the impure from the pure.” Nevertheless, the pragmatic and syntactic
structures do not sustain viewing Leviticus 11–15 as one discourse space, but rather as four sequential episodes (Lev. 11, 12, 13–14, 15). I recognise this delimitation into four episodes is counter to the general trend of Levitical studies as is evident by Nihan’s view,

Ultimately, however, what we need is to understand the comprehensive view of pollution that lies behind Lev 11-15 as a whole, and what effect is achieved by P in combining ch. 12-15 with ch. 11, and by placing Lev 11 before 12-15.\footnote{Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 303.}

I agree with Nihan that analysing why the redactor arranged the text in its order is critical, but thematicity does not by itself demand a ‘whole’ reading. Also, by viewing the chapters as a ‘whole’, we lose the distinctiveness of each episode within Leviticus 11–15. In fact, viewing Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15, as four sequential episodes perhaps raises the task of exploring the ‘why’ of this arrangement to a greater imperative.

As noted above, the onset marker in 11:1-2 signals the discontinuity of the previous episodic schema at 10:20, while also initiating a new discourse space beginning in 11:1-2. The two quotative frames in 11:1-2α where, for the first time, Aaron is included with Moses as a recipient of the divine speech acts to break the information flow from 10:20, but which is not an onset marker by itself.\footnote{Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 645, notes the inclusion of Aaron into the address because ‘it is the priests’ function to teach the difference between the pure and the impure’ (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 152; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 195; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 171). This is a fair assessment considering the pointedness of 10:8-11 addressing the priestly role and task. However, this is the first time that Aaron is addressed directly; I assume this is due to his consecration as the high priest (see also Noth, Leviticus, pp. 92-93).} The two quotative frames do, however, precede an XP structure in 11:2αβ, which has an onset function of presenting the topic of the discourse space, the ‘living things’ (הָוִּיה). The relative clause (Px) in 11:2αγ clarifies the topic further to encompass the living things that are permissible for the Israelites to eat and, more specifically, from the livestock upon the earth. The schema then unfolds

\begin{footnotes}
\item[125] Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 303.
\item[126] Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 645, notes the inclusion of Aaron into the address because ‘it is the priests’ function to teach the difference between the pure and the impure’ (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 152; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 195; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 171). This is a fair assessment considering the pointedness of 10:8-11 addressing the priestly role and task. However, this is the first time that Aaron is addressed directly; I assume this is due to his consecration as the high priest (see also Noth, Leviticus, pp. 92-93).
\end{footnotes}
through a series of paragraphs that are marked by initial XP clauses where the clause-initial constituent is either a cataphoric demonstrative, which presents the particular kind of living thing that will be the referent for the following instructions (v9a, v13a, v24a, v29), or else if the initiating clause is a categorical principle declaring a particular kind of living thing detestable (םָּשֶׁך; v20, v41). The sentence-initial Xp clause in 11:46 is a discontinuity marker where the anaphoric demonstrative precedes the list of 'living things' that have been active topic referents in the schema so far. Thus, vv46-47 acts to consolidate the mental representation of the episode as a whole by listing the topic referents of the schema and by citing the motivation for the instructions in v47. Thus, the episodic schema has eight paragraphs, including the first case in vv1-8 and the closing summary in vv46-47, as represented in the table of onset and closure markers below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידבר יהוה אל‐הארשי וה­לואם אל‐הלים:</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובו‐זרו א‐ָל‐‏ר ה‐לואם:</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>11:2aα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>את היה נא‐הר רא‐ן מא‐ל‐בànhמה</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>11:2aβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XP[Px]</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>[11:2ay]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>א‐דיה ת­א‐ל‐מ כל‐א‐ר ב‐ים</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>11:9a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וא‐ה­למ הש­קע מ‐ה‐ולין</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>11:13a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic shift</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. The order of the topics in the schema is living things from the animals of the earth (vv2-7), fish (vv9-12), birds (vv13-19), and then swarming things (vv43-44), while the order of the Xp clause at the conclusion of the episodic schema is animals, birds, fish, and swarming creatures (see 11:46). Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 688, explains, ‘The order of fish and birds [...] is here reversed, probably for aesthetic, literary reasons. In this way vv46b is composed of two symmetrically balanced parts: creatures of the water and creatures of the earth.’ Contrary to Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, p. 141, who notes that v46 ‘cannot be reconciled with the present text of vv. 2b-43 as regards sequence and delimitations’.  


The proposal for a nine-paragraph episodic schema may appear to some as rather flat and void of hierarchy in comparison to, for instance, Hartley’s structure that has three major divisions (vv2b-23, vv24-40, vv41-45). Each major division makes use of a conceptual shift from living creatures that are both impure and pure (vv2b-33), instructions more generally about what is considered impure (vv24-40), and instructions about swarming things (vv41-45). Each major section is then delimited further to consider the more specific cases that reflects a similar structure to the one I have outlined above (see Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 152-153).
Since the closure marker in 11:46-47 discontinues the episodic schema in Leviticus 11, 12:1-2 will naturally begin a new discourse space. Once more, Leviticus 12 begins with two sequential quotative frames in 12:1-2αβ together with an XP structure in 12:2aβ, which has a strong onset function. The XP structure in 12:2aβ is a major conditional frame where the protasis initiates the situation of when a woman gives birth to a son. This situation, while being the sentence topic, is also the theme for the schema. There is a slight topic shift in 12:5a where a minor conditional frame, which is also an XP clause, focuses upon a situation where the woman gives birth to a daughter. This topic shift in v5a suggests the beginning of a new paragraph. Thus, the coherence of both semantic and pragmatic structures suggests two paragraphs, vv1-4 and vv5-7bα, within the episodic schema of Leviticus 12. However, I acknowledge that a counter-argument could be that vv6-7 pertains to both cases of the birth of a male and a female, which then requires that vv6-7 be included in a coherent section with vv1-5. However, forming vv5-7 as a paragraph does not disrupt coherence, but rather maintains coherence within the episodic schema. The second paragraph is not isolated from vv1-4, but rather develops the logic of the first

---

97 While commentators rarely begin a new paragraph at v5a, there is acknowledgment that the minor protasis marker begins a second, albeit subordinate, case. For example, Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 215, and Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 755. An exception is Sklar, Leviticus, pp. 177-178, who recognises that the minor case represents, at least, a shift in logic from the first case in vv2-4. From a pragmatic perspective however, the beginning of a new case, major or subordinate, is a topic shift that warrants the beginning of a new paragraph schema, at least.

98 For example, Noth, Leviticus, p. 97.
paragraph. Thus, vv6-7 applying to both cases of the birth of a male and female does not contradict my delimitation of 12:1-7 into two paragraphs.

The Xp summary in 12:7b יָאָ תְרֶעָת הַלָּהַר אֲו לֵכַבְּעָ, refers back to the theme of the whole schema, the woman who has given birth to either a male or a female, and thus closes the discourse space.\(^{13}\) This closure, however, is not as decisive as previous concluding summaries. The schema continues beyond the Xp concluding summary to initiate a second minor case (initial Px structure) in 12:8.\(^{13}\) This progression of the schema beyond the conclusion summary in 12:7b יָאָ תְרֶעָת הַלָּהַר אֲו לֵכַבְּעָ does not necessarily mark continuity between Leviticus 12 and Leviticus 13, however. Rather, placing the provision after the closure marker suggests that the case in 12:8 is not to be the norm and thus also curtails Leviticus 12 as an episode.\(^{13}\)

At first, the singular quotative frame in 13:1 seems to have the function of highlighting the divine speech that follows, rather than breaking the information flow that precedes the beginning of a new episode. The quotative frame, however, is not redundant. The quotative frame returns once more to addressing both Moses and Aaron. Thus, the higher

---

\(^{13}\) See also Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 761; Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 186. However, Milgrom’s note that a reader is to read his explanation of the subscript beginning יָאָ תְרֶעָת הַלָּהַר אֲו לֵכַבְּעָ at 6:1 suggests that he is not differentiating, and thus confusing, the linguistic structure when it begins at the beginning of a discourse space and when the structure closes a discourse space. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 761.

\(^{13}\) Unsurprisingly, there is discussion about whether v8 is a later addition into the text since it is placed after the conclusion summary. For instance, Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 761, notes, *‘This verse is clearly a later supplement, as shown not only by its placement after the true end of the chapter, the subscript v7b, but – more importantly – by its altered vocabulary.’* See also Noth, *Leviticus*, p. 98. Irrespective of whether v8 is a later supplement, it is redacted into the arrangement after the closing marker as a means of indicating that this is a provision as an addendum. This does not necessarily mean that there is continuity at the 12:7-8/13:1 seam.

\(^{13}\) Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, p. 281, notes that 12:8, as a ‘clause of necessity’, is a later addition to Leviticus 12. Moreover, he notes contrary to popular opinion (*e.g. Noth, Leviticus*, pp. 97-98) that Leviticus 12 ‘probably belonged initially together with Lev 15 and in their final form now ‘build a frame around ch. 13-14’ (*Nihan, From Priestly Torah*, pp. 281, 282). He very much contends for Leviticus 11–15 belonging together in thematic coherence. This, however, would be true even if Leviticus 11–15 were not one episode due to the linear progression of discourse units through the text. Rather than asking ‘what effect is achieved by P in combining ch. 12–15 with ch. 11, and by placing Lev 11 before 12–15’, as per Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, p. 323 (italics in the original), we should perhaps ask why the text is arranged into sequential episodes.
information coding in the quotative frame, together with an onset marker in 13:2a, suggests the beginning of a new episodic schema. This is confirmed by the fact that the major conditional frame in 13:2a represents a major theme shift from the woman giving birth in Leviticus 12:2-8 to addressing a situation in 13:2 where a person's skin has swelled, or has a rash, or has a white spot. The discontinuity in thematic referents suggests that Leviticus 12 and Leviticus 13 are, at least, two discrete episodes.

However, the macrostructure in Leviticus 13 has added complexity. At first, the episodic schema unfolds through a series of XP structures, each being major conditional frames, in 13:9, 13:18, 13:24, 13:29, 13:38, and 13:40az.\(^{135}\) Each conditional frame shifts the topic, although still cohering around the theme of a skin disease, and thus each begins a paragraph within the schema. This pattern, however, is broken in 13:45-46, which instructs the person with a skin disease to separate him or herself outside the camp. Furthermore, the XP structure beginning 13:47 shifts the topic substantially from the theme of skin being the diseased (צרעת) ‘object’ in 13:2-46 to fabric being the ‘diseased’ (צרעת) object in 13:47-59. This suggests that 13:47 may begin an embedded episode, while the Xp structure in 13:59 acts to close the discourse space since the anaphoric demonstrative in the clause-initial position reactivates the topics pertaining to the סרה of cloth only. Thus, 13:59 closes 13:47-59 as an embedded episode, although coherence is still maintained by the common theme of סרה, rather than the section forming a paragraph within the episodic schema of Leviticus 13 more widely.\(^{136}\)

The use of a discontinuity marker in 13:59 allows 14:1-2 to begin a new discourse space within the episodic schema. While the single quotative frame in 14:1 pauses the


\(^{136}\) Gerstenberger, Leviticus, p. 170, notes that 'the clothing regulations in vv. 47-59 constitute a self-enclosed thematic unit separated from the surrounding context by the concluding remark in v. 59.' This is contrary to Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 225-226, who essentially views vv47-58 as a paragraph within the schema of the chapter.
information flow, the XP structure in 14:2 uses a cataphoric demonstrative and so
topicalises a new discourse space (14:1-32). I would like to suggest that this new discourse
space is a second embedded episode since the XP structure

in 14:2 reactivates the topic of persons with a 

מַעֲרָת in 13:2-46. Moreover, a third
theme shift occurs in 14:33-34. The situation in 14:33-53 now pertains to a plague of
mould in the house of Israel’s possession. Although the theme shift between 14:1-32 and
14:33-53 is within the same domain of the 

מַעֲרָת, the change in topic from persons
(14:1-32) to house (14:33-53) is significant enough to warrant two discrete embedded
episodes. The summary statement in 14:54-57 reactivates all the topics of 

מַעֲרָת of skin
(13:2-46, 14:1-32), clothing (13:47-59), and houses (14:33-53), which further strengthens
the argument for Leviticus 13-14 being an episode within the global schema.\textsuperscript{137} By
reactivating the topic referents, the Xp discontinuity marker in 14:54-57 consolidates the
whole episodic schema, which encompasses the three embedded episodes as well.\textsuperscript{138} This
in turn enables Leviticus 15:1-2 to begin a new episode.

There are three significant observations to note about the schema of Leviticus 15. The first
is the prominent beginning of the schema in 15:2b-3. The clause sequence in vv2b-3 is

XP/XP/XP/Px/Px/Px. The XP structures represent two kinds of onset markers. The first
onset marker is the initiating XP structure in 15:2b that gives access to the discourse
space. The second XP onset marker in 15:3α then topicalises the discourse space with the
thematic referent of the impurity of the man’s discharge. The prominence of this
introduction suggests the beginning of an episodic schema. I recognise though that there
is strong conceptual coherence between Leviticus 12, Leviticus 13–14, and Leviticus 15,

\textsuperscript{137} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, p. 885, argues that 13:2 and 14:54-57 form an inclusio enclosing chapters 13–14.
Contrary to Nihan, \textit{From Priestly Torah}, p. 276.

\textsuperscript{138} Leviticus 13–14 is often delimited as a section within Leviticus 11–15. Examples include, Hartley, \textit{Leviticus},
pp. 180-183; Levine, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 75; Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 1–16}, p. 815; Sklar, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 818. However, if we take
away the need for Leviticus 11–15 to be a thematic unit by the logic that each episode is sequentially
connected and that discourse progresses linearly, then Leviticus 13–14 would be a discrete episode.
which could point to Leviticus 15 being an embedded episode of Leviticus 12–15 as a whole. Nihan observes,

The bulk of Lev 11-15 is made up by ch. 12-15 which, as noted in this study, form a coherent sub-section; it is framed by two laws dealing with cases of pollution stemming from genital organs: childbirth (Lev 12) and male or female genital secretions (Lev 15), whereas the torah on scale disease, the most severe form of impurity, has been skilfully placed at its center (Lev 13-14).\(^{139}\)

While Nihan’s observations are plausible, there are still strong onset and closure markers between Leviticus 14 and Leviticus 15 that suggest schematic discontinuity. We have noted the strong discontinuity structures delimiting Leviticus 12 and Leviticus 13–14 as two discrete episodes above. The coherence, therefore, between Leviticus 12, 13–14, and 15, could be on a global level, rather than coherence at an episodic level.

A second observation is that initial XP clauses also recur in 15:16a, 15:19a and 15:25a.\(^{140}\) Each initial XP clause is a major protasis representing a topic shift, as indicated in the table below. Each topic shift is still within the theme of discharge and so each major case represents the beginning of a paragraph schema.\(^{141}\)

\(^{139}\) Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 271.
\(^{140}\) Remarkably, the consistent text-structuring features within Leviticus 15 leads Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 283, to state that the ‘whole legislation, minus P’s interpolations, should therefore be regarded as a homogeneous composition’. He notes that v18 marks a transition from male to female impurity. The exception to this unity, in Nihan’s argument, is v31, which is a later interpolation to provide coherence with Leviticus 10 and Leviticus 16 (Nihan, From Priestly Torah, pp. 283-284). See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 946-947, for 15:31 as an interpolation by the hand of H.
\(^{141}\) Noth, Leviticus, p. 113, observes, ‘the whole is divided by the clearly parallel introductory conditional clauses v. 2b and v. 19a into two sections, the first concerning the “man” and the second the “woman”:’ See also Levine, Leviticus, pp. 93, 96. Although v19a signals a major shift in topic from the man to a woman, as I have noted above, v16 and v25 also share the same syntactic and pragmatic structures. This suggests four-sections, rather than two. See also Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 206-207; Sklar, Leviticus, pp. 198-199; Wenham, Leviticus, pp. 216-217.
When a man has discharge from his flesh

When a man has an emission of semen flowing from him

When a woman has a discharge of blood, the discharge is from her flesh

When a woman discharges a discharge of blood for many days not at the time of her menstrual impurity, or when she discharges beyond her menstrual impurity

Table 5: Clause Focus Structures and Topic Shifts in Leviticus 15

The third observation is that the initial Xp structure in vv32-33 signals the close of the episodic schema by referring back to the topic referents of both the man and the woman and, in doing so, consolidates the whole of Leviticus 15 as an episode. Based on these three observations, we can delimit the episodic level of Leviticus 15 according to the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידבע היה אליהם ואילאואר קאמר:</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>15:1</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דברי אל副会长 ישרא</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>15:2a</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אמרתם אליהם</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>15:2bz</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>איש איש כי היה ובבשרא</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP 15:2bβ-3</td>
<td>Episode + Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובו בלאמו</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זה תחלתי שמאתה בובא</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ר ברעת אחיו</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אירחיתתי בוחר מרוב</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שפאהויה</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואש כי בווב ובת המשה</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP 15:16</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואש כי בברחב לעם</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP 15:19</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואש כי בווב ובת המשה</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP 15:25</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>היא חותם על</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Xp 15:32-33</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The Delimitation of the Schema for Leviticus 15
Thus, rather than being one thematically unified unit, the schema of Leviticus 11–15 may have four sequential episodes (Lev. 11, 12, 13–14, 15). Each episode begins with an XP focus structure, which initiates or topicalises a new discourse unit (11:2aβ, 12:2aβ, 13:2a, 15:2bβ). Furthermore, each episode concludes with an Xp closing summary referring back to the thematic referent of the episodic schema (11:46-47, 12:8a, 14:54-57, 15:32-33). Each Xp structure with this closing function acts to consolidate the mental representation of each episode at a global level.

6. Delimiting Leviticus 16 as an Episode

The temporal narrative sequence in 16:1 establishes YHWH speaking to Moses in continuity with the fiery episode of 10:1-2 and so anchors Leviticus 16 within the narrative framework. The analepsis suggests that the instructions in 16:3-28 may be an outcome of Nadab and Abihu's death – to warn Aaron and to address the consequences of impurity from Nadab and Abihu's fiery end.¹⁴²

Although the speech begins in v2b, the XP clause at the beginning of v3, which places the preposition ב + cataphoric demonstrative זאת ('By this') in the clause-initial position, casts the focus forwards to the following instructions for the ritual process and thus breaks the information flow sufficiently from v2 to begin a new paragraph schema. Although there is asyndeton initially in v4, this only pauses the information flow, while the rest of the schema in vv6-28 progresses through a series of wqatal Px clauses that instruct and enact the ritual process.¹⁴³ There is, however, a shift at the beginning of v29 where the Px clausehapelek הכהה לѕמו trope shifts the topic from instruction that Aaron is to immediately enact

---

¹⁴² Please see pp. 186-187 in Chapter Three for a further explanation. See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 234; Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 100; Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 207; Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, pp. 1031-1032, notes that the deaths of Abihu and Nadab would have polluted the sanctuary by the presence of their corpses, as well as their offence ‘encroaching’ upon YHWH's presence. Thus, following the event of 13:3-2, the sanctuary would need to be purified.

¹⁴³ Please see Joüon-Muraoka's explanation of the future use noting, 'qatal is sometimes used for an action which in fact belongs to the (usually near) future, but which is represented as being performed at the very moment of utterance' (Joüon-Muraoka, §112-g). However, Joüon-Muraoka states that the performative use is usually in the first person.
(vv4-28) to how this same process is to be a permanent statute for all generations.\textsuperscript{144} Together with this topic shift, Milgrom also notes the change from the third person recollecting YHWH's instructions to Aaron and his implied performance (vv3-28) to the sudden use of the second person (vv29-30) addressing Israel directly for the first time in the episode.\textsuperscript{146} These two shifts between v28 and v29 suggest a new paragraph schema, which continues to v34.\textsuperscript{147}

The initial clause in v34 is a Px structure where the anaphoric demonstrative is in the second constituent position (והיתה־זאת). The demonstrative is anaphoric since it refers to the instruction in the speech report that has been given as an everlasting statute (vv2-34a).\textsuperscript{147} The final clause (Px) in v34b recalls Aaron doing as YHWH commanded Moses and explicates what has been implied by the use of the future-performative qatal in vv6-28. Hartley observes how the narrative introduction in v1 and the compliance formula in v34b form an inclusio for the chapter.\textsuperscript{148} He does not, however, proceed to explain the significance of this observation for the text's structure. At the very least, the knowledge of Aaron having done as YHWH commanded brings completion to the mental representation

\textsuperscript{144} The הָיוֹת-clause can begin new units within a schema. See Shimasaki, Focus Structure, p. 113.
\textsuperscript{146} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1053. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 1064, 1065, views this transition between vv3-28 and vv29-34a to be evidence of vv29-34a being a later addendum ‘tacked onto chap. 16’. Irrespective though of whether it is a later redaction, the change to the second person and direct address to Israel is part of the strategy of the text to command future audiences to seek restoration to a condition of purity before YHWH.
\textsuperscript{147} I acknowledge that there is disagreement about the coherence of Leviticus 16, and in particular how vv29-34a is redacted within the context of the wider chapter. The disagreement revolves around when vv29-34a was redacted into the composition of Leviticus 16. For example, Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 350, argues that H is responsible and is a later addition relative to 23:26-32, while Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1056, 1064–1065, notes that the editing of 16:29–34a is the work of H, is part of the last stage of redaction, and earlier than 23:26-32. Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2019, 2021, then argues that H in 23:26-32 summarises Leviticus 16 and supplements 16:28-32, which is the opposite of Nihan’s argument. Although arguing for the overall composition by the hand of H, Milgrom’s argument is still earlier than Nihan’s post-exilic conception.
\textsuperscript{148} Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1058, who states that the demonstrative pronoun in v34 refers back to הָיוֹת in v3. In Milgrom's opinion, the repetition of the demonstrative forms ‘an inclusio with it. Its purpose is clear: only by observing all of the procedures detailed in this chapter can Israel be purged of its sins’ (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1059). Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 338-339, offers a different understanding of the anaphoric demonstrative by stating that the demonstrative refers back to the instructions in vv29-33, since v34 summarises the instructions (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 243).
\textsuperscript{148} Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 232-233.
of the discourse space; however, v34b does not necessarily mark discontinuity of the episodic schema by itself. Discontinuity is marked by the onset markers at the beginning of Leviticus 17:1-2.

7. Delimiting Leviticus 17–24 as Six Episodes

The beginning of Leviticus 17 has strong discontinuity features and is highly salient within the overall macrostructure. The unparalleled prominence of 17:1-3 within Leviticus' macrostructure raises the question as to whether Leviticus 17:1-3 topicalises Leviticus 17–24 as a whole episode or whether, on the basis of other information structures, Leviticus 17–24 should be approached as more than one episode. After considering the semantic and pragmatic structures that underlie this question, I will argue below that the episode beginning in Leviticus 17:1-3 extends to the conclusion summary in 21:24, while Leviticus 22–24 can be delimited into a further five episodes (22:1-16, 22:17-33, 23:1-44, 24:1-9, 24:10-23).

Leviticus 17:1-3α marks discontinuity from the previous discourse space in Leviticus 16 in two significant ways. First, 17:1-2 is made up of four sequential quotative frames. The implied author has chosen to give prominence to the beginning of Leviticus 17 by deviating from the familiar two sequential quotative frames. Also, the second quotative frame has high information coding by using the full noun phrases 'Aaron and his sons' and 'all the sons of Israel', which requires higher cognitive effort. Second, 17:3-4a shifts the thematic referent to a situation unrelated to the Day of Atonement instructions, although still within the domain of sacrifice. Thus, these indicators suggest discontinuity between

---

149 Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 315, also notes that the speech formula in v2α is unparalleled in Leviticus so far since it is inclusive of Aaron, his sons, and all the sons of Israel. However, it is not unique within the rest of Leviticus. A narrative frame with the same recipients occurs in 21:24 and a quotative frame naming the three groups of addressees occurs in 22:18. Other quotative frames within Leviticus 17–24 address either the priesthood (21:3, 21:17, 22:2) or the sons of Israel (18:3, 19:2, 20:2, 23:1, 10, 24, 34).
Leviticus 16 and Leviticus 17, which in turn allows 17:1-4a to begin a new discourse space at an episodic level.\(^5\)

However, the fourth quotative frame is unusual. There are no other instances in Leviticus, even at the beginning of a speech, where a quotative frame has an initial XP clause with an onset function. The initial cataphoric demonstrative זה refers to the instruction (דבר) that was commanded by YHWH and which will be related in the following speech report. As such, the initial XP[Px] clause structures topicalise the discourse space.\(^6\) However, vv3-4a then initiates a situation focusing upon a man from the house of Israel who slaughters (שחט) livestock and does not come to the entrance of the tent of meeting. The XP[Px] clause זה הדבר אשר צוה היה could be the thematic referent for the episode beginning 17:1-2, while the situation in vv3-4a topicalises the paragraph. Also, similar XP clauses to v3a, each beginning with the phrase איש איש מבית ישראל, topicalise paragraphs in 17:8aβ, 17:10 and 17:13. A similar construction also occurs in v15, but in this instance the text has no interest specifying the distinction between 'a man from the house of Israel' and the 'foreigner', but rather initiates a broader situation for when anyone eats a carcass or that which has been torn by animals. Only later in the sentence does the implied author clarify that the situation applies both to the native-born and the foreigner. Thus, an episodic schema for Leviticus 17 begins to emerge, demonstrated in the table below.


\(^6\) The relative pronoun refers to הדבר זה to avoid repetition and thus is represented by [X] before the explicit predicate + subject יהוה in the relative clause.
If Leviticus 17:1-3 marks the beginning of an episodic schema with 'דבר' as the thematic referent, then an emerging question is where the episodic schema concludes. As we have noted, 17:1-3 is unusually prominent, whereas the two (20:1-2aα, 22:1-2bα, 24:1-2a) or three (18:1-2bα, 19:1-2bα, 21:1, 22:17-18dα, 23:1-2bα) sequential quotative frames preceding the onset of new episodes within Leviticus 18–24 are minimally coded. So far, however, I have noted that a discourse space at an episodic level tends to be initiated by two successive quotative frames, with or without redundancy, together with an initial marked clause structure, which shifts the theme of the new discourse space.  

Two successive quotative frames tend to halt the information flow, which allows the following markers of schematic discontinuity to begin a new discourse schema. The dilemma is to what extent the fourth quotative frame in 17:3dα topicalises. Does the fourth quotative frame in 17:3dα topicalise 17:4-16 only as an episode? If this is so, then Leviticus 17–24

---

N.B. The quotative frame in v8aα is redundant and acts to highlight the case beginning in v8aβ. By itself, the quotative frame has only a weak text-structuring function.

Three exceptions to this observation are 8:1-2, 13:1-2, and 16:1-2, which are all due to strong discontinuity markers at the conclusion of the previous episodes.

Alternatively, because of the prominence of 17:1-4a, do the following eight instances of two or three sequential quotative frames in chapters 18-24 introduce embedded episodes? If so, does 17:2dz thematicise the whole of Leviticus 17–24?

If cognitive linguistic theory is accurate and discourse progresses linearly, then Leviticus 17–24 being composed of ten episodes or one episode with nine embedded units makes little difference to the final mental representation of the text’s schema. The recipient will continue to add each unit to his or her mental representation. Except, a significant quotative frame at 21:24 would then be missed. At the conclusion of Leviticus 21, the text recalls that Moses spoke to Aaron and his sons and to all the sons of Israel. This is significant considering that the instructions in Leviticus 21 are addressed specifically to the sons of Aaron (21:1) and to Aaron (21:17). The instructions in Leviticus 18–20 are addressed directly to the sons of Israel. Thus, 21:24 closes the schema for Leviticus 17–21 given that the quotative frame reactivates the addressees of Aaron, his sons, and the sons of Israel. The implication being that the schemas beginning with either two or three sequential quotative frames, followed by onset markers in 18:1-3, 19:1-2, 20:1-2, 21:1, and 21:16-17, initiate embedded episodes within the discourse schema beginning with 17:1-3.

If the discourse schema beginning in 17:1-3 closes at 21:24, this suggests 22:1-2 begins a new discourse space. This is warranted considering the unusual beginning in 22:1-3. The

---

134 N.B. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, p. 1833, states that the narrative statement, which he calls a compliance report, in v24 ‘contains a major problem’. The problem is the sons of Israel having been included in the statement when the instructions in Leviticus 21 are not addressed to the Israelites. Milgrom concludes that the narrative statement of Moses’ compliance must be an ‘interpolation’, but this is an unnecessary conclusion if we understand 21:24 framing the whole of Leviticus 17–21.

135 This is contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, pp. 1845-46; Sklar, *Leviticus*, pp. 262-263; Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 289. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, p. 1845, notes that ‘Chap. 22 is a clear continuation of chap. 21. He views the continuity to be a tail-head linkage where the previous chapter ‘ends with priestly blemishes’ while chapter 22 ‘continues here with priestly impurity’. However, the thematic referent in 22:2 suggests that priestly impurity is not the topic of the whole episode, but rather how a priest is to approach God with the holy things that the Israelites consecrate to YHWH. The theme shift between Leviticus 21 and Leviticus 22 suggests
two sequential quotative frames in vv1-2a precede two Px clauses, which communicate the intent for the following instructions in vv3-16. This intent is for Aaron and his sons to dedicate the holy things of the sons of Israel so that YHWH's holy name is not profaned. The brief introductory paragraph concludes with the refrain: אִם יְהֹוָה. Nonetheless, the three sequential quotative frames in 22:17-18a encompass the sons of Israel as well as Aaron and his sons. There is also a significant theme shift from 22:1-16 to 22:17-33. Although the theme still remains within the shared domain of the 'holy things', vv17-33 now addresses how the man from the house of Israel is to offer his אֵלֶה as a vow or voluntary gift. Thus, the change in the speech's addressees and the theme shift in 22:17-18 suggest enough discontinuity for 22:1-16 and 22:17-33 to be discrete episodes.

that these are two distinct episodes. Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 289, agrees with Milgrom, but for a different reason. Wenham considers there to be thematic coherence within Leviticus 21-22 by use of the phrase, 'I am YHWH who sanctifies you/him/them' (21:8, 15, 23; 22:9, 16, 32). While the repetition of the declaration suggests thematic coherence, again Wenham's observation does not take into full consideration the thematic shift at 22:2 and a second thematic shift in 22:17. The thematic shifts between the episodes in Leviticus 21-22 are strong enough to be able to suggest that Leviticus 21-22 is best approached as three episodes, with Leviticus 21 being an embedded episode within Leviticus 17-21.

Contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, pp. 1846-1847, who observes v2aאֵלֶה to be a 'basic command' while v3 is the 'general law'. However, viewing v2אֵלֶה as the thematic referent, while v3 is then the topic of the next paragraph is just as feasible.

See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 357, 363. However, Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, pp. 1846-1847, has a tendency to separate vv17-25 and vv26-33 on the basis of the quotative frames. However, v26 is redundant and does not break the information flow. Moreover, there is no theme shift between vv17-25 and vv26-29. While Wenham, *Leviticus*, pp. 294-296, delimits the chapter into four sections (vv1-9, vv10-16, vv17-30, vv31-33), more significantly for our argument is that he observes the thematic unity of vv17-30. See also Sklar, *Leviticus*, pp. 273-276, for the coherence of vv17-33, although not as a discrete section.

Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, pp. 1846-1847, delimits the chapter into three units. The first unit in vv1-16 is addressed to the priesthood, while vv17-25 include the Israelites. He then delimits vv26-33 as a third unit, yet the quotative frame in vv17 is redundant and is a narrative statement recalling YHWH speaking to Moses. There is no further command for the instructions to be spoken. Even Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17-22, p. 1846, recognises that there is no explicit audience stated for vv26-33. On this basis, the single quotative frame does not break the information flow significantly, it simply highlights the following speech in vv27-33. This argument is also contrary to Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, pp. 322-323; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, pp. 493-494; Noth,
The next theme shift then occurs in 23:2bβ where, after three sequential quotative frames, the speech report focuses upon the appointed times of YHWH that the Israelites are to proclaim as holy festal days. This topic shift occurs at the beginning of the speech report by use of an XP clause that acts to topicalise the schema proceeding from v2bβ. The schema then closes using an unmarked structure in 23:44 where the text simply communicates that Moses spoke about the appointed times of YHWH (יהוה מועד) to the sons of Israel. Although unmarked, this quotative frame in 23:44 acts to consolidate the whole speech report by reactivating the theme of the schema, namely the מועדים יהוה. Thus, 23:1-44 is a discrete episode within the global schema.159

How we approach Leviticus 24 within the global schema is more problematic. The schema progresses through unmarked structures.160 The second of two sequential quotative frames in vv1-2 unexpectedly uses צוה rather than דבר, which heightens the seriousness of the instruction that then follows. There are then two phases of logic within 24:1-9, each beginning with the verbal idea took in v2b and v5. However, v10 then suddenly shifts the topic to a narrative focusing upon the son of an Israelite woman and an Egyptian man. This abrupt change breaks the information flow and thus v10 warrants the beginning of a new schema that coheres around a different thematic referent. The narrative statement in 24:23, although an unmarked structure, closes 24:10-23 at a conceptual level by communicating that the Israelites do as YHWH commanded Moses. The thematic shift

---


160 See also Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 328, 'This chapter lacks the clear structural markers characteristic of many sections of Leviticus.'
between vv1-9 and vv10-23, as well as the change in style i.e. command vs. narrative, is enough to suggest that each part is an episode.\footnote{See also Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, p. 355; Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 396-397; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, pp. 435-436; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, pp. 2081-2082; Sklar, *Leviticus*, pp. 287, 290.}

Thus, in the above, I have outlined an argument for approaching Leviticus 17–24 as six episodes within the global schema of the whole book. These six episodes are chapters 17–21, 22:1-16, 22:17-33, 23:1-44, 24:1-9, and 24:10-23. This is a similar delimitation of Leviticus 17–24 to Hartley’s analysis.\footnote{See Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. xxxiv. While I argue for Leviticus 17–21 as an episode, Hartley approaches each chapter discretely as part of Leviticus 17–26.} The major difference is, however, that while I delimit these episodes as part of the global level, Hartley has grouped these sections together under H as instructions pertaining to ‘holy living’.\footnote{See Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. xxxv.} Again, although these episodes may be discrete discourse units, with discrete internal schemas, there is a linear succession between the episodes. Later in this chapter, I will argue how these episodes cohere in a global schema with a global theme.\footnote{Please see pp. 123-129.}

8. Delimiting Leviticus 25–26 as an Episode

The first quotative frame in 25:1 includes the location where YHWH spoke, which is, in Noth’s words, ‘unusual and remarkable’.\footnote{Noth, *Leviticus*, p. 185.} This choice represents heavier information coding, and thus higher cognitive effort for the recipient, which in itself breaks the information flow from Leviticus 24. However, within chapters 25–26, there are no further major text-structuring features and thus the concluding summary (Xp pattern) in 26:46 concludes the two chapters as one episode.\footnote{See also J. Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation* (VTS 115, Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 82-83; R. Rendtorff, *The Covenant Formula: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), p. 18 fn. 26; Please see Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2274, for a concise summary for how Leviticus 25–26 forms a continuous unit. Smith, ‘Structure of Leviticus’, p. 26, delimits Leviticus 25–26 as a section, but not based on linguistic structures, but rather that the two chapters ‘have a concern different from that of the previous group’.} This concluding summary also mentions Mt
Sinai as the location where YHWH established the instructions between himself and Israel. Thus, the location provides a frame for Leviticus 25–26 as a discourse unit.\textsuperscript{167}

If Leviticus 25–26 is a coherent episode, with no embedded episodes, then the next structural level in the macrostructure is the paragraph schema. The paragraph schema in Leviticus 25–26, however, does not have consistent text-structuring markers and neither are the pragmatic structures necessarily marked. This can be observed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ידיבר יהוה אלהים בהר סיני:</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דבר אלהים לישראל</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>25:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואמרת אלהים</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>25:2bα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובתבו אלהים את ישראל</td>
<td>Initiating</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>25:2bβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר ואנס להם</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>תשבות האזרין שבת ליהוה:</td>
<td>Topicisation</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Leviticus 25:1–26:45 is a coherent episode, with no embedded episodes, then the next structural level in the macrostructure is the paragraph schema. The paragraph schema in Leviticus 25–26, however, does not have consistent text-structuring markers and neither are the pragmatic structures necessarily marked. This can be observed in the table below.

167 See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 433; Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2159, 2342. While this study establishes the relationship between Leviticus 25:1 and 26:45 through the repetition of סיני בהר, Luciani, Sainteté, p. 177, also observes how the repetition of משה رب and Moses between 25:1 and 26:45 also creates an inclusio relationship. The use of the verb נתן in relation to the land in 25:2a and then to the statutes, judgments, and instructions in 26:45 strengthens this relationship.
The first paragraph is initiated by three successive clauses (Px/Xp/Px) in 25:2. The first clause (Px) is a temporal frame that anchors the main clause (25:2b) in a future time, which is when Israel enters the land. The second clause (Xp), which is subordinate, highlights who is responsible for the nation entering the land, after which the main clause (Px) acts to topicalise the paragraph to focus on the land. Verse 8, a thematising Px structure, shifts the focus from the land to the 49 years, which is an access referent into the paragraph schema where the topic becomes the fiftieth year as the Jubilee. The use of asyndeton at the beginning of v13 pauses the information flow and together with an XP clause highlights the Jubilee year once more and shifts the topic to the freedom for every man to return to his property. From this point, each paragraph within vv25-43 (vv25-34, vv35-38, vv39-43) is topicalised by a Px conditional frame beginning אֶחָד, חָמָשָׁה. This repetition is broken, however, in v44 where an XP clause shifts the topic to the situation where an Israelite may have male and female slaves. This situation then changes in v47 to focus upon a case where a resident foreigner (דר נער) has overtaken in wealth and resides with the Israelites, and a fellow Israelite, due to his economic circumstances,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Initiating</th>
<th>XP</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Px]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:14a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:14b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:15a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:15b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:16a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:18a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:21a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:23a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:27a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Xp]</td>
<td>외부</td>
<td>26:46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Text-Structuring Markers in Leviticus 25–26
needs to sell himself to him. The use of the XP refrain ירה אלוהים in 25:55 consolidates 25:47-55 as a paragraph after which there are two pithy paragraphs in 26:1 and 26:2. The use of asyndeton at the beginning of each pauses the information flow. While there are no significant pragmatic markers to suggest that 26:1 is the beginning of a new paragraph, the break and topic shift from 25:55 is significant enough to suggest discontinuity. Thus, the topic of 26:1 is the prohibition against making idols and, once more, the occurrence of the XP clause ירה אלוהים at the end consolidates v1 as a paragraph. The Xp clause in 26:2 highlights as the topic of another pithy one verse paragraph.

The predominant text-structuring marker changes in 26:3 to a conditional frame using the minor marker וא. In the first conditional frame (v3), the initial Xp structure topicals the whole paragraph focusing upon Israel walking in YHWH’s statutes. Notably, this paragraph has a formal discontinuity marker in v13. This closure marker is two clauses where the first clause, an XP structure, is proclamatory, ‘I am YHWH your God’. The second clause is subordinate to the first, and acts to identify the one speaking with the act

---

68 Just as there is disagreement about how Leviticus 25 has been redacted (see Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2149-2150), so too there is no consensus as to how Leviticus 25 should be delimited. For a comparison, Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 422–424, subdivides Leviticus 25 into two sections where the first section in vv2-22 focuses upon the Sabbath year and the year of Jubilee, while the second section in vv23-55 then instructs about how the kinsman-redeemer relationship relates to the Jubilee year. Hartley then delimits the first section into the vv2-7, vv8-17, vv18-19, 20-22, while the second section then has three units in vv23-34, vv35-38, and vv39-55. In contrast, Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2148-2149, delimits the chapter into four major sections. The first is similar to Hartley in that he recognises vv2-22 focuses upon the Sabbath and Jubilee years. This first section, according to Milgrom, has two units, vv2-7 and vv8-22. The second major-section is vv23-34 focusing upon instruction about redeeming property, which has a further two sub-units in vv23-24 and vv25-34. Only the first sub-unit, vv23-24, aligns with Hartley’s proposal. The third major section in vv35-38 concerns the Israelite who loses land due to debt, which Milgrom delimits further into v35, vv36-37, and v38. The fourth major unit focuses upon the Israelite who becomes a slave because of debt in vv39-55. Milgrom delimits this last section into four sub-units in vv39-43, vv44-46, vv47-54, and v55. Thus, the lack of consensus between Hartley and Milgrom is symptomatic of a wider lack of consensus on how to understand the macrostructure of Leviticus 25. Intriguingly, Nihan, From Priestly Torah, p. 520, makes the statement that ‘In spite of the law’s complexity, the structure of ch. 25 is clear.’ Further study needs to be concentrated upon the linguistic structures of Leviticus 25, especially those that have a text-structuring function.

69 See also Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 456-458; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 479; Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2304-2330.

70 See Shimasaki, Focus Structure, p. 152, and also Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2303.
of bringing Israel from the land of Egypt and from slavery. The one who is speaking these instructions is YHWH their God who redeemed Israel and, in doing so, transferred them to his possession.

The next paragraph is initiated in 26:14-16a by a succession of seven clauses containing three conditions that the XP clause in v16a is dependent upon. These six clauses act to highlight the condition of Israel not listening to YHWH and not doing what he commands. The XP clause in v16a is then a declaration by YHWH that he will do 'this' to Israel (אָפָהֲנֵיהּ) in response to Israel's refusal to listen. The demonstrative pronoun is cataphoric and thus the topic of the ensuing schema in vv16-17 is what YHWH will do to Israel when the prior conditions in vv14-15 are a reality.

The remaining four paragraphs in the schema use conditional frames to begin each unit (v18, v21a, v23a, v27a). Three of the four conditional frames (v18, v23a, v27a) use a similar XP clause where the fronted constituent is a preposition (עד or ב) + anaphoric demonstrative; that is, the 'this' and 'these' refer to the events that are described in the prior paragraph. The logic being, after the events just described, if Israel still does not listen or walk with YHWH, then God will enact the next set of events that are unfolded in the new paragraph schema.

9. Delimiting Leviticus 27 as the Final Episode

The place of Leviticus 27 within the text's macrostructure is a cause of much perplexity. The eclectic interests of Leviticus 27 ranging from the valuation of vows (vv2-13), dedication of property (vv14-25), חֶרֶם (vv28-29), to tithing from the land (vv30-33), are a reason for the perceived difficulty. Questions emerge as to how the internal paragraph schema of the chapter coheres and how the topic of the schema relates to the rest of the book. It is easier to assume that the chapter is a later supplement and thus permission is

---

N.B. An anaphoric demonstrative is usually characteristic of a closing Xp text-structuring marker. In this instance though, the anaphoric demonstrative is part of an XP clause that topicales a new discourse space.
granted not to consider Leviticus 27 as part of the wider discourse unit of Leviticus. Yet, as cognitive linguistic theory emphasises, the more a text demonstrates signs of editing, the more coherent a text will be; it is undoubtable that Leviticus is highly edited. Thus, our working assumption is that the chapter was placed at the end of the text by an implied editor whose view of the editing process is that the schema of Leviticus 27 coheres with the rest of the book. Our immediate task though is to delimit Leviticus 27 as the final episode within the book’s macrostructure.

Curiously, both the semantic and pragmatic structures in Leviticus 27 are consistent with the rest of the text and these structures do not share the complexity inherent in earlier episodes. The three sequential quotative frames in vv1-2bz break the information flow from the previous discourse space to allow the reported speech in v2bβ to begin a new schema. The first XP clause in v2bβ presents a situation where a man seeks to fulfill a vow in the valuation of persons and thus initiates and introduces the topic for the first paragraph in vv2bβ-13. Verse 14 initiates the situation where a man sets apart his house as holy to YHWH and thus topicalises the second paragraph within the episode's schema. Thus, in vv2bβ-25, the text-structuring marker within the episodic schema tends to be an XP structure with a major protasis marker ( כי). This is true too in 27:26-33, but rather than כי being the syntactic marker, the restrictive adverb אַך occurs (v26, v28). Thus, the XP structure in v26α introduces the topic of the firstborn dedicated to YHWH from the livestock, which is then the referent for the paragraph schema in vv26-27, while v28 then shifts the topic to all that is devoted as חֵרֵם. Thus, so far, the episodic schema in Leviticus 27 has four paragraphs, where all paragraphs are introduced by an XP structure that is either a conditional (vv2bβ-13, vv14-25) or restrictive frame (vv26-27, vv28-29).

---

72 See Noth, Leviticus, p. 203; Ruwe, ‘Structure of the Book’, p. 69.
73 While the minor protasis marker א is used in previous texts as a semantic marker for the beginning of a paragraph, such as in Leviticus 1–3, the minor protasis marker in 27:2bβ-25 tends to signal steps within each paragraph and thus belongs to the micro-level.
74 Past approaches to the arrangement of Leviticus 27 tend to delimit the speech in v2aβ-33 into a tripartite structure using the structural markers כי יָשָׂר (v2aβ, v14a) and אַך (v26). See Balentine, Leviticus, p. 207;
There is, however, one more topic shift in the episodic schema in v30. Using an XP structure, without either a conditional or restrictive frame, the topic shifts to 'every tithe of the land', whereas the previous paragraph schema in vv28-29 concentrates upon all that is חָרֵם. This new topic in v30 provides a new referent for a coherent schema in vv30-33. Thus, vv30-33 is a fifth paragraph. The concluding statement (initial Xp structure) in v34 is the final discontinuity marker in the global schema that signals the completion not only of the fifth paragraph, or of Leviticus 27 as an episode, but the discontinuity of the global schema as a whole.

10. The Perception of Incoherence

This chapter so far has undertaken the second step in this study's rhetorical-critical framework, which is to delimit Leviticus' macrostructure as a rhetorical unit. A vital dimension of this task was asking where the pragmatic and syntactic markers align, where one schema closed, which in turn allowed the next discourse space to begin. However, the task of establishing Leviticus as a rhetorical unit still remains unfinished since the study so far has not demonstrated how the macrostructure of Leviticus displays coherence. Coherence occurs when two linguistic structures align and in our delimitation so far, the pragmatic and syntactic markers seem to cohere. There is, however, another critical point in the theory of coherence, which is that a coherent paragraph schema will have a head

---

Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 483; Hess, 'Leviticus', p. 821; Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, pp. 493-494; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, pp. 2367-2368. Rooker, *Leviticus*, p. 323, differs from the general consensus by giving equal structural value to the valuation of vows concerning humans (vv2-8), the valuation of vows concerning livestock in vv9-13, the valuation of sanctified houses and fields in vv14-25, and the restrictions in vv26-29. Not only does he bring the restrictions in vv26-29 under the general heading of instructions concerning vows, but he separates the instructions about tithes in vv33-33 from vv1-29. Moreover, Wenham, *Leviticus*, pp. 336-337, 341, notes the structuring value of כי איש, but then classifies vv25-33 under 'Miscellaneous Regulations about Vows'. Thus, in Wenham's tripartite structure, vv25-33 forms the third section, but with no comment about whether or not כי איש has a structuring function. So too, Kaiser notes the use of כי איש as a structuring device, but then states that no such device exists in the remaining speech. Thus, the third section 'appears to be more of a potpourri of items collected in one place for the sake of convenience' (Kaiser, 'Leviticus', p. 1187).

topic, which is the referent for the whole schema.\textsuperscript{176} At both the global and episodic levels, the point of coherence is a theme around which the whole unites, but this theme may not be as prominent at a paragraph level.\textsuperscript{177} Incoherence, then, can be perceived at a global or episodic level if a theme, which acts to integrate the whole schema, is not accessible to the recipients.\textsuperscript{178} At a paragraph level, incoherence may occur if a head topic seems to be absent. In the absence of a theme at a global or episodic level, the discourse space will often progress through, what is termed, 'sequential connectedness' where, for instance, a succession of three episodes may each have three different topics conceptually, yet there seems to be a semantic relationship between the three.\textsuperscript{179} In texts that exemplify sequential connectedness, often a thematic referent is introduced late in the discourse space that then integrates the whole.\textsuperscript{180}

While the episodic and paragraph schemas in Leviticus mostly have a head topic indicating coherence, the global level of Leviticus' macrostructure displays features of sequential connectedness, which may be the reason why Leviticus has been perceived as an incoherent text in the past.\textsuperscript{181} Nonetheless, I would like to suggest that although there are characteristics of sequential connectedness, this does not undermine the text of Leviticus as a coherent discourse unit and, in fact, I will argue in Chapters Three and Four that the sequential connectedness of the text is part of Leviticus' rhetorical strategy.

I have noted above that Leviticus 1–7 is a coherent discourse unit where the theme initially is the bringing of gifts to YHWH (1:2b\textsuperscript{β}), which is then consolidated by the summary statement in 7:37-38. Practically, the explanation of the offerings is needed

\textsuperscript{176} Dooley, Explorations, pp. 28-29, 93.
\textsuperscript{177} Dooley, Explorations, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{178} Dooley, Explorations, p. 110.
\textsuperscript{179} Dooley, Explorations, pp. 108, 110.
\textsuperscript{180} Dooley, Explorations, p. 110, labels this 'just-in-time coherence'.
\textsuperscript{181} For example, Noth, Leviticus, p. 10, 'the book consists preponderantly of a large number of divine instructions of varying scope, simply linked together by the constantly recurring introductory formula; so much so that the book, considered first solely from the point of view of arrangement, appears to have little coherence.'
before Leviticus 8–10, which supposes knowledge of these gifts as active referents.\textsuperscript{182} Moreover, 7:35-36 previews the consecration of the priesthood and thus there is a tail-head connection between Leviticus 1–7 and 8–10. Leviticus 1–7 and 8–10 are, therefore, sequentially connected.

The theme of Leviticus 8–10 is not immediately apparent. The instruction given to Moses in 8:2 is an access point into the narrative and is the point of connection with the previous episode (Lev. 1–7), but does not immediately communicate the theme. The recipient has to wait until 10:3 for the theme, בקרבי ('By those who draw near to me I will be sanctified and before all the people I will be glorified').\textsuperscript{183} When the recipient hears these two parallel clauses, the whole of Leviticus 8–10 coheres, as well as Leviticus 8–10 with Leviticus 1–7. The first seven chapters exemplify the theme of 10:3 by instructing how the people and the priesthood are to approach the holy with gifts (people) or mediate those gifts to YHWH (priesthood) in a way that ensures that he is sanctified in their midst.\textsuperscript{184}

At this point, Noth's argument about Leviticus 8–10 forming the 'literary kernel of the whole book', although a composite text, is significant.\textsuperscript{185} While Leviticus 9 is mostly Pg according to Noth, it is supplemented with later material from Ps. Nevertheless, in stating that these chapters form the 'literary kernel' around which P is then constructed, Noth observes the central nature of these chapters at least within Leviticus 1–16. An extension of Noth's logic is that Leviticus 8–10 provides coherence for, at the very least, P. Elliger, maintaining a similar view to Noth on the role of Leviticus 8–10, departs from Noth's argument by arguing for 10:1-5 being Pg, while Leviticus 8–10 is still a composite text.\textsuperscript{186}


\textsuperscript{183} Contrary to Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 429, who argues that the theme is the legitimising of the Aaronide priesthood.

\textsuperscript{184} Noth, Leviticus, p. 29.

\textsuperscript{185} Elliger, Leviticus, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{186} Elliger, Leviticus, p. 11.
Irrespective of one's view of the composition of Leviticus, the usefulness of Noth's and Elliger's arguments is the concern for the centrality of Leviticus 8–10 and, even more so, 10:1-5 within Leviticus 1–16. Not only is it feasible to suggest that Leviticus 8–10 may be the point of coherence for Leviticus 1–16, but even more so 10:1-5 may provide the theme that coheres the whole. My argument is a step further to suggest that the thematic statement in 10:3 is the point of thematic coherence at a global level.

The beginning of the following episode in 11:2αβ, as we have noted above, is an XP introductory clause that topicalises the following episode. Leviticus 11, therefore, exemplifies coherent discourse theory, since the topic at the head of the schema forms the theme of the paragraph, at least. The topic referent is the living things that can be eaten. Thus, the activated referent of food in 10:12-20 becomes the topic in Leviticus 11, although only broadly in the domain of food and is addressed to the Israelites. Thus, 10:12-20 and 11:1-2 is an example of tail-head linkage that exemplifies sequential connectedness. Furthermore, the conclusion of the episode in 11:46-47 consolidates the topic of the episodic schema, while also conveying the motivation of the instructions in v47, which is to make the distinction between the pure and the impure (see 10:10). Thus, there are two connections between Leviticus 10 and Leviticus 11; namely, the tail-head link with a concern for food and the purpose of Leviticus 11 as stated in v47 applying the principle of 10:10. It is especially the latter that suggests Leviticus 11 exemplifies the principle of 10:3 since Israel making the distinction between impurity and purity is a means by which they are to embody being a holy people to reflect YHWH’s holiness. By making this distinction and embodying their holy status, Israel ensures that YHWH is sanctified in their midst. Having said this though, the declaration אַלּ יְהוָה אַלּ הָאָדָם occurs in v44 for the first time in the global schema, which is then repeated at the beginning of v45, albeit in a shortened form, יהוה. This XP clause will emerge as the thematic referent for the global schema in Leviticus 18. Thus, the theme of 10:3 is an integrating thematic
referent for Leviticus 1–16, while the XP declaratory clause, אלהיכם אני, will emerge as the global thematic referent.

Just as Leviticus 8–10 and Leviticus 11 share a relationship of sequential connectedness, so too this relationship exists between chapters 11, 12, 13–14, and 15. Each episode has the intent to instruct about separating the impure from the pure (see 14:57, 15:31), but in different domains. However, 15:31 intensifies the act of separating, using נזר rather than בדיל, and connects the instruction to separate with the imperative to keep impurity from defiling YHWH's tabernacle. Implied within the paraenesis of 15:31 is the principle of 10:3. By ensuring that Israel is separated from her impurity and so kept from defiling God's earthly dwelling-place in their midst, the priesthood is ensuring that YHWH is sanctified and also glorified before the people. Furthermore, this motivation expressed in 15:31 establishes a conceptual relationship with Leviticus 16, which provides the process for the Day of Atonement to remove the impurities of Israel, both ritual and ethical, from both the tabernacle and the people so that Israel's life is preserved with their covenant God in their midst. Once more, the principle of 10:3 is inferred within Leviticus 16.

Thus, the thematic referents of each episode in Leviticus 1–16 cohere at a global level by way of the integrating thematic referent in 10:3. This principle establishes conceptual coherence in Leviticus 1–10, and also underlies Leviticus 11–16. Related to this conceptual coherence is the priestly task defined in 10:10. Although the command to make the distinction between the holy and the common, and between the impure and the pure, is not the primary thematic referent in Leviticus 8–10, it certainly emerges to be primary in Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15. Thus, within Leviticus 1–16, there is conceptual coherence at a global level, while the arrangement is sequentially connected.

The relationship between Leviticus 16 and 17 is yet another instance of sequential connectedness; each episode addresses the issue of sacrifice (16:11-19; 17:3-7) and the function of blood (16:15-17; 17:10). However, the integrating theme for the episodes
within Leviticus 17–27 is not announced until the embedded episode in 18:2bβ, אַלְוָהֶךָ, יְהוָה אִשְׁתְּכִי. This XP declaratory clause in 18:2bβ is prominent in each episode, and embedded episode, within chapters 18–24 and so emerges as the global thematic referent, rather than the YHWH's and Israel's holiness. The plausibility of this suggestion can be tested by the association between the theme of YHWH's and Israel's holiness and the declaration יְהוָה אָנֵי אֱלֹהָיכֶם within Leviticus 19 and 20. In 19:2bβ, the XP + Px structure, הָיוּ קָדֶשֶׁךָ אֵין קָדָשִׁי כֵּי יְהוָה אָנֵי אֱלֹהָיכֶם, relates the reason for Israel is to be holy to YHWH's identity. The subordinate Px clause אֵין קָדֶשֶׁךָ כֵּי יְהוָה אָנֵי אֱלֹהָיכֶם modifies אֱלֹהָיכֶם יְהוָה אָנֵי by the predicate קדש being placed in the clause-initial position and so emphasises that Israel is to be holy for the reason that their covenant God is holy. Leviticus 20:7–8 then repeats the clause from Leviticus 19:2bβ, although with a further emphasis that Israel's state of holiness is both their responsibility (והתקדשתם) and a work of YHWH (מקדשכם). Once more, the clause מקדשכם יְהוָה אָנֵי is a modification of אֱלֹהָיכֶם יְהוָה אָנֵי. Thus, while YHWH's and Israel's holiness is certainly prominent within these chapters, it is always in association with, or even modifying, the declaration of אֱלֹהָיכֶם יְהוָה אָנֵי. Thus, it is plausible that the XP clause אֱלֹהָיכֶם יְהוָה אָנֵי could be the primary thematic referent, rather than the motif of holiness. The implication of this argument is that Leviticus is about Israel's nationhood, in identity, character, and behaviour, in relation to their covenant God living in their midst.

Thus, I have suggested so far that the global thematic referent that provides coherence for the global schema in Leviticus 17–27 is 'I am YHWH your God'. This fulfills the criteria for coherence. Furthermore, this thematic referent also encompasses what has been

---


188 See also J. Milgrom, 'The changing Concept of Holiness in the Pentateuchal Codes with Emphasis on Leviticus 19' in Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas, ed. J. F. A. Sawyer (JSOTS 227, Sheffield: Sheffield, 1996), p. 67. Although I agree with Milgrom that 19:2 modifies the clause יְהוָה אָנֵי אֱלֹהָיכֶם from 18:2, I disagree that this is a 'radically different perspective'.

189 See also Müller, 'The Sanctifying Divine Voice', p. 72. He argues that the use of the declaration modified by forms of קדש are 'expanded formulae'.
instructed or narrated in previous episodes. The God who has instructed about how to approach him with gifts (Lev. 1–7), who demands that he be glorified before the people (Lev. 8–10), who requires the Israelites to learn how to separate the pure from the impure (Lev. 11, 12, 13–14, 15), and who has provided the Sacrifice of Atonement (Lev. 16) - he is their covenant God. What then happens to the integrating thematic referent from 10:3? Worth observing is that Leviticus 18–20 extends the state of holiness to Israel (see also 11:44-45) in the land and 10:3 is primarily concerned with the YHWH being sanctified by the priesthood. However, the expanding of the integrating thematic referent to encompass the people of Israel occurs in 22:32bα. YHWH being sanctified among the nation is Israel’s responsibility. By the extension of 10:3 to the people in 22:32b, the theme encompasses the instruction in Leviticus 17–20 as well. I also argue at the conclusion of Chapter Four that the principle stated in 10:3 and extended in 22:32bα also underlies the following episodes in Leviticus 23–27 as well. The diagram below represents this development of the integrating thematic referent (10:3, 22:32bα) and how this strengthens coherence.

Illustration 3: The Coherence of the Global Schema Through the Thematic Progression of the Integrating Referent

---

99 Dooley, Explorations, p. 111.
100 Please see pp. 226-228 in Chapter Four.
This coherence continues to encompass the final two episodes in Leviticus 25–26 and 27. The thematic referent 'I am YHWH your God' recurs, but with a topic shift. Initially in Leviticus 25, attention is upon the land, which YHWH is giving Israel (vv2-24). There is a conceptual shift that occurs in v25 to focus upon the people in the land, but before this shift, vv23-24 highlights two points. First, the land belongs to YHWH (v23) and second, the Israelites live in YHWH's land as resident foreigners and sojourners (v23). Verse 23 transitions the focus from land (vv2-23) to people (vv23-45). After this conceptual shift, the schema's goal is the idea that the Israelites belong as servants to YHWH. Leviticus 26 then spells out the consequences of 25:1-45 for both the land and the people, which is that YHWH demands the people's obedience (26:3-13) and, in light of their rebellion, he will cause their exile from the land (26:14-45); although, he will not reject Israel completely because he is YHWH their God (26:44-45). Thus, how the global schema progresses from Leviticus 17–24 to Leviticus 25–26 is no longer by sequential connectedness, but displays thematic coherence. This thematic coherence encompasses Leviticus 27, but this final episode is more strongly sequentially connected with Leviticus 25–26. The thematic referent clause is not explicit in Leviticus 27, but conceptually the chapter builds upon the emphasis of the land and the people belonging to YHWH. Leviticus 27, as we will see in Chapters Four and Five, emphasises giving to YHWH what belongs to him and so forms a fitting end to the book.

Thus, the global schema seems to progress from one episode to the next by sequential connectedness, which gives the impression of incoherence. However, the principle in 10:3 is the integrating thematic referent until the refrain אַלַי יְהוָה אֳלֵהֶם emerges as the global thematic referent in 18:2bם. Illustration 4 below depicts how the integrating and global thematic referents encompassing the sequential connectedness of each episode strengthens the coherence of the global schema.
Illustration 4: The Coherence of the Global Schema Displaying Sequential Connectedness and the Integrating/Global Thematic Referents

11. Conclusion

By undertaking the second step in this study’s rhetorical-critical framework, which is to delimit the boundaries and macrostructure of Leviticus as a rhetorical unit, I have argued that Leviticus 1:1 and 27:34 are the boundaries of the rhetorical unit and fifteen episodes that make up the global level of the text’s arrangement (Lev. 1–7, 8–10, 11, 12, 13–14, 15, 16, 17–21, 22:1-16, 22:17-33, 23:1-44, 24:1-9, 24:10-23, 25–26, 27). These fifteen episodes may encompass embedded episodes and each episode has a schema of paragraphs. My goal has been to seek the seams where both the semantic and pragmatic markers align; where one discourse space, and thus schema, closes, and so a new schema begins.

Coherence of a discourse unit occurs when the conceptual structure also aligns with the semantic and pragmatic structures of the text. I have suggested that Leviticus' text is perceived to be incoherent because the text uses sequential connectedness between
episodes. I have argued, however, that the principle of 10:3 is the integrating thematic referent until the declaration, 'I am YHWH your God' emerges into prominence in 18:2b§. This thematic referent integrates previous episodes into a coherent schema with the episodes that are arranged afterwards. Thus, having delimited the macrostructure of Leviticus and presented a case for how we can approach Leviticus as a coherent text, I will now progress in the next chapter to exploring the rhetorical strategy of the text's arrangement.
CHAPTER THREE

The Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus' Arrangement: Chapters 1–16

The goal of delimiting the macrostructure of Leviticus is to explore the rhetorical strategy of the book's arrangement, which is the third step in the rhetorical-critical framework that this study has adopted from its beginning. As outlined in Chapter One, this third step entails examining the arrangement of each episode by outlining the 'argument' and logic of each episode, its disposition, and by asking how the strategy of each episode achieves a particular intent. The analysis of the rhetorical strategy of each episode will also take into account devices of style where a particular device is necessary to demonstrate the rhetorical strategy and persuasive intent of each episode. Also, to prepare for the fourth step of the rhetorical-critical framework, which is to suggest how the rhetorical strategy of the whole arrangement functions to achieve the rhetorical unit's intent, this chapter will also explore how each episode relates to the arrangement at the global level. The motivation for analysing the book's rhetorical strategy is to identify the persuasive intent of Leviticus as the sum of its parts. However, due to the breadth and complexity of Leviticus' global schema, this chapter will focus upon chapters 1–16, while Chapter Four will focus upon chapters 17–27. While this chapter will conclude by consolidating the argument and rhetorical strategy of chapters 1–16, Chapter Four will offer final conclusions about the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus as a whole.

1. Leviticus 1–7: The Gifts for YHWH

Leviticus 1:1-2bα marks a significant development within the overarching narrative. Previously, Exodus 40:34-35 relates how Moses is unable to enter into the tabernacle because of God's glory filling it and so there is a physical separation between Moses and YHWH.¹ Now in Leviticus 1:1-2bα, YHWH calls from the tent of meeting with the intent to

¹ See also Morales, Who Shall Ascend, pp. 107, 114; Nihan, From Priestly Torah, pp. 90, 105.
speak instruction to Moses that he is to mediate in turn to the sons of Israel. The summary conclusion in 7:37-38 relates the purpose of the instruction, which is so that Israel will bring their gifts to YHWH in the Sinai wilderness. Thus, this first speech in Leviticus represents YHWH’s provision for overcoming the separation inherent in Exodus 40:34-35.

The instructions in Leviticus 1–7 find coherence in the theme of the gifts given to YHWH where the first concern is gifts given to enable the Israelite to approach YHWH.

1.1 Leviticus 1:2b-3:17: Gifts of Approach to YHWH

Leviticus 1:2b-3:17 begins with the major case in 1:2b that simply states the situation where a man from among the Israelites wishes to present a gift to YHWH from the livestock. In its concise manner, the protasis sets the direction that 1:2b-3:17 continuously moves towards, which is approaching with a gift ליהוה. The text progresses through a sequence of instructions for the three gifts of the מנחה, עולה, and the שלמים זבח in 1:3-17, 2:1-16, and 3:1-17. Each of the three gift instructions is subordinate to the first major case in 1:2b. The first gift of the עולה demonstrates the necessity of being תמימין for acceptance in God’s presence. The very fact that the offerer needs to offer a gift that exemplifies being תמימין is an acknowledgment that his life does not exemplify this wholeness and thus the slaughtering of the gift for כפר is critical if the offerer is to be accepted before YHWH. Although there is a hint of disorder, the motivation for bringing the עולה gift is still positive, which is to approach God. The following two gift instructions in 2:1-16 and 3:1-17 are then wholly positive. The goal of the מנחה ritual process is for remembrance and, more particularly, of covenant relationship. The third gift instructions in 3:1-17, focusing upon the שלמים זבח, emphasises that an outworking of whole

---

*For example, 19, 13, 14, 17, 21, 22, 28, 29, 231, 232, 233, 236, 33, 35, 36, 39, 311, 314, 316.

3 Since my focus is upon the global level of the text’s arrangement and there has been substantial disagreement about how to render the names of each gift into English, I will leave the names of each gifts untranslated.

4 See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 3, 4; Milgrom, *Leviticus i–16*, p. 144; Watts, *Leviticus i–10*, pp. 159-164.


6 Please see pp. 260-262 of Chapter Five. See also Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 188.
relationship with God is giving to YHWH what belongs to him ing to him. Thus, the first three gift instructions are motivated by the desire of the offerer to bring a gift to YHWH, while the arrangement of the three initial gift instructions (1:3-17, 2:1-16, 3:1-17) emphasises first that the requirement of acceptance in the presence of YHWH is a life of integrity and wholeness, after which the text accentuates the need for covenant allegiance, and giving to YHWH what belongs to him. As we will observe in the rest of this chapter, these three themes of wholeness, covenant allegiance, and giving to YHWH what belongs to him, are three thematic strands that represent relational order between YHWH and Israel and which are present throughout the whole the book.

1.2 Leviticus 4:1–5:26: Gifts of Reconciliation

If Leviticus 1–3 accentuates approaching YHWH in whole relationship, then Leviticus 4–5 addresses the problem of offence fracturing relational order. There are four phases of logic within Leviticus 4–5, each corresponding to an embedded episode (4:1-35, 5:1-13, 5:15-19, 5:20-26). The first episode begins with a major protasis in 4:2 that describes the situation where an Israelite commits an unintentional ( thịtא) offence against any of YHWH's commands, which are not to be done. This situation is programmatic for the following minor cases, which narrate the ritual processes of the שגגה according to who committed the offence: the high priest (vv3-12), the Israelite community (vv13-21), a leader (vv22-26), and an individual from the people of the land (vv27-31). Verses 32-35

7 Please see pp. 263-266 of Chapter Five below.
8 The object of my exploration is the shape of the text and not ritual enactment. For this reason, my argument above differs from the theological significance derived by Morales, Who Shall Ascend, p. 124. By looking at the enactment order in Leviticus 9, he helpfully notes the order of 'expiation, consecration and fellowship'. Similarly, Rainey, 'Order of Sacrifices', p. 498, argues that the 'religious significance' lies in the procedural order of dealing with sin, 'self-committal', and then fellowship. This order differs from the arrangement of the text in Leviticus 1–5.
9 Contrary to Marx, 'Theology of the Sacrifice', p. 11, who argues that the sacrificial system is about 'establishing relationship with YHWH', whilst the function of the Leviticus 4–5 prescriptions is to 'restore the possibility of an untroubled relationship with YHWH'. First, Leviticus 4–5 is not 'subsidiary' to Leviticus 1–3. Second, the offerings in Leviticus 1–3 are not about establishing relationship.
10 There is disagreement about whether thịtא refers to what is prohibited by YHWH (see Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 92; Levine, Leviticus, pp. 19-20; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 229-230) or encompasses anything that the LORD has commanded, whether positively or negatively (Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 329-330).
deviate from this pattern by addressing the כפר חטאת ritual process where a lamb is the offering, rather than a bull or a goat. With the exception of the case for the high priest's offence in vv3-21, each apodosis thereafter follows a similar ritual process for the חטאת. When the guilty know their sin, an individual or representatives of corporate Israel must present a כפר gift without blemish to YHWH. The gift must be slaughtered in the presence of God, after which the priest purifies specific places within the sanctuary depending upon who committed the offence and the rest of the blood and all the fat are given to YHWH. The goal of the ritual process is for כפר to be effected so that the offender can be forgiven. Thus, each successive ritual process of the כפר processes addressing individual or corporate offence accentuates that the goal of כפר is reconciliation between YHWH and the offender.\(^1\)

As a necessary aside however, I acknowledge that the meaning of כפר (piel) is hotly debated and is critical to the כפר חטאת ritual process; yet, so far, I have referred to the verbal idea untranslated without directly defining the concept. Views range from 'to wipe',\(^2\) 'to cover',\(^3\) 'to ransom',\(^4\) 'to expiate',\(^5\) 'to accept composition',\(^6\) and 'consecration to the holy'.\(^7\) More recently, Sklar argued a variation depending upon the context כפר is used.\(^8\) For


\(^{13}\) BDB, s.v. 'כפר', HALOT, s.v. 'כפר'.

\(^{14}\) BDB, s.v. כָּפַר, 'Cushions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood', p. 55.


\(^{18}\) J. Sklar, Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions (HBM 2, Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix,
instance, 'כפר for the 'inadvertent sin' can be understood as 'a legally or ethically legitimate payment that delivers a guilty party from a just punishment that is the right of the offended party to execute or to have executed'," while in a situation of impurity with no offence, כפר can then be rendered, 'to effect purgation.' Since Sklar has to differentiate how כפר is to be rendered dependent upon the case and the context accentuates the complexity involved in deciphering the precise meaning in one or two words. Recently, Cranz made a similar point stating, 'the ambiguity associated with כפר is characteristic for the multivalency of this term, which covers a semantic range that is not fully reflected in any modern language.'

Thus, while כפר is central for understanding the ritual processes, entering into the discussion by favouring one particular argument over another will distract from my main line of argument and I posit will not affect an understanding of the persuasive intent of the whole text. Thus, I will leave כפר untranslated in this study so as not to detract from the argument as a whole.

Returning to the arrangement of Leviticus 4–5 however, 5:1-13 transitions logic from the חטאת offering by narrating a אשם process where the apodosis begins with the offerer bringing his אשם to YHWH (v6). The reference to אשם in v6 cannot refer to the reparation offering since the gift is declared to be a חטאת in v6, v7, v8, and v9. Thus, אשם in this instance must refer to the penalty that the חטאת represents. Also, the protasis is quite distinctive from the previous חטאת instructions. In this instance, the situations that

---

19 Sklar, Sin, p. 184.
20 Sklar, Sin, p. 185.
22 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 373, states that the use of אשם refers to the ‘punishment or penalty’ and is not a reference to the reparation offering. See also Levine, Leviticus, p. 28. Hartley, Leviticus, p. 69, notes, 'In this context אשם appears; should it be translated as “his reparation offering” or as “his penalty”? Certainly, the appearance of this word creates confusion between the offering required here and the reparation offering described below (vv17-19) [...] Thus it does not refer to a special kind of offering but to the penalty’. See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 361-362, who recognises that it could refer to guilt, to the type of offering, as well as to the penalty, and so concludes, ‘I have therefore translated 'guilt (payment)’ to try to render this multivalence into English'.
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would compel an offerer to bring his penalty for a חטאת gift encompass where a person has failed to give testimony as a witness (v2), or has touched a carcass of an impure animal (v3), or someone has sworn an oath rashly (v4). Following this discursive protasis, three successive cases where the first in vv5-6 narrates the exemplar process where, after realising his or her guilt, the offerer confesses that he has sinned and brings a female lamb or goat as a חטאת. The goal, once more, is כפר for what has been done. The following two processes in vv7-8 and then vv11-13 are provisions for the poor so that they can still access provision for כפר and סלח when offence has been committed.

The third phase of logic, 5:14-19, introduces the אשם as the reparation offering in response to the situation where an Israelite has broken faith with YHWH by means of an unfaithful act (מעלتعل, v15). Verse 15b clarifies the situation further by stating that the offerer has sinned against the 'holy things of YHWH'. The apodosis in vv15c-16 highlights the need for the offerer to make financial reparation as well as bringing a sacrificial gift so that the offence can be overcome. There is no detailed narration about how the priest will make כפר on the offerer’s behalf; simply, that he does. A minor case follows in vv17-19 where the ritual process follows similar sequences to the חטאת. However, v19 declares the gift to be an אשם since the offerer has done injury to YHWH. For the moment, it is enough to observe that the אשם gift has the intent of providing both כפר and סלח.

While 5:14-19 addresses situations where an Israelite has broken faith with YHWH in the matter of his property, the final phase of logic in 5:21-26 shifts the topic to the context where faith is broken with YHWH by committing an offence against a neighbour's property. There are two stages in the logic of the ritual process. First, the offender is to make peace with his neighbour by giving an additional fifth upon what has been restored as reparation.

---

90 See Milgrom, *Leviticus i–16*, pp. 323-324 for a discussion on what the 'holy things' are that יְהוָה might encompass. Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 30, is probably correct to acknowledge that מִכְרִים יְהוָה has a 'general, as well as specific connotations. In this context, it refers to sanctuary property, not to priestly allocations or tithes'.
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(v24c). The second stage is the bringing of a ram without blemish to YHWH as an אשם offering (v25) so that the priest can make כפר and declare the offender forgiven (v26).

As the logic of Leviticus 4–5 progresses through the succession of ritual processes first for the חטאת and then the אשם offerings, the text emphasises the need for reconciliation, effected by the provision of כפר, when offence fractures ordered relationship. This is a logical progression from Leviticus 1–3. Where Leviticus 1–3 reminds the Israelite community that acceptance in the presence of YHWH is conditional upon wholeness of relationship, Leviticus 4–5 immediately addresses situations where offence threatens the wholeness of relationship between YHWH and the offerer.

1.3 Leviticus 6:1–7:21: Confi ne the Holy to the Holy

The XP refrain אָזַז הָרוֹחַ topicalises each episodic schema within 6:2b–7:21 and thus provides order to the arrangement (6:2b, 6:6α, 7:1α, 7:11α), and restores order once the pattern is broken (6:18α). Each paragraph therefore addresses one of the five offerings already described in Leviticus 1–5 as well as the מנחה for the ordination of the priesthood: the עולה gift (6:2b–6), the מנחה gift (6:7–11), the מנחה for the priesthood’s anointing (6:12–17), the חטאת offering (6:18–23), the אשם gift (7:1–10), and the זבח sacrifice (7:12–21). Each rehearses two concerns: who eats and where the priestly portion can be eaten. 44 By each repeating similar concerns in short bursts, the rhetorical impact is achieved by stylistic device of repetition and by the cumulative emphasis of the whole. For the priests who are the active audience, they are reminded to give to YHWH what belongs to him and to confine the holy to the holy. The sons of Israel (the passive audience) learn that the holy is sacred and thus distinctive. 45

44 For a detailed analysis, please see pp. 281–292 in Chapter Five.
45 For a more detailed analysis, please see pp. 293–296 in Chapter Five.
1.4 Leviticus 7:22-36: Give to YHWH What Belongs to Him

The arrangement of 7:22-36 as the final unit within Leviticus 1–7 no longer concerns the ritual process of a particular gift, but rather, in two stages of logic, accentuates what is not to be eaten (vv22-27) and the responsibility of the offerer to give the priestly share to the priesthood (vv28-36). The reference to the anointing of the priesthood in v35 is a deliberate preview of the events narrated in Leviticus 8. In doing so, the text emphasises the authority of the command. Not only has YHWH purposed to give from the Israelites’ gifts, and so give from that which belongs to him, as a priestly portion to Aaron and his sons, he has also commanded this on the day YHWH set apart the priesthood for their purpose – to serve him. Thus, the logic of this final unit in 7:22-36 develops from prohibiting the Israelites from eating what belongs to YHWH (vv22-27) to giving to the priests the share of the food offerings that God has given to the priesthood (vv28-36). The emphasis is upon giving rightfully to YHWH and his servants.

1.5 The Disposition, Rhetorical Strategy, and Persuasive Intent of Leviticus 1–7

Curiously, although the summary statement in 7:37-38, which consolidates the whole episode, has a past orientation, the instructions within 1:2b–7:36 maintain a future orientation.\(^\text{26}\) The hearers within the persuasive situation are receiving instruction for present action i.e. bringing gifts to YHWH at Sinai. This future orientation is germane to the form of ritual instruction and thus also to the type of discourse that Leviticus 1–7 exemplifies. As explained though in Chapter One, the disposition of rhetoric is not merely about form or genre.\(^\text{27}\) The time orientation of the text is vital to the kind of impact or influence the rhetorical discourse intends to display within the situation it is spoken or written. In this instance, we are examining the impact within the spoken context of the

\(^{26}\) The quotative frames and summary statement use a combination of wayyiqtol and qatal verbs denoting sequential past narrative, whereas a feature of the instruction in 1:2-5:26, for instance, is the use of yiqtol or wqatal denoting a future orientation to the instruction being given.

\(^{27}\) For further explanation of this study’s approach to disposition, please see pp. 15-16 of Chapter one.
persuasive situation, namely, Israel at Sinai. Thus, the instruction in Leviticus 1–7 preserves the future orientation of the text in order to influence the Israelites to bring their gifts to YHWH who now dwells in their midst.

However, in Chapter One, I also observed the common view of ritual anthropologists that in the hearing and enacting of ritual instruction, the ritual shapes the values and worldview of the community.\(^{28}\) Moreover, the effect of ritual is to align and inculcate the values of the socio-cosmic order within the lives of those who submit to the ritual process and also within the audience who witness the enactment of the ritual.\(^{29}\) The future orientation of these instructions suggests future action and so building on this theory, the kind of impact Leviticus 1–7 would have in the persuasive situation is forming the community to embody the 'socio-cosmic' order that the ritual processes convey. Surprisingly, this disposition of the text aligns to the deliberative disposition of rhetoric where the future orientation seeks to exhort or dissuade about events and actions that are yet to come.

Leviticus 1–7 achieves its persuasive intent by the use of repetition within the ritual process of each gift instruction whether it be for different kinds of livestock or for varying situations. The repetition is a device to reinforce the beliefs and worldview that the ritual and text are wishing to inculcate.\(^{30}\) Furthermore, each phase of logic in Leviticus 1–7 accentuates relational order and also repeats a similar concern, which is that what belongs to YHWH is to be given to him and what is holy must be confined to the holy. When offence threatens that order, the Israelite community either presents a penalty to YHWH for order

---

\(^{28}\) For further explanation, please see pp. 31-45 in section 4 of Chapter One.

\(^{29}\) See Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives*, p. 160; Geertz, *Interpretation of Cultures*, pp. 90, 112.

\(^{30}\) See also Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, p. 57, for the impact of the repetitive style of the offering instructions. He observes, ‘The repetition of structural elements and of refrains has a long history in oral rhetoric because it helps an audience anticipate a speaker’s direction and respond appropriately to the speaker’s cues. Within such repetition, slight variation can convey considerable emphasis.’ While I agree with Watts on the rhetorical function of repetition, it is worth noting that the persuasive intent suggested above is substantially different to Watts’ argument.
to be restored or the culpable bear the penalty themselves. This is critical for the goal of Leviticus. If YHWH is to dwell among the people and not abhor them, then their acceptance in his presence is conditional upon relational order, while disorder will lead to their death and to national exile. Thus, the persuasive intent of Leviticus 1–7 is to form the new Israelite community into a people whose character and actions embody relational order with their covenant God-King and who then seek reconciliation when individual or corporate offence causes relational disorder. By this means, Israel at Sinai and all future generations may learn to sanctify the God who is in their midst and for God to be glorified before his people (see 10:3).

2. Leviticus 8–10: I, YHWH, Shall Be Sanctified and Glorified

The preview in 7:36 of the priestly ordination day pre-empts Leviticus 8–10, which, in part, recalls YHWH anointing Aaron and his sons for his service (8:1-36). However, the long-awaited fulfilment of the priesthood's consecration is only the first of four paragraphs within the episodic arrangement (8:1-35, 9:1–10:7, 10:8-11, 10:12-20). The focus of the arrangement is, unexpectedly, the two fiery events in 9:1–10:7 and the consequences in 10:8-11 and 10:12-20, and not the ordination of the priesthood in 8:1-35.

31 This is similar to Marx's argument that Leviticus 1–7 is a consequence of YHWH's presence being amongst Israel and so all other instruction within the book 'are merely a consequence' of 'this divine presence. See Marx, 'Theology of the Sacrifice', p. 106.

32 This is a significant departure from Watts, Ritual and Rhetoric, pp. 59-60, who views the intent of Leviticus 1–7 as reinforcing the authority of 'this torah' (as opposed to another) within both people and priesthood.

33 See also Ruwe, Heiligkeitsgesetz, p. 45, who observes that the Sinai narrative reaches a climax in 93–102:20 with the appearance of YHWH's glory displayed before the Israelites. This is a slightly different argument to Bibh, Narrative Words, p. 103, who views Leviticus 8–9 as the climax stating, 'Thus, as chs. 8 and 9 serve as the natural conclusion to the ritual prescriptions contained in that earlier material.' While Leviticus 8:1-35 does indeed bring completion to the Exodus 28–29 instructions, the consecration of the priesthood is surprisingly in the background relative to Leviticus 93–107. Moreover, the event of YHWH's glory appearing to Israel is not pre-empted within Exodus 25–40 and thus does not form a 'natural' conclusion. Moreover, part of the surprise is Leviticus 8 not forming the climax, but rather the two fiery displays in 93–107.
2.1 Leviticus 8:1-36: The Anointing of the Aaronic Priesthood

Bibb helpfully notes, contrary to Gerstenberger, that the fastidious recollection of Moses setting apart the priesthood in 8:1-35 is part of ‘sacred history’ and refers ‘to a specific sequence of events’.34 Both the arrangement and detail accentuates that the consecration of the priesthood is done just as YHWH commanded (cf. Ex. 29). Verses 1-4 recall the command for Moses to take Aaron, his sons, the oil of consecration, the loaves, the livestock for the purification gifts, and the whole community of Israel to the entrance of the tent of meeting.35 Verse 4 carefully relates that Moses did as YHWH commanded by use of the main Px clause + Px relative clause, יעש משה אשם זאיהם ויעש, followed by the result of Moses’ obedience, which is, in turn, the people’s obedience as they gather at the entrance of the tent of meeting.36 Once gathered, Moses announces to the congregation in פה העובר אשם זאיהם יレストラン חיות לכלשהון, What follows is not the relating of the ‘word’ that YHWH commanded since this has been communicated already in Exodus 29, but rather vv6-30 narrates Moses fulfilling the command, action by action, as he sets apart the priesthood.37

34 Bibb, Narrative Words, p. 102. Contrary to Gerstenberger, Leviticus, p. 100, who states, ‘Leviticus 8, then, does not represent a narrative about any historic event. Rather, this text is a literary composition that perhaps from the very beginning was intended to be read in a worship service. Its purpose is to demonstrate that the sacrificial worship service in the temple of Jerusalem already familiar to its contemporaries was established at Sinai and still proceeds to the same pattern.’
35 I have chosen to render עדה as ‘community’. See my explanation for this rendering on p. 273 fn. 64 below. See also Watts, Leviticus 1-10, pp. 340, 453.
36 Watts, Leviticus 1-10, p. 454, notes that the ‘fulfilment formula, יעש משה אשם זאיהם יレストラン חיות ויעש “Moses did as YHWH commanded him,’” therefore functions as a summary heading for the rest of the chapter that will detail his obedient actions, starting with assembling the community.
37 There is a general recognition that Leviticus 8 is an outworking of Exodus 29. See D. Fleming, The Biblical Tradition of Anointing Priests, JBL 17/3 (1998), pp. 408-413; Gorman, Ideology of Ritual, p. 104; Hess, ‘Leviticus’, p. 646; Jenson, Graded Holiness, p. 119; G. A. Klingbeil, ‘Ritual time in Leviticus 8 with special reference to the seven day period in the Old Testament’, ZAW 109 (1997), p. 512; Rainey, ‘Order of Sacrifices’, p. 496. An exception is Elliger, Leviticus, pp. 106-115, who rejects notions of intertextuality. However, most also note a few deviations in the prescriptive order between the two texts, such as the blood being mentioned before the oil in Exodus 29:21, whereas Leviticus 8:30 places oil before blood. Unsurprisingly, the differences have led some, such as Levine, to investigate the layers of source material and which pericope preceded the other (see B. A. Levine, ‘The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch’, JAOS 85 (1965), pp. 327–331). Others, however, have attributed the differences to a desire to shape Leviticus 8 with another intent other than prescription. For example, Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 495, observes the differences noting, ‘This in itself is not surprising because frequently the prescriptive (administrative) order will differ from the descriptive
Each phase of the consecration process is concluded with the refrain לֹא־שָׁרוּ הָאָדָם (v9, v13, v17, v21, v29), a shortened form of v4a. However, the final refrain in v29 is not inclusive of the setting apart of Aaron’s sons and their garments.6 This, instead, is narrated in v30 where Moses fulfills his role before speaking to Aaron and his sons about how they are to complete the consecration process in vv31-35. Again, Moses’ instruction stresses command and obedience, but in this instance the responsibility belongs to Aaron and his sons, not to Moses. In v31, the phrase לֹא־שָׁרוּ הָאָדָם echoes the refrain used in vv6-29 before recalling the command וְאַהֲרֹן בָּנָיו יִאֵכְלוּ referring to the instructions Moses gives earlier in the verse. Significantly, v33 and v35 begin with prominent Xp clauses where each fronts to draw attention to where Aaron and his sons may not depart from (v33a) or, more positively, where they are to reside for the seven days of the ordination process.39 Furthermore, this repetition in v33 and v35 frames v34 where Moses reminds Aaron and his sons that the gifts offered within vv6-29 were commanded by YHWH to make on their behalf. Verse 35 concludes with כיִעֲשֵׂה כִּם תֵן after Moses warns Aaron and his sons about their responsibility to YHWH, which is a difference between life and death.40 Verse 36 quickly closes the paragraph by relating that Aaron and his sons did all the words that YHWH commanded by the hand of Moses.41 Thus, the arrangement of 8:1-35 is shaped

(procedural) order. For an alternative view though, Watts, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 439, observes that Leviticus 8 is shaped by the prescription of Exodus 29 and the ‘chapter was therefore written with close attention to its literary context.’

38 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 499, observes that the refrain יִשָּׁרֵעַ מִשָּׁרֵעַ does occurs seven times in Leviticus 8 and functions ‘to subdivide[s] the chapter into seven coherent sections’. While the emphasis upon the fulfillment of command certainly shapes the narrative, the refrain suggests steps rather than subdivisions because of the strong continuity within the schema. Moreover, while the refrain suggests a completion of a particular stage or phase in the process, the final clause in the inclusio of v30 also consolidates the whole process beginning in v6.

39 See also Klingbeil, ‘Ritual time in Leviticus 8’, p. 501.

40 While Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 542, translates כִּם תֵן rightly ‘I have been commanded’, he then notes that the instruction is not reflective of Exodus 29 and so the use of the first person must be justified. However, it could be the text is taking care to sustain a focus on Moses’ role while having an implied emphasis upon YHWH as the one commanding.

41 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 542, observes that the use of the relative clause Миָּרֶשֶׁה at the conclusion of 8:36 forms an inclusio with 8:5 ‘that effectively envelopes and, thereby, unifies this chapter.’ There is indeed validity to Milgrom’s observation, yet the unity of the episode is established in the narrative sequence of the ritual process for consecrating the priesthood, not necessarily by the use of the inclusio
to accentuate the point that the setting apart of the Aaronic priesthood is completed as YHWH commanded. Bibb observes, 'Insistence that everything is being done exactly according to the command of YHWH reveals, ironically, an underlying sense of doubt or unease about this matter.' While v35 does have a concern for compliance as a matter of preserving life, the shaping of the arrangement is not motivated by doubt, but rather is part of the strategy to highlight that adhering to command leads to life and acceptance. There is a dispassionate confidence, rather than anxiety. This, however, is not the climax of the episode's arrangement, but is narrated in preparation for the two fiery events in 9:1–10:7, which deliberately juxtapose the consequence of obedience to YHWH's command (9:24) with that of disobedience (10:1-2).

2.2 Leviticus 9:7–10:7: YHWH is Sanctified and Glorified

The temporal phrase in 9:1, 'יהי בימים השבעים', contextualises the events of 9:1–10:7 after the completion of the consecration process. The shape of the narrative in vv1-6 develops in two phases. First, in vv1-5, Moses commands Aaron 'to take' the livestock for the חטאת and עולה gifts and approach before YHWH, which has echoes of YHWH's instruction 'to take' the livestock, the oil, the bread, and to gather the people at the entrance of the tent of meeting from 8:2-3. This time, however, Aaron is to come before YHWH. In turn, Aaron is to speak to the sons of Israel commanding them to take livestock for the three gifts, the עולה, הפסח, and the נחמה, as well as the bread with oil for the מנחה (v3). The causative clause ending v4, which consolidates this first phase, gives the reason for the command and also why it must be fulfilled, 'today YHWH will appear to you'. Verses 5-6, the second phase,

...
recall Aaron completing the command to take that, which has been commanded, to the entrance of the tent of meeting. The whole congregation approaches and now stands before YHWH. This sets the stage for Moses to announce in v6: 'The word of YHWH was to Moses.' However, the next Px clause, elaborates on 9:4 and conveys the rationale for why YHWH's command is to be fulfilled; the glory of YHWH will appear to Israel. Thus, each step in logic within vv1-6 concluding with a clause announcing YHWH's intent to appear before the whole congregation anticipates God's glory appearing before Israel as the climactic event.\footnote{Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 576, notes that the referent for הָדְרָכָה הָיוֹת תְעֹשֶׁה is unclear. He observes that the same phrase in 8:5 refers back to the instructions in Exodus 29, but there is no parallel referent for 9:6. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 491, also notes the similarity with 8:5 except that the final verb תְעֹשֶׁה is a second person plural יָקְלָה, rather than the infinitive construct תְעֹשֶׁה. Unlike Milgrom though, Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 491, does not see a problem with an absent referent and states that 'verse serves the chapter's rhetoric simply by emphasizing again that all this takes place in obedience to divine instructions. Listeners and readers can be expected to assume that the referent lies in chaps. 1–7, in part or in whole.' While Watts' explanation is helpful, it is perhaps unnecessary since the demonstrative in 9:6 could be cataphoric since it begins a new phase in the narrative, preceding a command, and also a command that is critical if there is to be life, and not death, when YHWH's glory appears before the people. See also Morales, Who Shall Ascend, p. 120.}

If vv1-6 functions to introduce YHWH's intent to appear before the people, vv7-23 moves towards this goal. Verse 7 though pauses the progression of the narrative. Moses reiterates the command for Aaron to approach with the gifts of the עֲשֹׁת עֶלֶךְ and the הָעָתוֹת לַעֲשֹׁת עֶלֶךְ to highlight the gifts' function; that is, the repetition in v7, הָעָתוֹת לַעֲשֹׁת עֶלֶךְ, accentuates the necessity for כֶּפֶר to be made on behalf of Aaron and the people as YHWH commanded. As Milgrom observes, 'This sequence is essential. The priests cannot atone for others until they have atoned first for themselves.'\footnote{Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 578. Also, the absence of the זָבַח וְשָׁלֵמָה in v7 is due to the focus being upon the gifts that provide כֶּפֶר, which the מָכַר does not (see Lev. 3).} Through continuous narration, vv8-21 depict Aaron offering completely the two gifts of the הָעָתוֹת לַעֲשֹׁת עֶלֶךְ on his behalf (vv8-15) and then the four kinds of gifts – the פֶּרֶס (v15), עֶלֶךְ (v16), מָכַר (v17), and the כֶּפֶר.
Numbers 15:5.  ‘foreign’ smoke people burnt 50. and eventually to Aaron’. part 497. an attributing 49. כמשפט fi re. their censors, they put incense on the fi re, and they offer before YHWH the fat from the offerings and their faces to the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, each taking his censor. Having put their function of כפר ה البرلمان שלמים HWH fi re coming from before YHWH fi re on fi re on fi re faces to the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, each taking his censor. Having put their function of כפר ה البرلمان שלמים HWH fi re coming from before YHWH fi re on fi re on fi re faces to the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, each taking his censor. Having put their function of כפר ה昶laws HWH as God's glory is made visible. Rightly, all the people shout for joy and fall down upon their faces having witnessed the fire consuming the offerings and their lives being preserved.

Although the narrative has reached its goal in 9:22-23, the wayyiqtol beginning 10:1 suggests continuity of the narrative sequence. The focus shifts from the people on their faces to the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, each taking his censor. Having put fire on their censors, they put incense on the fire, and they offer before YHWH a ‘foreign’ (זרה) fire. As Bibb notes, there is no reason to detect tension in the sequence of 10:1 until the

---

40 In the past, some have had a problem with the clause in the MT אשיםעם זמה meshes at the conclusion of v21 not attributing the command to YHWH. LXX adds καρδία as the subject of συνέταξεν and מַאֲזַן in the dative as an indirect object. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 116; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 586; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 497. Bibb, Ritual Words, p. 111, helpfully notes though that the use of 'Moses', rather than יהוה is an 'important part of the ritual dynamic.' He then observes, 'The authoritative voice passes from Yahweh, through Moses, and eventually to Aaron'.

41 Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 591, who notes that the singular שלמים ה昶laws in v24 'generic for all of the burnt offerings sacrificed on this day'. There were three שלמים הוא offered: for the priesthood (vv12-14), for the people (vv16-17), and the morning gift (v17). Verse 16 avoids suggesting the people's offering was caused to smoke or done as was commanded. Thus, it is reasonable to suggest that what the fire consumed in v24 is the people's שלמים gifts.

42 The use of the attributive adjective זרה modifying ז琟 in 15:1 is unclear. Usually rendered 'strange' or 'foreign', the question is how a fire on a censer pan can be 'strange' or 'foreign' (see also Wenham, Leviticus, p. 155). Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 598, prefers the idea of 'unauthorised' deduced from how זراه is used within Numbers 17:5. Hartley, Leviticus, p. 132, also notes the idea of 'unauthorised', but also adds the idea of being
phrase אֲשֶׁר רָאָה. The relative clause referring back to the 'strange' fire ominously clarifies why the fire is רָאָה; they were not commanded to offer the fire and incense before YHWH. The use of the clause יָצָא אָשׁ מְלָפַת יְהוָה in 10:2a deliberately parallels this event with that in 9:24. The parallel, however, is a purposeful juxtaposition with the fire shockingly consuming Nadab and Abihu.

Moses' next statement in 10:3 is the principle that the two fiery events exemplify. The two clauses display syntactic equivalence with the prepositional phrases preceding the two niphal verbs מקדש and בכבד, which share the same semantic domain:

10:3א rgb מקדש
10:3ב היעלפי כי חמהzacaac

There is disagreement though about how to render the niphal verbs of המקדש and בכבד, which makes a significant difference to the understanding of this principle and the narrative. Milgrom, for instance, understands the niphal of המקדש to be reflexive, 'I shall sanctify myself', referring to how YHWH will act through consuming Nadab and Abihu. Similarly,
Milgrom suggests that the *niphal* of בָּכָר is also to be a reflexive, ‘I will glorify myself’.\(^5\)

However, the *niphal* can also be rendered simply as a passive, ‘I will be sanctified’ and ‘I will be glorified’.\(^6\) The first prepositional phrase בָּכָר would then convey agency. While Milgrom’s suggestion is possible, especially since both 9:22-23 as well as 10:2 are both examples where YHWH sanctifies and glorifies himself, this is not necessarily the case with either 8:1-36 or 10:12-20, where Aaron and his sons act in obedience to divine command and, in doing so, sanctify YHWH and enable him to be glorified before the people. The focus is also upon the obedient (or disobedient) actions of the priesthood to YHWH’s command. Thus, rendering the two *niphal* verbs as simple passives is feasible and makes sense of the whole episode. If we proceed with this logic, each clause is an Xp focus structure that highlights the identity and thus responsibility of those who are to sanctify YHWH and before whom he will be glorified. While the phrase בָּכָר refers in all likelihood to the priesthood, this does not preclude the sons of Israel since the verbal idea בָּכָר also applies to the Israelites’ actions bringing gifts to YHWH in Leviticus 1–3 especially.\(^6\)

---

\(^5\) ‘Among those who approach me I will show myself holy’, yet he then translates the second *niphal*, ‘in the sight of all the people I will be honored’ (see also Hess, ‘Leviticus’, pp. 663-664; J. M. Kimulu, *Leviticus: The Priestly Laws and Prohibitions From the Perspective of the Ancient Near East and Africa*, SBL 115, New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2008, p. 65). While this is certainly feasible, Averbeck’s understanding suggests that the *niphal* does not need to be translated reflexively in the second instance, which then could extend to the first *niphal* as well.


\(^6\) See also Morales, *Who Shall Ascend*, pp. 145, 146; Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 155. Also, compare with the *niphal* of שַׁלָּח in 22:32 that is understood by many as a passive, not a reflexive. Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 59, translates the two *niphal* verbs as reflexives, as per Milgrom, but recognises that both understandings are feasible based on the contrasting use of the *niphal* in Leviticus 22:32 (passive) and Numbers 20:32-33 (reflexive). He notes in conclusion, ‘Either way, God emerges triumphant, for He will not allow His sanctity to be compromised’ (Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 60).

\(^6\) Contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 600, who argues for בָּכָר being a ‘technical term, designating an official who can have access to (qārôb) his sovereign directly’, which in this instance, based on Ezekiel 42:13 and Exodus 19:22, refers to the priesthood. For בָּכָר referring to the priesthood, see also Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, p. 128; Hess, ‘Leviticus’, pp. 664; Hieke, *Leviticus 1–15*, p. 387; Kaiser, ‘Leviticus’, p. 1070; Rendtorff, *Leviticus 1.1–10.20*, p. 310-311. Yet the verbal idea בָּכָר can also describes the action of Israel as they approach YHWH with their gifts in Leviticus 1–7 (e.g. 12, 13, 15, 133, 134, 135, 21, 24, 28, 212, 214, 31, 33, 376, 314, 43, 414, 58, 67, 614, 735, 738). While the priesthood might be primarily in view, the Israelites are also encompassed within the phrase בָּכָר. As Bibb, *Ritual Words*, p. 124, notes, ‘The principle at stake here, whatever it may be, does not concern only the priests, but also has implications for the people and how they view Yahweh.’
Thus, the principle in 10:3 accentuates that YHWH is to be sanctified by those who approach him and glorified before the people. The juxtaposition between 9:24 and 10:2 highlights the two-sided nature of this principle. The obedience of Aaron, Moses, and the people, in providing their gifts for מִנָּהּ exemplify YHWH being sanctified by the priesthood and being glorified before the people, and the people live. However, while Nadab and Abihu's actions did not sanctify YHWH, and they died as the consequence, YHWH glorifies himself by the fiery display. Thus, the theological principle of 10:3 provides coherence for Leviticus 8–10 thus far. Also, the principle of 10:3 encompasses the gift instructions in Leviticus 1–7 since this first unit instructs the Israelites about approaching YHWH with gifts in relational order (1:1–3:17, 4:1–5:26, 7:22-36) and instructs the priesthood about confining the holy to the holy (6:1–7:21). By these means, both people and priesthood ensure that YHWH is sanctified in the nation's midst. Thus, the imperative for YHWH to be sanctified and glorified is implied throughout Leviticus 1–7. The function of 10:3 is making explicit what has been implied to this point in the book's arrangement.

The final clause in 10:3 immediately apprises of Aaron's response – silence – whilst the narration of the remaining consequences of Nadab and Abihu's deaths carefully depicts obedience once more. In v4, Moses instructs Mishael and Elzaphan to remove the bodies to outside the camp, after which v5 relates that they approached and removed the bodies as Moses said. Similarly, after Moses instructs Aaron and his two remaining sons, Eleazar and Ithamar, not to enact mourning rituals for the two who were consumed (vv6–7a), the text comments that they did as Moses said (משה כדבר ויעשו).

2.3 Leviticus 10:8-11: The Holy and Common and the Impure and Pure

In the third paragraph, 10:8-11, YHWH speaks directly to Aaron about how the priesthood are not to serve YHWH and the nature of their role. Without ambiguity, YHWH begins the

---

30 Hieke, Levitikus 1–15, p. 387, also observes that the function of the Nadab and Abihu narrative is to demonstrate that YHWH will prove himself holy by his justice. Moreover, his justice is to ensure that his 'holiness is maintained' (my translation; Hieke, Levitikus 1–15, p. 388). See also Jenson, Graded Holiness, pp. 93, 148.
short speech in v9 with a statute for all generations prohibiting the priesthood from entering the tent of meeting having consumed alcohol; if they refrain from drinking alcohol, then they will not die. The use of לָכַיִּים in v9 may echo the fiery end of Nadab and Abihu and thus may imply their disobedience is an outworking of being under the influence of alcohol. However, 10:1-2 does not mention why Nadab and Abihu acted in the way they did, but rather places the focus upon their actions of offering 'strange' fire before YHWH. After the prohibition in v9, YHWH clearly states the nature of the priestly role by use of two infinitival statements (v10, v11). The first statement in v10 conveys that the priestly function is to distinguish between the holy and the common and between the impure and the pure. By conveying this first purpose, the text clearly defines the two binary pairs where the first, the holy and the common, are states of being, while the second, the impure and the pure, are conditions that can affect the two states i.e. the first binary pair. Joosten articulates how the two binary pairs may or may not interact stating,

These two oppositions are related in a peculiar way: the profane may be either pure or impure, and the pure may be either holy or profane, but the holy and the impure are absolutely incompatible. What is impure may never be brought into contact with what is holy.

---

60 While Hartley, Leviticus, p. 135, disagrees with rabbinic tradition over the interpretation of v9, he states, 'While there is nothing in the text that supports this interpretation, the final editor who placed this decree here probably assumed that there was some connection between alcohol and this tragic incident.' See also R. Hess, 'Leviticus 10:1: Strange Fire and an Odd Name', BBR 12/2 (2002), p. 197.

61 See also Lee, Between Law and Narrative, p. 123; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 158.

62 The two binary pairs of the holy and common and then the impure and the pure assumes four 'categories' of the holy, common, impure, and pure. This represents a different view to Sklar, Leviticus, pp. 45, 163, who observes three ritual states, which are the impure, pure, and holy. Sklar, Leviticus, 163, also notes that the mention of 'common' in 10:30 is not a separate state, but rather 'it simply refers to that which is non-holy'. However, even being 'non-holy' is a status albeit a neutral one and thus we will include 'common' as a state in line with 10:30. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 616; Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 68-69.

63 The 'common' describes the normal state from which a person or people, an animal, or an object, can be set apart as 'holy' for a particular purpose. See also Watts, Leviticus 1–16, p. 543; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 19.

64 For the idea that the holy and common are two states, while the impure and pure are two conditions, see R. E. Averbeck, 'Clean and Unclean', NIDOTTE, ed. W. A. VanGemeren (vol. 4, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), p. 481; Morales, Who Shall Ascend, p. 155; Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 68-70.
As we progress through the arrangement of Leviticus, it will become evident that these are critical distinctions since the rest of Leviticus concerns how the Israelites are to navigate these distinction within the binary pair of impurity and purity so that they can maintain their status as a holy people (e.g. 11:47, 14:57).\(^{66}\) The second infinitival statement in 10:11 is equally vital for the rest of Leviticus' arrangement. The second priestly function is to teach the sons of Israel all the statutes YHWH has spoken 'to them' (i.e. the sons of Israel). The relative clause \(\text{אלשיהו דבר יהוה אשר אָבָר בְּיד־מְשֶה} \) echoes the final relative clause of 8:36, \(\text{ביד־מְשֶה יהוה אשר־צוה} \). The context though of 8:36 is Aaron and his sons obediently completing the consecration process; the implication in 10:11 being that the sons of Israel are also to obey the statutes YHWH has spoken through Moses. These two infinitival statements explicating the priestly role, stated in such close proximity to the theological principle of 10:3, suggests that by fulfilling these two functions, the priesthood will sanctify YHWH and he will be glorified before the people. This is true also at the global level of Leviticus' arrangement. The remaining episodes within the book are concerned with making the distinctions within the two binary pairs from 10:10 and also relating YHWH's instruction to the sons of Israel that they are to embody in obedience. The priestly role is to ensure that the Israelite generations know these instructions so that YHWH is sanctified by Israel and he in turn is glorified before them.

---

\(^{66}\) Joosten, *People and Land*, p. 124. Please note though that Joosten's argument differs slightly to my own due to the fact that I have adopted Averbeck's language of the holy and common as states and the impure and pure as conditions. However, this difference in language does not undermine what Joosten observes in terms of both holiness and impurity being contagious, whilst 'the profane and the pure merely signal the absence of holiness and impurity respectively; they are static qualities, though by certain rites an object or a person may be transferred from the holy to the profane or from the impure to the pure' (Joosten, *People and Land*, p. 124).

\(^{66}\) See Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 616, who argues that 10:10 is more than a mere introduction to Leviticus 11–15. He states, 'Yet it is more likely that chaps. 11–15 were inserted between chaps. 10 and 16 in order to exemplify the sanctuary pollutions that require thoroughgoing purgation rites, and only subsequently were vv10-11 inserted in their present place in chap. 10 to act as their introduction. In either case, this clause can justly be claimed as a proleptic introduction to chaps. 11–15.'
2.4 Leviticus 10:12-20: When Acting Contrary to Command is Justified

The final paragraph recalls an event, related to the deaths of Nadab and Abihu, which exemplifies a situation where not doing what is commanded is justified. The arrangement of the paragraph is straightforward, although its purpose has caused confusion. Verses 12-15 recollect Moses’ command to Aaron and his remaining sons about eating the food offering. The concern is to restrict the eating of the priestly portion to a pure place, while still giving permission to eat the food gifts. Verses 16-18 then portray Moses asking about the goat of the פדיון and finding out that the priestly share had been completely burned.65 Moses responds angrily asking why they did not eat the prebend since it is most holy to YHWH.66 Aaron, breaking his silence in the text, responds in v19 by asking whether YHWH would be pleased if he participated in the eating of the food gift in light of the deaths of Nadab and Abihu. Verse 20 tells the audience that the response was pleasing to Moses.

The issue with 10:12-20 is its purpose within the arrangement. Why does the text not simply progress from 10:8-11 to the food instructions in Leviticus 11? This final narrative seems to interrupt the coherence of the arrangement. Watts’ argument is that both 10:8-11 and 10:12-20 function to endorse Aaron’s authority.67 He notes that YHWH speaking

65 The use of the pual פדיון relates the idea of destroying something completely by fire. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 622, views the pual to be a hapax and suggests a qal passive instead might be helpful. Worth noting though is that this would not change how פדיון would be rendered in English. Thus, there is no reason to modify the step from a Pual to a Qal. What is significant though is that the prebend was not burned in the same way as an הבש gift since the verbal root הבש is not used. Thus, the idea of הבש is that the prebend was destroyed and not given to YHWH. See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 547.

66 I acknowledge the contention surrounding פדיון as to whether the priests eating the פדיון completes the הבש process. Please see Gane, Cult and Character, pp. 91-96 for an overview of the problem. He argues concludes his discussion stating, ‘Thus far we cannot escape the conclusion, reached by a number of interpreters, that priestly consumption of sacrificial flesh is an integral part of the purification-offering ritual and makes some kind of contribution to expiation. It is not merely priestly enjoyment of compensation for service already rendered, including applying blood to the altar. B. Levine is right that the priestly meal of purification-offering meat accomplishes both things at once’ (see also Hess, ‘Leviticus’, p. 671). N. Kiuchi, The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature: Its Meaning and Function (JSOTS 56, Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), p. 49, argues strongly against this notion since Leviticus 9 already completes the הבש process. An assessment of this issue is not integral to the overall thesis; thus, I will refrain from assessing the various points of view at this point.

67 Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 506. This is contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 627, who observes, ‘the fact that
directly to Aaron in 10:8-11 gives authority to Aaron 'to determine correct ritual practice' and thus 10:12-20 depicts Aaron exercising that authority with Moses then acquiescing to his ruling.70 For Watts, it is vital that the arrangement shows the priests 'having the final say'.71 However, Watts' argument is perhaps unnecessary and thus I would offer an alternative. As noted above, the example seems to be one where the priesthood does not do what is commanded. While Moses' anger is roused by the notion of disobedience, Aaron's response acknowledges that the people have sacrificed both their gifts, yet his concern is whether his eating of the היפאד (השפר) would be pleasing to YHWH (בעיני יהוה). One might infer that Aaron may have understood himself to be sharing the guilt, or at least shame, of Nadab and Abihu's actions. This is a plausible reason for why Aaron thought it would be inappropriate for him to eat the part of the corpse, his concern is to act in a way that is pleasing in YHWH's eyes.72 Technically, whilst Aaron may have the last verbal say, the narrator in fact gives the 'final say' to Moses whose response upon hearing is approval. Implied then, considering Moses' role as YHWH's mediator, is Moses' approval reflecting God's approval. There is no

70 Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 543.
71 Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 554.
72 This is a different proposal to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 639. He understands the purpose of the priests consuming the מזון prebends, the holy consuming the impure, to be symbolic of life consuming death. The refusal to eat the מזון is, in Milgrom's view, the priests acknowledging that the tabernacle has polluted by the rebellion of Nadab and Abihu and their corpses, including the מזון. Thus, 'its [the מזון] carcass was too laden with impurity to be safely ingested'. There is a substantial issue with Milgrom's argument. Houston, 'Tragedy in the Courts', p. 36, argues contrary to Milgrom that Aaron 'does not express himself in terms of clean and unclean, and his mention of the other offerings seems rather to imply that the whole process of expiation had been thrown into doubt by the day's happenings'. However, Houston does suggest that the reason for Aaron's silence in 10:3 is that he shares the 'dishonour' of his two, now dead, sons (Houston, 'Tragedy in the Courts', p. 34). This dishonour could be a cause for not eating as much as it is a cause for silence.
73 See also S. Chavel, Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah (FAT 2/71, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), p. 47, who uses 10:16-29 as an example where we should not 'overly' explore the text for 'fine legalistic reasoning'; in this case, the reasoning that could be forced for an explanation is why Moses seems to acquiesce to Aaron.
suggestion, therefore, in the text that the intent is to demonstrate Aaronic authority, especially over Mosaic tradition, but rather that relational order is maintained by seeking what is good in the eyes of YHWH. By demonstrating Aaron's motivation to please YHWH, the text concludes the episode with an example where doing what is contrary to command does sanctify the God who is in their midst.

Thus, the whole episode presents three narratives illustrating YHWH's statement in 10:3. The first in 8:1-35 shows YHWH sanctified by the priesthood by completing the consecration as YHWH commanded. The second narrative, 9:1–10:7, juxtaposes two events where YHWH is sanctified and glorified by obedience to command. When he is not sanctified by those who approach him, death ensues and, by the offenders' being consumed, he shows himself glorified before the people. The third narrative in 10:12-20 functions to demonstrate that there is an instance where not adhering to divine command does not result in death, but in fact results in YHWH being sanctified by those who are in his presence.

2.5 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 8–10

The focus of the three narratives in Leviticus 8–10 is very much upon the obedience of the priesthood to YHWH's command and, in the context of rebellion, an opportunity arises to instruct the priesthood about the nature of their role as God's servants. The events beginning first with adherence to divine command in the seven-day process of the priesthood's consecration (8:1-36) and on the eighth day leading to YHWH's glory appearing (9:1-22), the gifts being consumed (9:23), and the people's life being preserved (9:24), are exemplars of the principle in 10:3 that accentuates the responsibility of the priesthood both to ensure that YHWH is sanctified and also glorified before the people. Thus, the use of juxtaposition is a stylistic device that contributes to the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 8–10. The juxtaposition of the two fiery events (9:1-10:7) framed by two

---

26 Contrary to Watts, Ritual and Rhetoric, pp. 115-118.
narratives exemplifies priestly obedience (8:1-36, 10:12-20) and enables the principle of 10:3 to be highlighted within the text's arrangement.

The principle of 10:3 is also an integrating thematic referent of the global schema, since it explicates the intent underlying Leviticus 1–7 as well as the intent underlying the episodes within Leviticus 11–15, at least. In Leviticus 1–7, the intent is to form the Israelite community into a people and priesthood who approach their covenant God in their midst in ordered relationship (1:1–3:17) and who seek to restore that order when offence fractures the relationship (4:1–5:26). Furthermore, 6:1–7:21 instructs the priesthood about how they are to preside within the offering process that respects the holy and so influences the priesthood to give to YHWH what belongs to him and to confine the holy to the holy. By these means, both people and priesthood ensure that YHWH is sanctified by those who approach him irrespective of whether their task is to draw near with a gift or to mediate the gift to YHWH. Thus, the principle of 10:3 is implied within Leviticus 1–7, but it is only when the principle is explicitly mentioned in 10:3 that it functions to integrate Leviticus 1–7 with Leviticus 8–10 conceptually. Additionally, Leviticus 10:3 also encompasses the forthcoming episodes in Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15. In the above discussion of 10:10, I note that the proximity of 10:10 to 10:3 suggests that the priesthood ensures that both the people and priesthood make the distinction between the impure and pure and between the holy and common, and that this is a means by which YHWH is sanctified by those who approach him and in Israel's midst. The four sequential episodes in Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15, instruct the Israelites to make the distinction between impurity and purity so that they embody the condition of purity as a means of being set apart for YHWH and to learn that they need to be separated from their impurity lest they die with YHWH's presence being in their midst (11:46-47, 15:31). Once more, the intended influence of Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15, exemplifies the more foundational principle of 10:3, which is ensuring that YHWH is sanctified by those who approach him.
and glorified before the people. As I will argue at a later point, this principle is extended to the covenant community in the land within Leviticus 17–22.

At this point in my argument, it may be useful to pause to observe how my argument above differs from that of Watts. Watts observes similar patterns within the rhetorical strategy of the text as I have done. He concludes though with a radically different view to my own. For example, Watts helpfully observes the repetition of the refrain נאשֶׁר צוה יהוה אֶת־משה throughout Leviticus 8–9 and then the jarring evaluation of Nadab and Abihu's actions in 10:1.

He rightly surmises from this observation that the text accentuates the one example of noncompliance and its fiery consequence after the pattern of compliance. He states,

Thus the rhetoric of Leviticus 8–10 builds the theme of compliance with divine commandments through constant repetition, then emphasizes it with a single example of noncompliance and its disastrous consequences before reasserting the theme in the rest of chapter 10.

However, after asking 'who was trying to persuade whom of what by using the refrain of compliance with divine instructions?'; he then states, 'Clearly, they aim to legitimize the Aaronide priesthood, as many interpreters have observed.' Yet a legitimising of authority is not where the emphasis of the text lies. The juxtaposition demonstrates the consequence of obedience in contrast to rebellion – life and not death – and thus highlights the responsibility of the priesthood, rather than trying to establish their authority. Moreover, the explanation offered in 10:3 focuses upon YHWH and how he is to be sanctified and glorified. This emphasis is not merely to legitimise priestly authority in

---

76 See Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, pp. 106, 111. Contrary to Hess, *Strange Fire and an Odd Name*, p. 190, who argues that the clause אתם צוה לא אשר אתם is 'an expression associated with foreign cultic activities'.
line with ‘divine instruction from Mt. Sinai.’ There is a real concern within the text to ensure that Israel’s covenant God who dwells in their midst is sanctified so that there is life and not death for both priesthood and nation. Watts’ argument diminishes this concern.

Within the persuasive situation, Moses as YHWH’s intermediary is persuading Aaron, his sons, and future generations of priesthood, to ensure obedience so that YHWH is sanctified rather than establishing Aaronic authority. However, it is worth noting the possibility that the Aaronic priesthood in the rhetorical situation, irrespective of what historical situation that may be, may have both faithful and rebellious elements, even within a legitimate priesthood. It is within the realm of possibility that a faithful priesthood may be persuading the rebellious to embody their role and responsibility. On this note, I will return below to outlining the persuasive intent of Leviticus 8–10.

Before proceeding to persuasive intent of Leviticus 8–10 however, the disposition of Leviticus 8–10 needs to be observed. The form of Leviticus 8–10 is quite obviously narrative and even when there is direct speech relating ritual instruction, the narrative relates its fulfilment rather than awaiting future enactment, such as in Leviticus 1–7. The past orientation of Leviticus 8–10 is germane to the form and type of discourse of narrative. What is unresolved so far, however, is what kind of impact or influence the past orientation seeks to achieve. The juxtaposition within Leviticus 9:1–10:7 and the arrangement of 10:12–20 at the conclusion of the episode suggests that by recalling these events, an aspect of the text’s disposition is for the priesthood and people to agree with YHWH’s action in 10:2 and Moses’ approval of Aaron’s actions in 10:12–20. By influencing both priesthood and the Israelites to agree with both YHWH and Moses in the two events, they then align their values to that of both YHWH and Moses, which is to ensure that

---

81 Ironically, Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, pp. 112-113, criticises past attempts at understanding 10:3 as ‘fail[ing] to consider its rhetorical impact’. He views the rhetorical impact of 10:3 to highlight the dangerous job of being a priest with the force of meaning, ‘We do a dangerous but necessary job, and the rarity of fatalities shows that we do it well! So don’t begrudge us its perks’ (Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, p. 113). Again, this diminishes the concern for YHWH’s presence and places the emphasis upon a self-interested and self-promoting priesthood.
YHWH is sanctified by those who approach him. However, this explanation of disposition does not take into account the whole of Leviticus 8–10 since there is no verdict or penalty in Leviticus 8 that the text is asking the audience to agree with and furthermore 10:8-11 is exhortation to the priesthood about their priestly task for both present and future action. Thus, since the juxtaposition of the 9:1–10:7 is framed by two narratives where there is acceptance of the priesthood due to obedience complying to command or by seeking what is pleasing to YHWH, the past orientation of the rhetorical unit still seeks to influence the present and future actions of the priestly community directly, and the covenant community indirectly. The nature of this influence relates directly to the persuasive intent that Leviticus 8–10 aims to achieve.

Thus, the intent of Leviticus 8–10's rhetorical strategy is to motivate and warn. By demonstrating that obedience to divine command ensures that YHWH is sanctified by the priesthood and will lead to Israel's life being preserved, this motivates the current Israelite generation and all future generations to pursue obedience to command and what is pleasing to YHWH. Specifically, 10:8-11 instructs about the responsibility of the priesthood both to distinguish between what is holy and common, and what is impure and pure, as well as teaching YHWH's commands to the sons of Israel. Thus, the juxtaposition of the two fiery events in 9:1–10:7 motivates the priesthood to soberly undertake their role so as to ensure YHWH is sanctified in their midst. Nadab and Abihu's fiery end, however, then warns that rebellion profaning God's presence has the consequence of death and so acts to deter a priestly audience, whether they are the first generation at Sinai or future generations in the land, from rebellion. The intent of Leviticus 8–10, therefore, is to shape the character of the priesthood into God's servants who faithfully adhere to his instruction, namely by the two-fold role of 10:10-11, and so ensure that YHWH is sanctified and that he is glorified before the people (10:3).
3. Leviticus 11: Learning the Distinction Between the Impure and the Pure

The speech’s opening in 11:2αβ reactivates the topic of food from 10:12-20, but with a significant development. The focus in Leviticus 11 is now upon what the Israelites can eat from the animals of the earth (vv2αβ-8), sea creatures (vv9-12), birds (vv13-19), and swarming creatures (vv20-23). As Trevaskis notes, some level of intertextuality between Leviticus 11 and Genesis 1 can now be assumed.\textsuperscript{82} He also adds that there is a strong case for intertextuality between Leviticus 11 and Genesis 2–3. Indeed, intertextuality with Genesis 1 2 is a rhetorical device employed within the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 11. For instance, both Genesis 1–2 and Leviticus 11 display a pattern where YHWH gives permission to eat ‘from all’ (מכל, Gen 2:16, Lev. 11:3, 9), which is then followed by a restriction upon what the audience cannot eat (Gen 2:17, Lev. 11:4-6, 10-12).\textsuperscript{83} However, this pattern does not recur throughout Leviticus 11. In the first four paragraphs, there is a movement from living creatures where there is a distinction between what can and cannot be eaten (vv2αβ-8, vv9-12) to living creatures that are forbidden (vv13-19, vv20-23). Thus, the pattern Trevaskis observes is only evident in the initial two paragraphs (vv2αβ-8, vv9-12). As this section explores the arrangement of Leviticus 11, I will draw upon Trevaskis’ contribution to understanding the symbolic dimension of the text whilst assessing his argument about the notion of impurity.

As noted above, the first two paragraphs focusing upon animals (vv2αβ-8) and sea creatures (vv9-12) each follows the pattern of what the Israelites can eat (vv3, 9) and then defining what cannot be eaten (vv4-6, vv9-12). At the beginning of the first paragraph, v3 gives permission to eat from all (םכל) animals that have a divided hoof and chews the cud. Verse 4, beginning with the restrictive adverb ולא, then excludes the eating of animals that display only one of these characteristics (v4α). Verses 4β-7 identify exemplars where v4α is

\textsuperscript{82} See Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 96-97.
\textsuperscript{83} See Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 97.
true and declares each to be טמא; that is, they are impure (v4, v5, v6, v7). Verse 8 concludes the paragraph by prohibiting the Israelite from eating flesh or touching carcasses declared impure. The second case of the sea creatures in vv9-12 follows similar logic. Verse 9 first gives permission to eat from all (емся) sea creatures that have both fins and scales. Verse 10 then highlights those creatures that do not have both fins and scales and which are to be regarded as שפקש. Rather than giving examples, vv11-12 repeats that the Israelites are not to eat the flesh of the sea creatures, which have the status of being שפקש ('detestable').84 Following the logic of the text so far, the living creatures, whether animal or sea creature, that are permissible to eat are those that exemplify both characteristics, while those declared either אס or שפקש may only have one, or none, of the traits. We can deduce, therefore, that those declared impure or detestable are those that represent incompleteness, while those that can be eaten, and thus considered pure, are those that are complete.85

The following two paragraphs, vv13-19 and vv20-23, then address two cases where there is an absence of instruction giving permission to eat before the prohibitions. Verses 13-19 identify the particular birds that the Israelites are to detest and significantly, with the exception of the Hoopoe and the bat, each is a bird of prey. Wenham notes some

---

84 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 656, distinguishes between שפקש and אס where שפקש refers to living creatures that are forbidden from being eaten and yet are not contagion (i.e. can be touched), whereas אס refers to living creatures that are forbidden from being eaten and touched because they are contagion. While it is true that the verbal idea שפקש is not used when creatures, such as sea creatures in v11, are שפקש, this does not necessarily mean those that are שפקש are not impure. Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 83, questions whether the absence of the verb שפקש necessitates the absence of the idea. He suggests in relation to v8 and v11, 'Given that each verse begins with a prohibition against eating the animals regarded as either אס שפקש (v. 8) or שפקש אס (v. 11), and that the verbs שפקש (v. 8) and שפקש אס (v. 11) share the same object (i.e. נבולה), it seems reasonable to assume that 'do not touch' (v. 8) and 'detest' (v. 11) are closely related in meaning.' The use of שפקש does not seem to be a 'lesser' term than אס, nor the act of touching more than the act of detesting. As Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 83, notes, the use of שפקש seems to be a 'deliberate intensification of what is implied in the command שפקש אס.' The force of the repetition of שפקש in v11 seems to be, in Trevaskis' words, 'Not only must you refrain from touching (vv. 1-8), but absolutely detest these animals.' On this basis, Trevaskis calls for an evaluation of Milgrom's distinction between אס and שפקש.

confusion as to why birds of prey are considered טמא. As Sklar notes, the intended audience would be able to access the meaning and for now we just need to note that vv13-19 outline the birds that are detestable and thus should not be eaten. The logic of vv20-23 is quite different, however. In contrast to vv2aβ-12, v20 declares all (מַּךְ) swarming-flying creatures upon the earth שָׁקַץ, while vv21-22 then describes the characteristics of the swarming-flying creature that can be eaten (v21), and which is then followed by examples (v22). In this instance, the Israelite is given permission to eat the swarming flying creature that has four legs, but which must be jointed so that the insect hops on the ground. Verse 23 then clarifies that all swarming-flying creatures that have four legs are שָׁקַץ. The reason why swarming-flying creatures are to be considered detestable is not as easy to surmise at this point in the arrangement; the logic will become more explicit when vv29-45 clarifies that the swarming things, which move along the ground, are impure (טמא).

However, vv24-28 seems to interrupt the instructions about the swarming things (vv20-23, vv29-45) to address the consequences of contagion. In summary fashion, vv24-25 repeats the prohibitions not to touch the carcasses of 'these', that is, those that are prohibited from being eaten in vv2-23. Afterwards, vv26-28 repeats the instructions focused upon animals, although adding a clarification about animals with paws (כֵּן; vv27-28). The purpose of reiterating the principles of vv2-23 is to highlight the consequence of touching that which is טמא. The use of the refrain עד־הערב טמא recurring at the conclusion of v24, v25, v27, and v28, emphasises the consequence of touching impure creatures, which are contagious.

Trevaskis observes that the instruction for purification has been omitted

---

86 Wenham, *Leviticus*, pp. 174-175. Quite a few studies have sought to identify the birds and find the reasoning for why these birds of prey are considered impure, in the end we cannot know for certain. A feasible explanation could be that the birds ingest carrion (i.e. decaying flesh) or live prey. As soon as flesh is at the stage of decay, it becomes corrupt and therefore impure. This could mean that the association is with the decay of death and thus represents disorder. There is yet to be a reasonable explanation to be found for those birds that eat live prey. This reasoning, however, still leaves the Hoopoe and the bat unaccounted for.


88 See also Trevaskis, *Holiness*, p. 87.
purposefully at this point to highlight the consequence of impurity. Moreover, he notes that the significance of the penalty קְדִישָׁתָא (טָמֵא יְדֵי-עַצֵּר) has a further consequence implied in the text, which is 'a period of exclusion from the sanctuary'. Thus, the Israelite is to detest (קדישתא) what is to be considered impure (טמא) because it causes separation from God. Trevaskis, however, takes this argument a step further to suggest,

[exclusion from God's presence] is symbolic of the penalty of 'death' (מות) experienced by Adam and Eve upon eating the fruit of the tree of good and evil (Genesis 3). In this sense, the status of טמא would symbolize the consequence of rebelling against Yahweh, namely exclusion from His immediate presence."

While Trevaskis' use of intertextuality with Genesis 3 requires further assessment, it is plausible that the penalty of being impure until evening, and thus exclusion from the sanctuary during this period, has association with the penalty of death. The emphasis of vv24-28 is upon the consequence of טמא, namely remaining in this condition until evening and thus exclusion from the sanctuary during this period, albeit temporarily.

The final two paragraphs (vv29-40, vv41-45), before the summary in vv46-47, return to the topic of swarming creatures that are impure. Verses 29-40 address the consequences of contagion in situations where an individual has touched a carcass (vv29-31), a particular item such as clothing (v32), a cooking pot (vv33-35), a water source (v36), or a seed for planting (vv37-38). In the situations of an individual or an item, the consequence is remaining impure until evening (v31, v32), whereas the danger of contagion with a cooking pot, i.e. food becomes impure, requires that the clay pot is broken to ensure disuse (v33, v35). The final paragraph, vv41-45, then strongly prohibits eating the swarming

---

89 Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 88. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 667, 668, suggests that purification rites are implied within Leviticus 11 and are 'self-understood'.

90 Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 88.

91 Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 89. Italics are part of the original text.

92 Although the MT puts a break after v38, I have chosen to enfold vv39-40 into vv29-40. The reason for doing this is that vv39-40 continues expanding upon the consequences of being contagious, albeit from animals,
creatures (v41). Asyndeton occurs at the beginning of both v42 and v43, which breaks the information flow in both instances, and accentuates v42 and v43 within the whole arrangement. The Xp structure in v42 highlights the kind of swarming creatures that are not to be eaten by fronting the description of the swarming things namely 'all' that moves upon the belly (עליבון), moves on all four legs, or on many feet, and that swarm upon the earth. The verbal sequence in v43, אֲלֵיָּתְשֵׁקָתְּשָׁהּ prosecute a number of forensic terms in Leviticus, 1–16, p. 683, still sustains his argument that the swarming creatures mentioned in v41 are to be detested, but are not defiling. I take the point of view above that all declared טמא are also contagion. There is no separate category in the summary verse in v47 for the טמא; the distinction is between the שֵׁקָה and the טמא. It would be strange if the living creatures that are to be considered טמא are precluded from the anaphoric summary statement in vv46-47.

58 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 684. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 683, views vv43-44 as forming a 'symmetric, introverted structure' where v43a and v44d provide an inclusio to four clauses (v43b, v44a, v44b, v44c). Verse 43b and v44b are parallel and thus associating the prohibition not to become impure by the swarming creatures with the command for Israel to sanctify their selves. Verse 44a and v44c are then parallel where both clauses repeat the reason for the prohibition and command in v43b and v44b respectively, which is namely because YHWH 'your God' is holy.

59 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 684. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 684, suggests further, Their synonymity contrasts sharply with their discrete meanings in the previous verses, an indication that another source is operative here. However, rather than attributing this 'synonymity' to a different source, it is reasonable to view earlier synonymy as well.

60 Milgrom, Holiness, p. 103.

61 Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 103.
creatures. The first causal statement in v44 begins with the declaration קדשים, which is later to be the characteristic refrain in Leviticus 17–26. The rest of v44 is an outworking of this declaration and is the first time within Leviticus, and the Torah, that explicitly relates the imperative for Israel to avoid that which is impure with the imperative to set themselves apart as holy in imitation of YHWH. As Milgrom states, Israel's goal of being in a state of holiness 'cannot coexist with impurity.' Thus, Israel being set apart in purity is a condition for God's continued presence as Israel's covenant God.

Worth clarifying at this point, since this is the first time in Leviticus' arrangement where YHWH declares himself holy, is the meaning of YHWH being holy and what it means then for Israel to be 'holy' as YHWH is 'holy'. By his very nature, YHWH is depicted as being utterly complete and whole in his being and so the attribute of being holy is being set apart in this utter completeness. This understanding represents a subtle, and yet

---

*I recognise that Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 686, attributes vv43-45 to H. Irrespective of one's view of source composition and dating, the fact remains that an implied editor has arranged the text, and this episode, with these particular associations and connections. My task is to explore what the shaping of the logic and arrangement suggests about the intent and strategy of the episode within the book as a whole.

**Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 686. I disagree though with Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, pp. 686-687, that this is a means by which Israel is 'to be holy' as though their holiness is an attribute to be achieved by their obedience. Rather, as argued by Trevaskis, *Holiness*, p. 104, the הית납את ה classe and the Px clauseIRT can be understood as maintaining a status of holiness, not gaining this state. However, like Trevaskis, I wish to note that this argument is controversial within Levitical scholarship considering that the P and H distinction is predicated on the observation that holiness in P extends to the inner parts of the sanctuary, the priests, the consecrated vessels, and the prebends given to the priests, whereas H is seen to extend the notion of holiness to the people (see Trevaskis, *Holiness*, p. 104). Yet, the implied editor has included what is deemed to be a 'H' element within the arrangement episodic schema, which affects the meaning of Leviticus 11 as a whole.

***This is a similar point to Trevaskis, *Holiness*, p. 103, who states, 'These points [that is, the purpose statements in vv44-45] suggest that the main purpose of the preceding instructions pertaining to סמן are aimed at warning Israel against having themselves excluded from God's immediate presence as Adam and Eve were before them. The call to be qualità (vv. 44-45) must be understood against this background [...] Since God is qualità, the Israelites must not live in such a way that will exclude them from his presence, but be qualità.' While I do not disagree with Trevaskis, I think the relationship between סמן and.qualité is much more particular. The means by which they are to be qualità is by not becoming saldo. Positively stated, Israel is to be holy by remaining in a pure condition. Thus, I would re-word Trevaskis' last statement in the following way, 'Since God is qualità, the Israelites must not live in such a way that will exclude them from his presence, but [by maintaining a condition of purity as the means of being].qualité.'
significant, distinction from Douglas' notion of holiness. She defines 'the Holy as wholeness and completeness'. Douglas' definition, however, confuses the notion of holiness with that of purity. My argument is that being in a condition of purity is being whole and complete, which is based on the distinction between impurity and purity established in Leviticus 11. Being 'holy' is being in a state that is 'set apart' from its binary opposite of the 'common'. YHWH is set apart from what is common in his utter purity i.e. in his condition of being utterly complete and whole in and by himself. For this reason, the imitation of God's holiness is being set apart by being in a condition of completeness and wholeness i.e. being set apart by being in a pure condition. Thus, the repeated clause in v44c and v45b, in the context of instructions about making the distinction between what is impure and pure, commands Israel to be set apart by being in a condition that represents completeness and wholeness. In this way, Israel is to imitate YHWH because Israel belongs to YHWH.

The second causal statement in v45 begins by expanding upon the declaration אני יי by highlighting his work of bringing Israel from the land of Egypt for the purpose of being their God. It is significant at this stage in the arrangement that the emphasis is upon YHWH belonging to Israel as their God by use of אליהם (v44) and then לאלהים (v45). Radically, YHWH's motivation in redeeming Israel is so that he will belong to the nation. For this reason, v45 repeats v44c, ויהי קדוש כי קדשים והיתם. By ensuring that Israel

---

103. Douglas, Purity and Danger, p. 52.
104. Wenham, Leviticus, p. 24, states, 'We can conclude that holiness is exemplified by completeness. Holiness requires that individuals shall conform to the class to which they belong.' The Israelites by virtue of the covenantal relationship as the goal of the exodus event belong to YHWH and thus must 'conform' to the one to whom they belong.
105. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 687, seems to suggest that the emphasis in v45 is upon YHWH's ownership of Israel stating, 'Above all, the Lord's redemption of Israel is transferred from Pharaoh to God (26:12-13; Exod. 20:2) and Israel now must service him (25:42, 55) and, hence, obey all his commands.' While this is certainly true, this is not the emphasis of v45 and thus is reading wider context into the text at this point. The implied author has chosen not to phrase v45a as כי אני יי המלך ואנחנו מארמים מradiים לאלהים כי לא – this would then place the emphasis of the purpose of redeeming upon Israel having the legal status of belonging to God. Yet the purpose statement of v45 is לאלהים, which accentuates the legal status of God belonging to.
does not become impure by swarming creatures, the nation sets itself apart as a people who are distinctive in their status as a holy people. This raises the question of why the swarming creatures are being singled out in vv44-45, which in turn leads to the issue of why the swarming creatures are considered to be contagious.\textsuperscript{106}

Verses 42-43 unambiguously state that swarming creatures with the trait of moving upon their belly, on all four legs, or on many feet, are a means of contagion if an Israelite comes into contact with them. Trevaskis observes that the only other place that the phrase על־גחון occurs in the MT is Genesis 3:14 and notes that the use of the two verbs רכש and אכל along with the prepositional phrase strengthens the echoes between Leviticus 11:42 and Genesis 3:14.\textsuperscript{107} The use of intertextuality at this point as a rhetorical device associates the impurity of swarming creatures in 11:42-45 with the rebellion and its consequences in Genesis 3. Trevaskis argues, based on these associations, that impurity symbolises ‘the consequence of rebelling against Yahweh, namely exclusion from His immediate presence.’\textsuperscript{108} Yet Trevaskis confuses the consequence of impurity for the inherent meaning of impurity. There is an argument to be made for impurity as ‘incompleteness’ based on the logic of the text.

As noted above, the animals and the sea creatures that are deemed to be טמא and שקץ are those that do not exemplify all the traits. Thus, impurity has associations with incompleteness. This, of course, does not explain the whole system of impurity and purity, but neither does it need to do so. There are several analogical dimensions to the symbolism of impurity that we have observed from Leviticus 11, such as decay (e.g. birds)

\textsuperscript{106} Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 685, raises a similar question, but rather than asking why, in the logic of the text, the swarming creatures are singled out in the paraenesis, he asks why 'this source single[s] out the swarming creatures?' He then offers the suggestion that the key is the phrase על־גחון and proposes on the basis of the use of 'גוון' that 'it is the association with the earth, the sphere of death, that led to the exclusion of all land swarmers from Israel's diet' (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 686). Milgrom then admits that this explanation is tenuous but notes that this idea is coherent with the ideational framework of Leviticus 11–15. This explanation, admittedly speculative for the present, will take on added force once it is demonstrated that all ritual impurity, embedded and legislated in chaps. 11-15, has this as its common denominator: the association with death' (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 686).

\textsuperscript{107} Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 98.

\textsuperscript{108} Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 89.
and rebellion (swarming creatures). All these symbolic meanings are in association with the central concept of disorder. Based on vv24-28, Trevaskis notes helpfully that the repeated command to wait until evening for purification infers separation from the sanctuary for that length of time. This is a consequence of the condition, not inherent in the symbolism of the condition itself. Thus, the impure condition of the living things, i.e. those not to be eaten, is derived from an association with incompleteness, decay, and rebellion. The reason why the paraenetic instruction in vv44-45 is in relation to swarming creatures is due to their association with rebellion and its consequences. By avoiding the swarming creature that causes the Israelite to be impure due to its association with rebellion, the Israelite learns to avoid that which the swarming creature represents – rebellion.

The use of asyndeton at the beginning of the summary statement in vv46-47 pauses the information flow before the Xp statement reactivates the topic of the episode. There are two parts of logic to the summary statement in vv46-47. First, v46 summarises the list of living creatures to which the instructions in vv2-45 pertain. The second part in v47 is a purpose statement where the infinitive לִהְבָּדֵל governs two sets of objects that are related by syntactic equivalence as per below.

לִהְבָּדֵל

בִּין הַטְּהוּר

בִּין הַטְּמֵא

בִּין הָאָכָל אָכַל לָא אָכַל

The use of syntactic equivalence associates the act of distinguishing between the impure and the pure with making the distinction between what can and cannot be eaten.109

109. N.B. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 689, observes about v47, ‘The separation of the animals into the pure and the impure is both a model and a lesson for Israel to separate itself from the nations. The latter have defiled themselves by their idolatry and immorality. Israel must, therefore, refrain from partaking of their practices and, thereby, become eligible for a life of holiness – the way and nature of its God’. Yet Milgrom reads a later development from Leviticus 20:25-26 into 11:47. The only distinctions that the text highlights at this stage in the text’s arrangement are between the pure and the impure and between what cannot and what can be eaten. There is no mention of the nations yet in the text. While a counter-argument could be made that the later development in 20:25-26 is in the frame of interpretive reference, the implied author has chosen not to
However, the arrangement of v47 places the two positive phrases 'between the pure' and 'between the living creatures to be eaten' between the two negative phrases 'between the impure' and 'between the living creatures that you are not to eat'. While this purposefully echoes 10:10, especially with the use of הבדיל, v47 reverses the order of 10:10 (holy, common, impure, pure) where the two negative phrases underlined above ('impure', 'not to eat') encompass the positive ('pure', 'which are to be eaten'). This deliberate choice of word order in 11:47 highlights not the pure and what can be eaten, but rather the two negatives of the impure and what cannot be eaten. The inclusion of intent and motivation in a summary statement is unusual within Leviticus' arrangement so far. Thus, vv46-47 is not the usual Xp summary statement that just consolidates the schema's topic; vv46-47 acts to consolidate topic and intent for the whole episode.

3.1 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 11

Consistent with the narrative and instruction in Leviticus 1–7, the recalled speech in 11:2aβ-47 maintains a future orientation as though the instruction is being addressed to Moses to mediate to Israel at Sinai, a newly-formed nation, with the intent that Israel adopts the beliefs and the way of life being commanded by YHWH. As noted earlier, the purpose of living ritual and ritual texts is to shape the identity and worldview of those involved in the communication act. Thus, the disposition of Leviticus 11, like Leviticus 1–7, is deliberative. This aligns with the purpose statement in v47, which makes the intent of Leviticus 11 explicit, which is for Israel to make the distinction between the impure and the pure and between the living things that are to be eaten and those that they are not to eat. Within the persuasive situation, the intent is for Israel at Sinai to learn and so embody the distinction between purity and impurity so that they can be set apart in their purity as a covenant nation. In learning to embody this distinction, Leviticus 11 also motivates Israel to desist from rebellion. Thus, the intent is both to persuade and dissuade. Leviticus 11 dissuades the community from being associated with rebellion so that they do not bear make the association explicit at this point in the text.
the consequence of exclusion from God's presence, while persuading Israel to embody their holy status by being a people whose condition is pure. By this means, both priesthood and people are ensuring that YHWH is sanctified and glorified in their midst (see 10:3). Thus, the desired impact would be to inculcate the ideology of the distinction between the pure and impure within Israel's worldview so that internal attitudes and external actions align to reflect relational order with their covenant God-King.

There are a further three aspects of the episode's arrangement, which we have already identified above, which are part of the rhetorical strategy of the text. The first is the movement within the speech report from instruction for animals and fish where permission precedes prohibition (vv2αβ-8, vv9-12) to instruction that categorically prohibits eating specific birds, insects, and things that crawl on their belly (vv13-19, vv20-23, vv24-28, vv29-40, vv41-45). Since prohibition against eating or touching what is impure and detestable is the focus for the majority of the episode, the emphasis of the text is for the Israelite not to become detestable and impure by associating with what is detestable and impure. The strategy though is for the Israelite to first learn the distinction between impurity and purity (vv2-12) before being prohibited from becoming detestable because of the consequence of exclusion from God's presence.

Second, as we have noted above, vv24-28 interrupt the logic of the text's arrangement to make explicit the consequences of becoming impure and detestable. This highlights the consequence of separation from God's presence and thus the reason why it is imperative for the Israelite not to become detestable by the impure living creatures. The third aspect then is the paraenetic conclusion to vv41-45 before the summary and purpose statements in vv46-47. From a rhetorical perspective, the use of paraenesis explicitly states the motivation for why Israel should avoid that which represents rebellion and thus disorder and, in doing so, they also learn that they must embody purity as the means by which they are to be holy to YHWH their God and thus rid themselves of rebellion. Thus, the rhetorical strategy of the episode's arrangement seeks to achieve the intent of motivating Israel to
make the distinction between the impure and the pure so that they can desist from
detestable behaviour and be set apart by their purity in imitation of their covenant God.

4. Leviticus 12: Instructions for a Woman After the Birth of a Son or a Daughter

Leviticus 12 represents a significant point of departure from the theme of distinguishing
between the impure and the pure in Leviticus 11. Leviticus 12 focuses upon impurity as
contagion and its consequences while addressing the situation where a woman gives birth
to a son or a daughter. The arrangement of the episode is straightforward. The first
paragraph, vv2aβ-4, is a major case where a woman conceives and gives birth to a son. In
this case, the mother is impure (טמא) for seven days, but must wait for 33 days before she
can touch what is holy or approach the sanctuary. The second paragraph, beginning in v5,
shifts the topic to when a daughter is born. In this case, the woman is impure (טמא) for 14
days and she must not approach the sanctuary for 66 days." This second paragraph,
however, continues beyond the case of giving birth to a daughter to enfold into the
paragraph schema instructions for the mother to bring her gifts to the tent of meeting
irrespective of the child being a male or female (v6). Once the days of her purification are
complete, the woman is then able to bring an עלה and a חטאת to the entrance of the tent

---

"There is much conjecture as to why the days of impurity (two weeks) and the time of exclusion (66 days)
in the case of a daughter’s birth is double that of the situation of the son’s birth. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp.
759-751, notes that the explanation for this significant difference is unknown (see also Sklar, Leviticus, p. 179).
However, the arrangement and shape of the text is disinterested in the rationale for the difference; rather, the
shaping of the schema seems to be concerned with the consequence of being in an impure state, which is
separation from the holy (v2, v4, v5). This is contrary also to Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 165-166, who builds on
Hoffmann’s argument suggesting that the origin of the impurity is the flesh and thus the reason why the first
case has a reduced length of time is due to the male’s circumcision on the eighth day that acts to purify the
woman. While Trevaskis responds helpfully to Milgrom’s critique of Hoffmann’s argument, there are a couple
of problems with the argument. First, the term ‘flesh’ is only used in 12:3 whereas the impurity is associated
in v2 with the same kind of impurity as for menstruation (see also v5). Consistent with v2 is the declaration
in 17 that the consequence of הדם being made on her behalf is that she will be pure from the ‘flow of her
blood’. Thus, the source of impurity seems more likely to have an association with the loss of blood in the
afterbirth phase (see also Sklar, Leviticus, p. 174). Second, the woman is declared impure for seven days in v2,
which assumes that she is not impure on the eighth and so the act of circumcision cannot have the function
of purifying the woman. Third, the woman is only declared pure once her gifts are surrendered to YHWH and
חטאת is made for her (v7). Thus, these three points undermine Trevaskis’ argument. For the sake of
understanding the intent shaping the text, our focus needs to be upon the focus of the text, not necessarily
delving into questions that the text itself is not asking.
of meeting for בּשָׂר. Only then is the mother purified from her loss of blood (v7b). The summary statement in v7cδ is a typical Xp clause that reactivates and thus consolidates the episodic schema; however, in this instance, the summary is not final. Instead, a third paragraph gives provision for the woman who cannot afford a lamb for the two gifts, but who instead is to bring two doves or pigeons for בּשָׂר. ⁴⁴

4.1 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 12

There are two observations about the emphases of Leviticus 12’s arrangement. First, the mother’s impurity is contagious. The text does not focus upon how this contagion might affect everyday articles of clothing, seats, or other people that she may have contact with (cf. Lev 15). Rather, v4 accentuates that she is unable to touch the holy or to approach the sanctuary during the days of waiting. The woman in a condition of impurity, or at least in a condition where she is still undergoing purification, is excluded from having contact with things that belong to God and the place where God is present in the midst of his people (see Ex. 25:8). ⁴⁵ The second observation then is that it is necessary for her to offer an עולה and a תָּנָא תֵּהוֹד gift to be declared pure. ⁴⁶ The עולה gift enables the mother to be accepted in

⁴⁴ N.B. The singular pronominal suffix modifying the hiphil of קִרְצָה in v7a is surprising since the mother is to bring the two gifts of an עולה and a תָּנָא תֵּהוֹד to the entrance to the tent of meeting. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–6, p. 759, argues that the singular can encompass all that is brought as a gift to the tent of meeting at one time. Thus, its feasible to view the use of the singular as a collective.

⁴⁵ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–6, p. 761, states that the added case in v8 is ‘clearly a later supplement’ due to being placed after the summary statement at the conclusion of v7 and due to a difference in terminology. While there is a difference in verbal language, the differences and the addition after the condition may simply accentuate that this is not to be the norm for the Israelite woman. For v8 being an appendix, see Hartley, Leviticus, p. 166.

⁴⁶ Sklar, Leviticus, p. 176, suggests that the instruction not to touch what is holy or to go to the sanctuary emphasises ‘the importance of respecting the Lord by respecting those things associated with his holiness.’ While this is certainly a by-product of the text's arrangement and of v4 especially, the clause אל לא אמרהו לא תנא תנה לתחי, which incidentally is marked by the use of an Xp clause, highlights the sanctuary precincts as the place where she is not to go. This is not an emphasis upon respecting what belongs to YHWH, but rather being excluded from the place that represents God’s presence with his people. See also Hartley, Leviticus, 168, p. 169, ‘Being unclean means solely that the mother is to be separated from the holy until this abnormal situation is corrected, until her body is whole again.’

⁴⁷ Sklar, Leviticus, p. 174, observes a three-stage process of purification in both cases. The first stage is the initial time of impurity (v2a2, v3b) followed by a second stage of either 33 or 66 days depending upon whether the child is a male or female, and then the third stage is the offering process of the עולה and the תָּנָא תֵּהוֹד. While this is a helpful breaking down of the process, worth noting is that the woman is not declared
God’s presence (the function of the כפר) so that she can then be restored from her impurity (the function of the חטאת). Her purification and restoration process is complete only when כפר has been made and she can be declared pure (חטאת). Although we do not know why the ‘flow of blood’ (12:7) is a cause of impurity, what we can deduce is that this ‘blood’ represents incompleteness so that she is excluded from the holy. The goal of כפר, therefore, is that she is restored to a condition of wholeness. Thus, the arrangement of Leviticus 12 is not concerned with why a mother is made impure by the loss of blood in childbirth, only that she is impure and the consequences of her impurity. The consequence is that her impure state stops her from approaching God in his sanctuary. She is restored to a condition of wholeness, and thus is able to have contact with the holy, only once כפר is made on her behalf.

The above two observations about the arrangement of the text are significant for understanding the text’s rhetorical strategy. By presenting two sequential cases addressing the birth of the son and then the birth of the daughter, the text repeats the two essential ideas of the arrangement, which is that being in the condition of impurity is contagious and the consequence of being in this condition is exclusion from God’s presence. If this

---

pure until after the gift process reaches completion. For a similar point of view, see Hartley, Leviticus, p. 169, and D. Hoffmann, Das Buch Leviticus, Band 1 (Berlin: Poppelaue, 1995), p. 263, who observes that the purpose of כפר, which in their view is expiation, deals with the impurity excluding the woman from approaching the sanctuary precinct. However, Hartley, Leviticus, p. 169, notes that there is purification of general sinfulness. Yet the impurity of the woman is not due to her general sinfulness, but rather due to what her impurity represents.

This is aligned with the intent of both the עלה and the חטאת that we observed in Leviticus 1 and 4. Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, p. 169, and Sklar, Leviticus, p. 179 suggests (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 169). Also, the use of the חטאת does not suggest that the impurity is a result of sin; rather, there is a need for purification leading to restoration to YHWH’s presence after having been in a condition of impurity, albeit ritual impurity. This is a different understanding from Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 760, who argues that the function of כפר by the חטאת is to ‘purge’ the pollution from the altar resulting from the women’s ‘severe and prolonged discharge.’ Yet Milgrom’s argument is founded on the notion that impurity is ‘miasma’ that accumulates upon the altar. This, however, is not the place for an evaluation of Milgrom’s understanding of impurity. The logic of Leviticus 12 suggests that care must be taken for impurity not to come into contact with the holy. It is the condition of impurity that the mother represents due to the ‘flow of her blood’ that causes the separation. Thus, the חטאת is not above removal of miasma, but rather a restoration of the woman to YHWH’s presence.
exclusion is to be overcome, then blood needs to be shed for כפר and for restoration to God's presence. These two ideas represent two fundamental beliefs about order and disorder in the YHWH-Israel relationship and is part of the worldview the ritual process teaches. Furthermore, Leviticus 12 sustains the future orientation of instruction with the purpose that it shapes future action and so continues to exemplify a deliberative disposition. Thus, the impact of repetition, along with the future orientation of the text, is to warn and instil the values foundational to the Hebrew worldview. The warning is of the consequence of being in an impure condition. By inculcating the belief that impurity is contagious and thus there is a need for כפר to be restored to relational wholeness, Israel at Sinai is motivated to seek כפר when in a condition of impurity. The following episodes will then build on this basis articulating the need for separation from impurity (Leviticus 13–14) and the consequence of permanent exclusion if the nation persists in an impure condition in the future (Leviticus 15).

5. Leviticus 13–14: Instructions for the בצרעת of Skin, Clothing, and Houses

The theme of Leviticus 13–14 is instruction for a בצרעת and more particularly pertaining to skin (13:1-46, 14:1-32), clothing (13:47-59), and houses (14:33-53). This represents a significant point of departure from the theme of Leviticus 12. Initially, the episodic schema in 13:1-46 focuses solely upon when a person has a swelling, rash, or spot, ‘on the skin of his flesh’ (בעור-בשרו) that could be a בצרעת נגע (‘an affliction of disease’). Each paragraph within 13:1-46 addresses a variation where the בצרעת could be a sign of skin

Please see Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 187-190, for a discussion on the meaning of בצרעת. There is undoubtedly a symbolic level operating within Leviticus 13–14 and particularly focusing upon the בצרעת. Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 110-119, summarises and assesses the historical arguments for the symbolism of the בצרעת. In doing so, he clarifies what the symbolism is not, which is representing the consequence of a specific sin and so he states, ‘Those diagnosed with this disease are not accused as sinful’ (Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 112). However, he does suggest that the need for a חטאת implies a general connection with sin (Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 113). Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 132-139, observes that the reason why the instances of גנט בצרעת are declared to be impure is that the infection goes deeper than the ‘skin of the flesh’ and that the flesh becomes exposed. Based on this observation, he proposes that the symbolic dimension in Leviticus 13 is related to בשר, which has the cognitive domain of ‘human rebellion against Yahweh and its divine punishment’ (Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 145). While Trevaskis’ argument is intriguing, it still needs assessment, since the accessibility of this domain seems distant and tenuous.
disease (13:1-8, 13:9-17, 13:40-44), an inflamed spot (13:18-23), a burn (13:24-28), or a rash (13:38-39). Each describes how the person with the чрезгуз on his or her skin must approach the priest who is to determine whether the person is impure."

Predominantly, the person who is declared impure is where the affliction has spread deeper than the skin and/or there is raw flesh (v3, v8, v10, v14, v20, v22, v25, v27, v30, v35, v43). For instance, in the case of the swelling, rash, or spot 'on the skin of his flesh' in vv2-8, the priest is to see if the hair has turned white and the affliction is deeper than the skin of the flesh (מעורעמוקבשרו), in which instance the priest is to declare the person 'impure'. If the affliction has not spread after two consecutive seven-day periods, then the priest can pronounce the person 'pure' (vv4-7). Verse 8 then clarifies that if there is a significant spreading of the affliction after the priest has purified him or her, then the priest shall declare the person 'impure'.

While the first case in vv2-8 deals with the situation where there is ambiguity about whether there is skin disease, the second case in vv9-17 deals with the scenario where the person knows the issue with his skin is a чрезгуз. In the logic of the text, the distinction between a pure skin disease and when the person is impure is the presence of white hair and raw flesh (v10, v14) signalling impurity, whereas if the disease covers the whole of the person, then he or she is declared pure (vv12-13). Thus, as each paragraph progresses to the next, and so each case, the text reiterates the distinction between the conditions of impurity and purity; namely, a чрезгуз making a person impure is when the cause spreads or is deeper than the surface of the skin, while a person considered pure is where there is a diminishing of the affliction or there is no exposed flesh.

Verses 45-46, the final paragraph before the shift in topic to the чрезгуз of clothing in v47, instructs the person who is declared to have a defiling disease to separate themselves by

---

"See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 183.

*"Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 132-135 observes that there is always a concern in the examination by the priest to see if the disease is deeper than the skin of the flesh. Moreover, he notes that the sign that an affliction is a cause of being contagious is that the flesh is living i.e. raw (בשר חי). Also the use of מחית seems to allow for the possibility of the flesh being 'raw' and so I have chosen to keep the translation 'raw flesh'. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 191.

"See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 191; Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 133.
lamenting, covering the lower part of their face, crying out that they are impure, and living in isolation outside of the camp.“ Verses 45-46 are unambiguous; the person declared impure must remain separated for as long as they are in this condition. The use of the Xp clause at the conclusion of v46 is purposeful since living alone outside of the camp is not just exclusion from people, but also from God's presence.” This represents a greater degree of separation than either Leviticus 11 or 12.

While Leviticus 14:1-32 returns to the topic of a בפשע of the skin, the embedded episode in 13:47-59 interrupts what would be a logical progression from identifying defiling skin disease (13:1-46) to seeking purification from the condition of impurity (14:1-32).“ The embedded episode in 13:47-59 sustains a focus upon the theme of the בפשע, but this time shifts the topic to that of clothing. The episodic schema displays a three-paragraph arrangement with the Xp summary statement in 13:59 consolidating the whole. The first paragraph in vv47-52 is the major case concerning a 'mark of בפשע (i.e. mould) in a garment of wool, linen, or leather.” Once more, the person with the garment must take it to the priest who is to determine whether the בפשע is destructive (מאר) and so is to be declared impure.” The consequence then is that it is to be destroyed by fire (שרף). The following two paragraphs are minor cases addressing situations proceeding from the first

103 J. Kleinig, Leviticus (Saint Louis, MS: Concordia, 2003), pp. 277-278, and Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 154, both observe and argue that vv40-46 forms a whole paragraph. While there is cohesion between vv40-44 and vv45-46, vv45-46 can refer to any of the cases of major impurity in 13:2-44 where the person is declared impure due to an affliction of skin disease. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 193; Levine, Leviticus, p. 82. 104 This is a similar argument to Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 155, who states, 'Together they symbolize this person's exclusion from life in God's immediate presence and entry into the realm of death'. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 200. 105 Contrary Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 808, and Noth, Leviticus, pp. 106-107, who argue for 13:47-59 being a dislocation and a later addition. Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 125, observes that 'the materials, listed in Lev. 13:47-59, contract the same disease as humans (i.e. בפשע) which encourages one to uncover the rationale for their present location before resorting to diachronic explanations.' 106 At this point I cannot agree with Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 157, that 'fabrics symbolize a human.' While the text uses the same term בפשע to describe the disease afflicting the material, this does not necessarily mean that the material has a symbolic dimension or that the fabrics are being personified. 107 I have translated בפשע as 'destructive'. I recognise the meaning is unclear. Levine, Leviticus, p. 83, notes that the meaning is 'destructive' although chooses to render the phrase 'malignant eruption'. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 812, suggests the association with the idea of 'chronic'.
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case in vv47-59. The second paragraph, vv53-55, addresses the situation where, if the mould has not spread on the garment after the first seven days of isolation as instructed in v50, then the garment is to be washed and isolated for a further seven days (vv54). If the mould is still apparent to the priest, then the clothing is to be destroyed by fire (שרף) since it is declared impure (v55). The third paragraph, vv56-58, is then dependent upon the priest examining the mark of mould after it has been washed (v56a) and, if the mark has diminished (v56b), then the priest shall remove the cloth with mould from the garment to test if the mould will spread once more (vv56c-57). If the mould reappears, then the garment must be destroyed by fire (שרף; v57). However, in the instance that the mould does not spread again, then it is to be washed a second time and be declared pure (v58).

The Xp summary statement in v59 communicates the intent of the instruction, which is to distinguish whether the garment is pure or impure. The logic of the arrangement, by use of repetition and the cumulative nature of each case, suggests that the condition of impurity is where the mark of mould is persistent or spreading and thus the consequence is its destruction, whereas the garment declared pure is where the mould has diminished.\footnote{N.B. My argument is that the destruction of the material is a consequence of it being declared impure and is not, as Trevaskis argues, the symbolic meaning of impurity (see Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 159).}

Leviticus 14:1-32 returns to the issue of skin disease, but with a significant development. The XP onset marker in v2a topicalises the schema to focus upon a person with a skin disease and particularly on the day of his or her purification. The progression of the schema is dependent upon the priest going outside the camp to meet the afflicted person and seeing that the skin disease is healed (v3). Verses 4-20 narrate an eight-day process where there is a gradual 'overcoming' of the separation between the healed person and God’s presence. The first phase of purification involves the bringing of two pure birds with cedar wood, scarlet yarn, and hyssop. The priest will then command the person to kill one pure bird over pure water, dipping the living bird, along with the cedar wood, yarn, and hyssop, into the blood of the first bird (v6). Using the blood-dipped living bird, the priest
splatters the healed person seven times with the blood and pronounces the person 'pure' (piel השחריר; v7).

The live bird is then freed in an open field (v7). The second phase begins with the healed person washing clothes and bathing him or herself (hithpael מתחם; v8), after which he or she is then able to enter into the camp, although remaining outside his or her tent for seven days (v8). On the seventh day, the healed person must shave off all hair, wash his or her clothes, and bathe, and they are stated once again to be pure (ωστὰς πυρήνης; v9).

The third phase overcomes the period of exclusion completely as the healed person, on the eighth day, is presented before YHWH by the priest, with two male lambs and an ewe that are areام and מנהה מינתה (v10). Only after each gift is offered – an ἁς (vv11-18), a תאתא (v19), and the second מינתה_UL (v20) – has been made and the healed person declared pure (ωστὰς πυρήνης).

The movement within the purification process therefore is from exclusion outside the camp to being in the presence of God. The second paragraph, vv21-32, in the episodic schema then addresses the situation where the healed person is poor. This scenario still requires an ἁς (vv24-25), a תאתא, an ἁς, and a תאתא (vv30-31), although of animals and birds of less economic value, to be offered for כפר before YHWH (v31c). Significantly, by both paragraphs repeating the list of gifts that are to

---

126 The piel השחריר in v7b can be translated 'he is declared pure'. While I recognise that the athnaq occurs under the last word of the previous clause (משמיס), this does not necessitate that the declaration by the priest begins the second phase of the purification process and neither does it suggest that the person is somehow partially pure and partially impure. Rather, after the blood rite with the two birds in the first phase, the priest declares the person pure before they proceed with purifying themselves by bathing that allows them to then return within the camp. Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 839.

127 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 843, notes that the 'level' of impurity after these seven days suggests that the 'healed scale-diseased person is equivalent to the new mother (of a male), zāb/zaḥā, the menstruant, and the corpse-contaminated person at the commencement of their purificatory periods, who are contagion by direct contact and who must wait seven days for the next stage of their purification'. While there is merit in the idea that the similarities in the length of time of exclusion suggests similar levels of impurity, worth noting is that the new mother of a son still has 33 days of separation from the sanctuary before she can have contact with the holy (see Lev. 11:4) and thus cannot be at the same stage as the one who, on the eighth day, can approach the sanctuary with the two gifts.

128 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 846-848 deems there to be symmetry within vv11-23 where v11 and v23 emphasise the purpose of purification, while the centre of the symmetry in v16 is where the oil is dedicated to YHWH. Evaluating this argument of symmetry is not possible at this point, but it is worth noting that if the symmetry is present, then this would indeed strengthen the overall movement from exclusion to being in the presence of God.
be offered for נפשו, the arrangement accentuates that purification is complete by the
shedding of blood and so נפשו for restoration on the healed person's behalf.\textsuperscript{129}

A third embedded episode, 14:33-57, then shifts the topic for the final time within the
schema of Leviticus 13–14 to focus upon the situation where, after YHWH has brought
Israel into the land for their possession, he gives a נפש נגע in a house.\textsuperscript{129} Once more, the
progression of the schema is dependent upon the owner recognising the נפש נגע and
approaching the priest (v35) who shall then determine whether the mould is contagion
conditional upon whether it has spread after seven days (vv36-39). If the נפש has spread,
then the priest is to command that the 'diseased' stones and mortar are to be replaced and
thrown away in an impure place outside the city (vv40-42). Again, the following two minor
cases in vv43-47 and vv48-53 are dependent upon the first major case. The first minor
case in vv43-47 is conditional upon the 'mark' reappearing after all the affected mortar,
clay, and stones have been replaced (v43). If the priest finds that the mould has indeed
spread, then the house is declared impure (v44). The consequence is that the house must
be torn down and all material taken outside of the town to an impure place.\textsuperscript{131} Verses 46-47
note first that the consequence of anyone who enters into the house when it is closed will
be impure until evening and second, anyone who eats or sleeps in the house must wash
their clothes. The logic of the text accentuates that impurity is contagious and the

\textsuperscript{129} Similarly, Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 862, observes, 'It should be noted that those rites are precisely the
same as in the previous pericope. They are repeated in order to emphasize that they are not to be
compromised; they are the quintessential element in the final stage of purification.

\textsuperscript{129} A critical question is why the instructions about the mould in houses is the last embedded episode
following the prescription about the purification of the healed person from skin disease (14:1-32). A
reasonable suggestion is that both 14:1-32 and 14:33-53 concern taking the impure person or material outside
of the camp/city. This association may have led to the order of topics addressed in the embedded episodes.
Also, as Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 864, highlights, there is an issue of context. The previous sections
addressed problems of נגע that are applicable to Israel at Sinai, whereas the instruction about mould in
houses is only applicable to life in the land. Thus, if 13:33-53 was placed before any other block of instruction,
it would affect where the instruction is to be implemented i.e. the instruction is for future generations in the land.

\textsuperscript{131} Hartley, Leviticus, p. 199, explains that the use of נתץ suggests 'the complete destruction of something'.
Thus, this is a consistent principle with the garments where the persistently impure cloth must be destroyed
by fire (13:52, 57).
consequence of being declared impure is separation. This is consistent with Leviticus 11 where the consequence of being impure until the evening implies separation from God's presence for that period. The second minor case then is the converse of the previous paragraph in vv43-47 and addresses the situation where the priest examines the reconstructed house from vv40-42 and the 'mark' has not spread. In this instance, the priest declares the house 'pure' and, following a similar process to the first phase of the purification and restoration process for the person healed of skin disease in vv4-7, acts to make כפר for the house by the blood of a sacrificed bird, water, a live bird, with the cedar wood, hyssop, and scarlet yarn (vv49-53).

Intriguingly, the final paragraph in vv54-57 closes and consolidates the whole episodic schema, including the embedded episodes, by reactivating all the topics within the theme of the צרה in Leviticus 13–14. Unusually though, there are two Xp summary statements in vv54-57 and thus they form a double conclusion. The first instance in vv54-55 is much more discursive by emphasising that the instruction is for all the marks (לכל־נגע), repeating all the topics addressed in Leviticus 13–14. The second Xp summary statement in v57αβ succinctly reiterates the broad theme of the צרה. However, between the two discontinuity markers, the beginning of v57 explicitly states the intent of the episode, which is to teach when a צרה is impure and when it is pure.

5.1 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 13–14

The disposition and strategy of Leviticus 13–14 resembles Leviticus 11 particularly with each episode accentuating the distinction between impurity and purity. Leviticus 13–14

---

132 The similarity in the bird blood rite between 14:49-53 and the first phase of purification for the person healed from skin disease (14:4-7) may be a third reason why this embedded episode is arranged after 14:1-32. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 864.
133 See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 199, and Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 885.
134 I have understood the verbal root ירה to mean 'teach', rather than 'determine', contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 884. Milgrom argues that the intent of the episode is to implement prescription and thus rendering the verbal root as 'to determine' is more helpful to 'describe the act of applying the procedure'. Yet the text does more than teach procedure, it also teaches about the nature of impurity and purity.
sustains the same future orientation that seeks to impact the future actions and also character of Israel. There is, however, a thematic progression between the two episodes, which seems to be part of the text's rhetorical strategy. Whereas Leviticus 11 teaches the distinction between the pure and the impure, Leviticus 13–14 accentuates the corrupting and spreading nature of impurity and so highlights the consequence of impurity as being contagious. Also, Leviticus 13–14 addresses situations both within the camp (13:46, 14:1-32) and within the land (14:33-53). The similarity of language, such as the two prepositional phrases למחנה מחוץ and לעיר אל־מחנה and the conceptual similarity of separating that which is declared impure suggests that the camp is paradigmatic of, or a microcosm of, Israel's settlements in the land. Thus, there is a relationship between relational order within the camp and relational order in the land. This is significant then for the intent and impact of the episode in the 'present' generation of Israel at Sinai who, having been formed into a new covenant nation, now need to reflect relational order with their covenant God-King. The intent then is for the nation to learn the distinction between what is impure and pure and also the consequences of both conditions. By learning this separation within the ritual dimension, the ideal impact is for Israel to embody this separation and so avoid the corrupting influence of impurity and its consequence of exclusion from God's presence.

Moreover, there is an intensification of the duration of the penalty between Leviticus 11 and Leviticus 13–14 perhaps due to the emphasis upon the corrupting nature of impurity. This intensification is part of the rhetorical strategy to heighten both the necessity and responsibility of the nation and priesthood to separate themselves from corrupting influences, and from their rebellion, because of the threat of permanent exclusion from YHWH's presence.

See Joosten, People and Land, pp. 145-148, 195, 204-205.
6. Leviticus 15: Instructions for When a Man or a Woman has a Discharge

The arrangement of Leviticus 15 is purposefully symmetrical. The episodic schema has four paragraphs organised in a corresponding schema where the two atypical cases enclose the two cases pertaining to normal functions of copulation and menstruation:³⁶

| Pa 1 | vv2bβ-15 | When a man has a discharge from his flesh (Atypical) |
| Pa 2 | vv16-18  | When a man has an emission of semen (Normal)         |
| Pa 3 | vv19-24  | When a woman has a discharge of blood (Normal)       |
| Pa 4 | vv25-31  | When the woman has a discharge of blood for many days (Atypical) |

Moreover, Milgrom observes that there is a more detailed symmetry within this arrangement with the atypical cases following the same pattern of logic: definition of impurity (vv2b-3, v25), the consequences of being contagious (vv4-12, vv26-27), and then the process of purification (vv4-12, vv28-30).³⁷ The cases addressing the normal discharges for both the man and the woman each have two parts of logic that describes the contagious nature of the discharge (vv16-17, vv19-23) and then the consequence for sexual intercourse (vv18, v24).³⁸ This corresponding structure is part of the rhetorical strategy, not merely as an aid for memorisation, but to reinforce by repetition the belief that impurity is contagious, which has consequences. This is evident by making three significant observations about this corresponding arrangement.

³⁶ This is similar to Hartley, Leviticus, p. 296, and Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 905. Milgrom views the four paragraphs as a chiastic arrangement where the central focus is on sexual intercourse in v18. While the cases certainly do seem to correspond with the two atypical cases enclosing the two normal cases, I’m not convinced that a chiastic arrangement is present. The cases each form paragraphs, which do indeed correspond, but v18 is part of the case in vv16-18 and there are no semantic or pragmatic structures in the text to suggest that v18 breaks the information flow and that we are dealing with the central point of a chiastic structure. Also, v24 addresses the issue of sexual intercourse within the case of the menstruating woman, yet Milgrom has not marked this verse for the same prominence as v18.

³⁷ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 904.

³⁸ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 904.
First, the emphasis of each case is a stark contrast with the logic of Leviticus 13–14. The progression of the episodic schema in Leviticus 13–14 is developed by the need to resolve whether or not the case of a צערת is a cause of impurity. Leviticus 15 does not contain ambiguity. In each case, the discharge, emission, or the loss of blood, is a cause of impurity (v3, v16, v19, v25).

Second, once each case defines the particular situation of discharge and its impurity, the text is then concerned with how the impurity is contagious and its consequences (vv4-12, vv17-18, vv19b-24, vv26-27). For example, anything a person, man or woman, with an impure discharge lays or sits upon will become impure (15:4, 9, 20, 26); similarly, a person who touches the person, the bed, or the couch, will also be impure until the evening (vv5-8, vv10-11, v18, vv22-24, v27). In the case of a man with a discharge 'from his flesh' (vv2-15), if he spits on anyone who is pure, then they too will be impure until evening (v8). Moreover, any clay pot he touches must be broken and a wooden utensil must be washed with water (v12). In the case of an emission of semen in sexual intercourse both the man and the woman are impure until evening (v18), and when a man has sexual relations with a menstruating woman then he is impure for seven days and any bed he lies upon also becomes impure (v24). As per Leviticus 11, the consequence of being impure for a length of time, whether it be until evening or for seven days, implies that the person in the condition of impurity is excluded from entering the sanctuary and thus from God's presence for that length of time. Third, each case highlights the need for purification and restoration both for those who have been in contact with contagion and those who are contagion on account of their discharge (men) or loss of blood (women).

The person who is affected by the contagious nature of impurity is required to bathe in

---

139 Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 913, makes a similar observation, 'This chapter is primarily concerned with the communicability of impurity, whereas the previous pericope, on scale disease (chaps, 13–14), says nothing on this matter.' Milgrom rightly notes that the concern of Leviticus 15 is the contagious nature of impurity, but then he continues, 'This difference can only be explained by the premise that the scale-diseased person is banished from the community and, hence, has no contact with persons or objects, whereas those experiencing sexual fluxes continue to reside at home.' While this is a fair assessment, the reason why Leviticus 15 emphasises contagion, and the other does not, may also be due to other concerns shaping the text as I will argue below.
water and wash their clothes (15:10, 11, 18, 22, 27). Moreover, in the cases of a man's discharge 'from his flesh' and a woman's discharge of blood, once the discharge has finished and after the seven-day period of exclusion, he or she is to come before YHWH with two gifts, a אֵשeph and an אֹלֶל, so that קָרֵשׁ can be made (vv13-15, vv28-30). In the second case where a man has an emission of semen, he must bathe his whole body with water and wait for the time of exclusion to reach completion before being restored to a condition of purity (v16)." Thus, the emphasis of each case, and so each paragraph, is not upon determining whether or not the person is impure or pure, but rather declaring they are contagious, and so highlighting the consequence of becoming impure and the need for purification and restoration.

The whole schema culminates with paraenesis in v31. The sudden use of the second person addresses Moses and Aaron directly since YHWH is speaking directly to Moses and Aaron in v1." The purpose of the second person address is to heighten the responsibility of separating (רוּחַם) the Israelites from their impurity (v31a)." The consequence is expressed negatively, which is so the Israelites will not die in their impurity (בִּטְמָא) as a consequence of desecrating (בֵּטְמָא) YHWH's sanctuary in their midst. This is true not only for the instructions pertaining to genital discharge, but also for any cause of ritual impurity." Impurity separates the Israelites from God and so is associated with relational

---

143 Sklar, Leviticus, pp. 45-46, 199, explains the differences between the purification rituals based upon the gradations of purity. Minor impurities only require a person to wash and wait until evening, while major impurities require atonement. Thus, Sklar, Leviticus, p. 190, states 'Because these discharges caused differing levels of impurity, some required more thorough cleansing rites than others'.

144 See also Hieke, Leviticus 1–15, p. 355.

145 Please note that Hartley, Leviticus, p. 213, views the separation in 15:31 between the common and the holy. Furthermore, he notes, 'The primary purpose of these laws on ritual purity in regard to sexual discharges was to separate from the holy any activity that belonged to the sphere of the common, the sphere of earthly existence' (Hartley, Leviticus, p. 214). However, the separation that is being addressed in 15:31 is the most critical within Leviticus, which is between the condition of impurity and the state of holiness. The sanctuary has the state of being holy, while the instructions in Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15 focus upon the distinction between the conditions of purity and impurity with the conviction that the impure is what an Israelite needs to avoid since the holy being defiled and profaned by the impure results in death. The contact of the common with the holy does not have such explosive consequences. Thus, Hartley's understanding at this point cannot be upheld.

146 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 945, questions which impurity (טמא) v31a is referring to in particular. He outlines
disorder and death. Thus, the arrangement of Leviticus 15 accentuates once more the consequence of impurity, which is exclusion from God's presence, and the need for purification and, with the exception of the second case, כפר by surrendering the two gifts of the חטאת and the עולה to YHWH. While this exclusion from God's presence represents death, since it is the antithesis of life, the consequence of remaining in impurity is permanent exclusion through death, whether that is a physical death or exile. Expressed positively, Leviticus 15 shows the need for כפר if Israel is to have life with their God–King in their midst.

6.1 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 15

Once more, the recalled speech in Leviticus 15:2b already sustains a future orientation and so also the situation of Israel at Sinai. For the present generation at Sinai, the nation is to implement the instruction within the camp and then in the land. Thus, once more, Leviticus 15 displays a deliberative disposition. By enacting the ritual process of impure discharges, the new nation internalises YHWH's worldview that impurity is contagious and the consequence is exclusion. The intent is that Israel heeds the warning of exclusion and when they do become impure, they are then motivated to seek reconciliation in the presence of YHWH so that their impurity is overcome.

This intent is achieved by two particular aspects of Leviticus 15’s rhetorical strategy. The first aspect is repetition through the schematic progression of the four cases, which inculcates the belief that impurity, as a means of being contagious, has consequence and yet also a means of restoration. Since the consequence is exclusion from God’s presence,

---

three options. First, it is a reference to all the causes of impurity in Leviticus 11–15. Second, it is a later insertion by H still referring to the impurities of Leviticus 11–15; or third, the impurity of genital discharge only. Milgrom concludes, ‘A definitive answer eludes me.’ Since v31 is part of the schema addressing the impurity of discharge, one can assume that the impurity being referred to in v31 concerns that described in Leviticus 15. Yet the general reference to מָזַן suggests that this would reactivate all causes of contagion described in Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15 so far.
restoration requires, for major impurity at least, through the surrendering of gifts that reconcile and allow God’s covenant people to be accepted into God’s presence.

The second dimension of the rhetorical strategy is the sudden use of the first and second person in v31. The impact is jarring, and purposefully so. YHWH speaks directly to the priesthood and thus heightening their responsibility to separate Israel from her impurity. Through this direct address, YHWH claims his sanctuary as his own (משכן). In the future, if there is priestly failure, then the warning of v31 is that if Israel is not separated from her impurity, then permanent exclusion from God’s presence will result, which could be physical death for some and exile for others.

6.2 The Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15

Traditionally, Leviticus 11–15 has been grouped together thematically as purity laws, rather than being approached as four distinctive episodes. Even by my analysis above, it is evident that there is a clear conceptual coherence within these four consecutive episodes. Nevertheless, grouping these four episodes together as one unit misses their progression and strategy. Hartley proposes that Leviticus 11–15 has been arranged with each major section increasing the length of time a person is impure and so is excluded from approaching God’s presence. There is certainly merit to Hartley’s argument as is evident in the first three rows in Table 9 below, with the exception of 15:1-33 (final column).

---

144 Hartley, Leviticus, p. 208, argues that 15:31 ‘has been added into the speech for its present setting, for it stands aloof from the context.’ While 15:31 does appear within the schema suddenly, this does not necessarily mean that the use of paraenesis at this point is detached from its context. Hieke, Levitikus 1–15, p. 545, acknowledges that 15:31 is undoubtedly a result of redaction, but rather being disconnected, the addition functions to form a relationship between Leviticus 11–15 and Leviticus 10 as well as with Leviticus 16.

145 Hartley, Leviticus, p. 139.

146 Hartley, Leviticus, p. 139, argues that the lengths of impurity in Leviticus 15 ‘corresponds’ to the previous three chapters i.e. hours (Lev. 11), months (Lev. 12), years (Lev. 13–14). Yet Hartley’s categories do not hold up since Leviticus 12 uses the length of days (7+33/66) and the length of time in Leviticus 13–14 is not stated and, furthermore, Hartley’s schema does not take into account the consequence of destroying the clothing and houses when found persistently impure (Lev. 13–14). Thus, it is probably too much of a stretch to say that the length of impurity in Leviticus 15 ‘corresponds’ to the lengths of time in Leviticus 11–14. For these reasons, Table 9 below has some of changed categories in comparison to Hartley’s argument.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living creatures that cannot be eaten or touched</td>
<td>Childbirth</td>
<td>שרעת של השלג</td>
<td>שרעת של בגדי</td>
<td>שרעת של בתים</td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Exclusion</th>
<th>Until evening</th>
<th>7 days + 33 days when a son is born</th>
<th>Outside of the camp until disease is healed</th>
<th>Destroyed by deconstruction and taken to an impure place outside the city</th>
<th>Seven days exclusion for cases of male and female discharge; until evening for an emission of semen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'For I am YHWH your God and you are to set yourselves apart and be holy for I am holy' (11:44-45)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So the Israelites shall not die in their impurity because they have desecrated YHWH's dwelling place in their midst (15:31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Correspondence</th>
<th>Learning to make the distinction between the impure and the pure</th>
<th>Impurity as contagion and the consequence</th>
<th>Learning what is impure and pure so that Israel can be separate from impurity</th>
<th>Impurity as contagion and the consequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 9: The Arrangement of Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, 15

While the paraenesis in 15:31 increases the severity of the time of exclusion due to impurity desecrating God's dwelling place, this is not actually a penalty of the impurity itself but rather the consequence of Israel not being separated from impurity and seeking to be restored to YHWH's presence. Moreover, the seven-days of separation in three of four cases in Leviticus 15 is a shorter time of exclusion than either case in Leviticus 12 (7+33 or 66 days). Thus, while there is a lengthening of the exclusion period between 11:1-48, 12:1-8, and 13:1-14:57, Leviticus 15 does not complete this pattern of progression. However, worth noting is that both Leviticus 11 and 15 conclude with paraenesis before
their Xp summary statements that close each episode. The paraenesis in 11:44-45 gives a positive motivation for embodying the distinction between the impure and the pure, while 15:31 is negative. Also, the overwhelming emphasis of each episode is upon the nature and consequence of impurity, which culminates in the 'crunch' of 15:31.

Furthermore, there seems to be a corresponding pattern between the episodes where the correspondence is thematic (as per the final row in Table 9 above). The strategy of this arrangement seems to emphasise first the nature of purity and impurity and second that impurity is contagious with the penalty of exclusion from God’s presence. The warning in 15:31 makes the intent of the arrangement explicit, which is so that the Israelites do not die in their impurity having profaned YHWH's sanctuary in their midst. Thus, embodying the distinction between purity and impurity ensures that YHWH is both sanctified and glorified. Furthermore, within the global arrangement, 15:31 accentuates the danger of Israel desecrating YHWH's sanctuary – the death of the nation – and so introduces the need to separate Israel's impurity from the tabernacle if this danger is to be assuaged, which is the function then of the next episode in Leviticus 16.47

7. Leviticus 16: The Day of Atonement as a Permanent Statute

While the previous episode concludes in 15:31 with a warning about the Israelites' impurity desecrating YHWH's sanctuary, the function of Leviticus 16 is to provide the means for managing the problem of Israel's impurity by the Day of Atonement becoming an everlasting statute.48 This function of the episode though is not apparent at the beginning, but rather is made clear by the end of the episodic schema. The arrangement of the schema in three paragraphs has a clear conceptual development. The initial paragraph in vv1-2 prohibits Aaron from approaching YHWH in the most holy place. The second paragraph in vv3-28 instructs Aaron about when it is permissible to enter the most holy

47 See also Averbeck, 'Leviticus', pp. 919-920.
48 See also Rendtorff, 'Lev 16 Als Mitte Der Tora', p. 256. He states that the arrangement is purposeful since Leviticus 15 shows the threatening nature of impurity, and why impurity needs to be removed from the sanctuary. Afterwards, Leviticus 16 focuses upon the provision for removing this threat from the sanctuary.
place and the purpose of such an approach. The third paragraph in vv29-34 then establishes the Day of Atonement as a permanent statute for all Israelite generations.

The beginning paragraph in vv1-2 warns Aaron about the consequence of coming before YHWH in the most holy place. Unusually, the first quotative frame in v1α is modified by a narrative sequence of two temporal frames after which YHWH spoke to Moses (v1αβ). The first temporal frame refers back to the fiery event of 10:1-2 where Nadab and Abihu died; notably, 16:1 leaves the two sons of Aaron unnamed. The second temporal frame (v1αγ) then clarifies the circumstance under which the two sons of Aaron died, which is when they approached YHWH. The second quotative frame in v2α is then the access point into the speech report to Moses, which he is, in turn, to mediate to Aaron. The negative particle + jussive (ואל־יבא) together with the categorical בכל־עת strictly prohibits Aaron from entering the Most Holy Place, inside the veil, and before the mercy seat at any time (v2b).

If Aaron respects this prohibition, he will not die (ימות). Thus, the motivation of the prohibition is to preserve Aaron’s life. Verse 2cβ then gives the reason for the prohibition, which is that YHWH will appear in the cloud over the mercy seat. The repetition of the root מות heightens the danger that God’s presence represents; not even Aaron can deign to enter the place where God’s presence dwells among his people. The use of analepsis purposefully heightens the danger that exists for Aaron if he does approach YHWH unbidden; the same fate would await him as it did for his two sons who died.

---

149 There are a couple of points about the rendering of בַּכּל־עָתָן that are worth mentioning. First, while the tone of the speech report’s beginning in v2b is a warning, the semantic structure of בַּכּל־עָתָן is analytic in the jussive conveys a strong prohibition. See Joüon-Muroaka, §114-i. Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, p. 221 fn. 2.a; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1012. Second, I understand the prepositional phrase בַּכּל־עָתָן to mean ‘at any time’ conveying that Aaron does not have the freedom to choose when he enters into the Holy Place. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 221 fn. 2.b, 227. Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1013.

150 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1013, observes that the relationship between Leviticus 10 and Leviticus 16 is logical since Leviticus 10 does not deal with the pollution caused by either Nadab and Abihu’s rebellion or their death. Leviticus 16 then reasonably supplies the purification process. However, the use of analepsis does not establish the need for dealing with the impurity caused by the two sons’ deaths, but rather seeks to warn Aaron about replicating the same mistake and thus the same consequence (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 234; Levine, Leviticus, p. 100; Morales, Who Shall Ascend, p. 148). My suggestion above deviates from Milgrom’s point of view, but is not necessarily contrary to it.
The initiating XP clause in v3, which begins the next paragraph within the arrangement, clarifies that the following instructions are the means by which Aaron is to enter into the Most Holy Place. He is to approach with two gifts of a bull for a חטא תובכ and a ram for an עלה, bathing and putting on his sacred clothes (v4), and with the congregation of Israel also taking two male goats for a חטאת and a ram for an עלה (v5). The schema in vv6-28 progresses through a series of Px clauses where the use of the נאכטאל suggests that, although in the third person, the actions are being performed as the instructions are being given." Thus, vv6-28 instructs the steps and recalls the process for how Aaron made כפר for the impurity, iniquity, rebellion, and sin of Israel. In vv6-10, Aaron draws near with his two gifts, after which he brings the two goats before YHWH and, by lot, chooses which goat belongs to YHWH (חטאת) and which will be the living goat sent into the wilderness. Verses 11-16 narrate how Aaron is to slaughter both his and the people's חטאת and enter into the Most Holy Place to splatter the blood upon (עלפי) the mercy seat. Verse 16 then breaks the narration of the process, although the progression of the information flow itself is not broken, to consolidate the purpose for the gifts from vv11-16. Namely, the function is to make כפר for the Holy place (עלפי) from the

See also p. 107 in Chapter Two for the suggestion of the future performative use of the קטל in Leviticus 16.
There has been considerable discussion about the meaning of לעזאזל. T.C. Cheyne, 'The Date and Origin of the Ritual of the 'Scapegoat', ZAW 15 (1895), p. 154, objects to the idea that לעזאזל represents the notion of a demon and accents that the ritual process is about providing a 'visible sign and proof of the removal of the sins of the year, and of the consequences of those sins.' More recently, M. Douglas, 'The Go-Away Goat' in The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception, ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler (VTS 93, Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 127, argues against the notion of the demonic since this is opposed to 17:7. Alternatively, Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1021, observes the significance of the living goat as a 'vehicle to dispatch Israel's impurities and sins to the wilderness' (see also Levine, Leviticus, p. 136). He also adds that the wilderness is symbolic of a 'netherworld' (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 241). A different view again is, Gorman, Ideology of Ritual, p. 99, who argues that the sending out of the goat into the wilderness represents Israel 'sending its sin, the cause of cosmic, social, and cultic disorder, into the realm of chaos.' A final alternative is proposed by J. C. R. de Roo, 'Was the Goat for Azazel Destined for the Wrath of God,' Bib 81 (2000), p. 298. Roo suggests that לעזאזל means 'for the powerful wrath of God' and that the goat 'becomes a symbol of evil' having had all the sins of Israel transferred to it. He then notes, 'In a barren region, the goat would die from starvation and his death would appease the anger of God.' Given the varied arguments and that the exact concept of לעזאזל does not affect my argument, I will not enter into the debate other than to acknowledge the breadth of disagreement.

As above, I have retained the traditional rendering of כותרת as 'mercy seat' contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1014, who states that 'It can hardly be rendered "mercy seat/throne".'
impurities, rebellions (מְשֻׁשָׁת), and sins of Israel. Verse 16b, echoing 15:31, clarifies why קָפֵר is necessary, which is due to the tent of meeting dwelling in the midst of Israel's impurities. After clarifying the reason for the instructions, the prohibition in v17 highlights that no one is to go into the tent of meeting until the process of קָפֵר for the Most Holy place is complete.

After vv16-17 pauses the progression of the ritual process, vv18-19 resumes the process by outlining how Aaron is to make קָפֵר for the altar, which is by putting the blood of the sacrificial gifts upon the horns of the altar (v18d) and then by sprinkling blood on it seven times (v19a). The goal is both to purify (סחָה) and consecrate (קדש) the altar from the impurities (מְנֶמאָר) of Israel. Only after Aaron has completed the process of making קָפֵר for the Holy Place and the tent of meeting does he then proceed (v20), with both hands pressing upon the head (v21), to confess all the iniquities, rebellions, and sins of Israel over the living goat, and sending the goat away into the wilderness (v22). The chain of two direct objects אָתְכִלָּתָנָה לָיִלָּת יִשְׂרָאֵל חֲטָאתֶם follows by the indirect object לְכָל־חָטָאתָם that, as Hartley expresses it, 'the totality of humans' sinning'. In this instance, the use of the three terms (כָּפָר, מְשֻׁשָּת, חֲטָאת) refers to the entirety of Israel's sinfulness. The purpose of the living goat being sent away into the wilderness is to

---

154 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1037, suggests that the act of placing blood on the horns of the altar purifies (קדש) the head (Resolve 16b), while the act of sprinkling consecrates (קדש) the altar (Resolve 16b). In contrast to Milgrom, Hartley, Leviticus, p. 228, suggests that the act of placing blood on the horns of the altar (Resolve 18d) is for the purpose of קפָרו (Resolve 18b), while the sprinkling of blood in Resolve 19a is to purify and consecrate. Yet the verbal sequence does not seem to assign functions to specific acts; rather, both acts of placing (Resolve 18d) and sprinkling the blood (Resolve 19a) have a purifying and consecrating purpose (Resolve 19b), which seem in this context to be encompassed by the term קפָרו in Resolve 18b. At the very least, the sequence of verbs that convey function (Resolve קפָר, סחָה, קָפֵר) enclose verbs of agency (Resolve קפָר, סחָה, קָפֵר). Hoffmann, Das Buch Leviticus, Band 1 p. 450, suggests that the purpose of purification is to deal with the impurities of Israel (past orientation), while the act of consecrating is to set the altar apart for its purpose (future orientation). This is a helpful way to understand the verbal sequence.

155 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1341, notes that the pressing down on the goat's head with both hands suggests a transference function, 'to convey, by confession, the sins of Israel onto the head of the goat'. Also, worth observing is that there is no mention of ritual impurity in the list of confessions; the three terms refer only to ethical impurity. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 1364, understands this to be a later 'reinterpretation' by H where the original was the living goat carrying away the impurities of Israel.

represent the separation of Israel from the entirety of Israel's sinfulness. Verses 23-25 then finish the sacrificial process by instructing how Aaron is to offer the gifts both for his and the people's behalf. The final phase of logic in vv26-28 focuses upon the need for the priest to release the living goat into the wilderness and then bathe before re-entering the camp.

Verses 29-34a then directly address the Israelites to establish the process of vv3-28 as an everlasting statute for all generations, signalling that the audience is not solely the priesthood but all the people in all generations, irrespective of being in the camp or in the land. Significantly, vv30-31 is prominent by the use of an initial XP contextualising clause in v30a and then an initial Px clause at the beginning of v31 signalling this as part of the foreground within the schema. Verse 30 supplies the rationale for why the Day of Atonement shall be a statute for all time, which is that the day is to purify Israel (לטהר אתכם) from all their sins so that they can be pure before YHWH. It is significant that the verbal language of מכל אתכם לטהר, which has been used to deal with ritual impurity within Leviticus 12–15, is now used in relation to ethical impurity (i.e. חטאת). The initial Px clause in v31 acts to highlight the day as a Sabbath of complete rest (שבתון שבת) for Israel. Verses 32-34a then consolidate the process of the Day of Atonement by reactivating prior information about the high priest needing to wear his sacred clothing (v32, see v4), making כפר for the most holy place (see vv11-17) and for the tent of meeting (v33, see

---

157. While I do not dispute that there is a notion of removal, it is removal as separation (see 15:31) rather than symbolising that ‘their sins had been completely wiped out and the power of these sins was terminated forever (Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 238).

158. The logic in v30 חטאתיכם מכל אתכם לטהר (‘for on this day כפר will be made for you to purify you from all your sins’) relates the goal of purification with the second person ‘you’ and thus the purification is for the people. The process in vv3-28, however, describes the purification of the Most Holy Place, the altar, and the tent of meeting, from the impurities of Israel. There is a significant shift between what or who is being purified in vv3-28 compared with the declaration of the statute in v30. See also Milgrom, *Leviticus* t–16, p. 1036.

159. See Levine, *Leviticus*, p. 109, for the translation of שבתון שבת as a superlative and thus rendered ‘a sabbath of complete rest’.
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vv18-19), and by reiterating the statute for כפר to be made annually for the sins of Israel (v34a; see vv29-31).

While the speech report ends by consolidating the purpose of the Day of Atonement, this is not the end of the schema. The schema itself reaches completion by returning to the overarching narrative and recalls that Aaron did as YHWH commanded Moses. Thus, the progression of logic within Leviticus 16 develops in a very purposeful way. First, in vv1-2, the recollection of the deaths of Aaron's two sons reactivates the consequence of when YHWH is approached without purpose or command. This provides the context for the prohibition for Aaron not to enter the Most Holy Place with the exception of this one event with a specific purpose. This purpose is to restore Israel to a condition of purity due to the sanctuary being in the midst of their impurity. Thus, the two paragraphs in vv3-28 and vv29-34 progress from instruction to Aaron about how he is to approach before YHWH for the purpose of making כפר on behalf of Israel (vv3-28) to then a declaration that this is to be an everlasting statute for all generations because of Israel's sin (vv29-34a). The narrative conclusion in v34b then brings closure conceptually to the whole episodic schema knowing that Aaron completed YHWH's command and so Israel's impurities are removed from the tabernacle.

7.1 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 16

Based on the above analysis, the episodic schema of Leviticus 16 progresses from the past (vv1-2), to the present generation at Sinai (vv3-28), to addressing future generations of Israelites (vv29-34a). This progression is a significant part of the text's rhetorical strategy. Verses 1-2 establish the prohibition against entering (יבא) the Most Holy Place after the temporal sequence recalls the deaths of Aaron's two sons to heighten the warning about approaching YHWH unbidden; the same fate awaits Aaron if he enters because YHWH will appear in a cloud upon the mercy seat. The repetition of the yiqtol יבא in v3 after the cataphoric demonstrative is a deliberate contrast to the prohibition in v2; YHWH gives permission for Aaron to enter with two gifts of a חטאת and an עלה, and this then begins the
process that brings Aaron into the Most Holy Place, preserving his life (v13), to make כפר
for the impurities and rebellions, for all the sins, of Israel (v16). Notably, the means by which Aaron's life is preserved in vv12-13 is a juxtaposition with how his sons died (cf. 10:1-2). Taking a censor full of coal from the fire before YHWH and adding incense, he enters behind the veil, and puts incense on the fire causing a cloud upon the mercy seat. As Nihan observes, this represents 'an unmistakable contrast' between the strange fire offered by Nadab and Abihu and the effective obedience of Aaron. Thus, in the context where the problem of 15:31 is resolved i.e. Israel's impurities are removed from YHWH's tabernacle, Aaron exemplifies the principle of 10:3, ensuring YHWH is sanctified as he approaches, and his life is preserved.

Although vv3-28 resolves the immediate problem of Israel's impurities within the persuasive situation, vv29-34 then extends these instructions as a permanent statute for all generations. The use of the second person in vv29-30 directly addresses Israel at Sinai and future generations, and conveys the intent of the permanent statute in v30; namely, for Israel to be purified and restored from all their sins. Thus, the intent is not only to remove the impurities from YHWH's tabernacle that dwells in Israel's midst (16:16, cf. 16:33), but to also purify the nation. Thus, the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 16 encompasses the use of rhetorical devices such as analepsis, repetition, and the deliberate juxtaposition between Aaron and his dead sons, as the schema progresses from the past, to the present, and then to the future, to achieve an intent that both warns and persuades.

The warning is to motivate both present and future generations of high priests to enter the Most Holy Place for this one particular purpose and with obedience to command as a means by which YHWH is sanctified and their life preserved. Although there is a past orientation at the beginning, however, the rhetorical device of analepsis at the beginning

---

161 N.B. Whilst I agree with Nihan's observation about the deliberate contrast, the purpose of this juxtaposition that I outline above differs substantially to that of Nihan who argues that Leviticus 16 'considers the possibility of the permanent recreation of this order through the ritual's performance' (Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, p. 101). For a complete explanation, see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, pp. 99-105.
of the schema is still to dissuade the priesthood from entering in YHWH's most holy place. Thus, the disposition of the whole is still deliberative since it aims to influence the present and future actions of priesthood and nation. The whole schema, therefore, seeks to persuade Israel at Sinai and all future generations to seek purification from their sins and to remove their impurities from YHWH's tabernacle so that their lives too will be preserved.

8. A Preliminary Summary: The Arrangement and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 1–16

The arrangement, or global schema, of Leviticus begins in continuity with the book of Exodus and so with a clear conviction that YHWH's presence, within his tabernacle, is in the midst of Israel. The first episode of Leviticus' arrangement focuses upon how Israel is to approach YHWH by bringing gifts in situations of relational order and when relational offence threatens that order. For Israel at Sinai, a redeemed people being formed into a nation, hearing the instruction and enacting the gifts would, with an ideal audience, shape the character and identity of the nation by embodying the worldview that the ritual process of the gifts convey. Leviticus 1–7 establishes an understanding of the gift instructions before their use in Leviticus 8–10 and so the association between Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 8–10 is an instance of sequential connectedness. However, the juxtaposition of priestly obedience and rebellion in 9:1–10:7 prompts the explanation in 10:3, 'By those who approach me I will be sanctified and before all the people I will be glorified'. Priestly adherence to YHWH's command and to their task ensures that YHWH is both sanctified and glorified. However, the principle in 10:3 also underlies Leviticus 1–7 as the means by which both people and priesthood are to sanctify and glorify their covenant God present among them. Thus, 10:3 emerges as an integrating thematic referent for Leviticus 1–10.

As a response to Nadab and Abihu's death in Leviticus 10, YHWH clarifies the priestly task and their responsibility in 10:10-11. The first part of this task is to distinguish between the two pairs, the holy and the common and the impure and pure. This clarification of the
priestly task is an outworking of the principle in 10:3, that is, by making distinctions within the two binary pairs, the priesthood ensures that YHWH is sanctified and glorified in their midst (10:3). Since the episodes within Leviticus 11–15 then concern making the distinction between impurity and purity as an application of 10:10, the principle of 10:3 also encompasses these chapters since making these two binary distinctions is a means by which the people and priesthood are to ensure that YHWH is glorified in their midst.

Leviticus 11 and 13–14 focus upon the nature of impurity and purity; impurity represents rebellion and disorder and also corrupts and spreads, whereas purity represents wholeness and order. Leviticus 12 and 15 then accentuate the consequence of impurity, which is exclusion from God's presence. The warning of Leviticus 15 is that if Israel persists in their impurity and so profanes YHWH's dwelling-place in their midst, then the nation will die. Separating Israel from their impurities is critical if Israel is to live with their covenant God in their midst and for the nation's life to be preserved.

Leviticus 16 responds to the problem of 15:31 with YHWH providing the annual Day of Atonement with the purpose that both the people and tabernacle are purified from the iniquities, transgressions, sins, and impurities of Israel. Again, Aaron ensures that YHWH is sanctified and also glorified before the people by approaching the place where God is present among his people in obedience to command. Aaron's obedience exemplifies the intent for all generations, which is to seek restoration to a condition of purity and to remove impurities from YHWH's dwelling place to ensure that their covenant God is both sanctified and glorified in their midst. As I will observe at the beginning of Chapter Four, the concluding note in Leviticus 16:34b conveys Aaron's obedience to command, while the head theme of the next episode is the instruction that YHWH commands the whole nation, both priesthood and people (17:1-3). As Leviticus 17–21 progresses, the conceptual basis of the global schema, and thus Leviticus' arrangement, will extend to Israel's life in the land whereby the nation's obedience to YHWH's command, because he is
their covenant God, will ensure that they are set apart from the nations to belong to YHWH and, in doing so, ensure that YHWH is sanctified in their midst (10:3, 22:32b).
CHAPTER FOUR

The Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus' Arrangement: Chapters 17–27

An examination of the rhetorical strategy and persuasive intent of the global schema in Leviticus 1–16 evinces the conviction of God’s presence in the midst of his people. With YHWH’s glory being among his covenant nation, he is to be sanctified by those who approach him and glorified before all the people if there is to be life and not death. By continuing the analysis of Leviticus’ arrangement within its global schema, this chapter will bring to conclusion the third step of this study’s rhetorical-critical framework, which is to analyse the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus’ arrangement, and in doing so demonstrate how the remaining episodic schemas in chapters 17–27 will extend the conceptual basis of Leviticus 1–16 to Israel’s future life in the land. This chapter will conclude by synthesising the argument for the disposition, rhetorical strategy, and persuasive intent of the whole of Leviticus’ arrangement and so complete the third step in the rhetorical-critical framework.

1. Leviticus 17–21: This is YHWH’s Command

The episodic schema in Leviticus 17–21 begins with YHWH’s command for Moses to speak to Aaron, his sons, and to all the sons of Israel (17:2). The final quotative frame in the 17:1-2 sequence, הוהי אמר אשר צוה הדבר הזה, forms a tail-head link with Leviticus 16:34b, which reinforces the expectation of obedience to command from the whole of Israel, both the people and the priesthood. Furthermore, the use of paraenesis within the embedded episodes of Leviticus 17–21 (18:1-30, 19:1-37, 20:1-27, 21:1-15, 21:16-23) unfolds why Israel is to do as YHWH commands – he is YHWH their covenant God.

1.1 The Arrangement and Intent of Leviticus 17

After 17:2cβ announces the theme of the schema, ‘This is the instruction that YHWH commanded’, the episodic schema develops through a succession of five paragraphs
(vv3-7, vv8-9, vv10-12, vv13-14, vv15-16) with each focusing on a particular situation related to the slaughtering of livestock. The first situation in vv3-7 is when an Israelite sacrifices (נָשָׁת) livestock (an ox, lamb, or goat), either in or outside the camp (v3), and does not come to the entrance of the tent of meeting to offer their gift to YHWH at his sanctuary (v4a). The penalty in v4a identifies this situation as an offence; the blood will be accounted to the Israelite. The Xp clause in v4a then gives the rationale for the penalty. The offender has 'poured out' (שִׁפְחָן) the blood and so the penalty applies. The rationale in v5 also highlights the problem motivating the prohibition in v3, namely, the Israelites are sacrificing in the 'open field' (עֲלֵי יְהוָה). In contrast, God desires the Israelites to come to the entrance of the tent of meeting, to an Aaronic priest, and sacrifice their gift to YHWH before him. By coming to the tent of meeting, the priest can splatter the blood upon the altar of YHWH and cause the fat to smoke as a soothing aroma to YHWH (v6). It is not a coincidence that v6 mentions both blood and fat since both are stated in 3:17 as belonging solely to YHWH. Thus, the purpose of ensuring that the Israelites bring their sacrifices before God is to ensure that what belongs to YHWH is given to him. Verse 7 then states the desired impact of this instruction, which is for the Israelites to stop prostituting themselves to the שָׂם by offering their sacrifices to idols.

---

1 For a five-section delimitation of Leviticus 17, see Schwartz, “Profane” Slaughter, p. 16; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 217. Contrary to Brichto, ‘on Slaughter’, p. 24, who delimits Leviticus 17 into two sections, vv3-7 and vv8-16, on the basis of the quotative frame ‘אִלּוֹת הָאָרֶץ מֶרֶס’ in v2c and ‘אִלְוָהָו יִאֵם’ in v8a.
2 There is some ambiguity as to what specifically this first case in vv3-7 is prohibiting and how this then relates to the second situation in vv8-9. Both Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1455, and Wenham, Leviticus, p. 241, understand the situation to be pertaining to the slaughtering of all livestock. Milgrom and Wenham though differ on the particulars. Whereas Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1455, views this to be a prohibition against slaughtering 'all common, non-sacrificial slaughter', Wenham, Leviticus, p. 243, argues that the instruction regulates the bringing of all slaughtered livestock to the sanctuary as a שָׁם לְכָל מַעְרָבָה to prevent idolatry.
3 As per Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1456, the logic of the penalty in v4 is that blood will imputed to the offender because he has spilt blood and so it is an outworking of the lex talionis principle. This is a different nuance to Sklar, Leviticus, p. 219, who observes that any use of blood outside of God’s command is prohibited and so the offender bears responsibility for the wrongful use of blood. However, the text relates the penalty to the shedding of blood and thus is more than likely an act of wrongful slaughter, rather than a wrongful use of blood. See also Brichto, ‘On Slaughter’, p. 24; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 317; Rooker, Leviticus, p. 234; Schwartz, “Profane” Slaughter’, p. 21; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 241.
4 See also Schwartz, “Profane” Slaughter’, p. 25.
The pithy quotative frame in vv8a/z pauses the information flow to draw attention to the forthcoming instruction and begins a new paragraph schema. This second paragraph in vv8-9 purposefully repeats the crux of the first case and, in doing so, extends the situation to the resident foreigner living in the midst of Israel. This second case though has a different emphasis from the first. The sequence of the protasis in vv8-9a clarifies that the Israelite’s, or resident foreigner’s, intent is to bring an הֵיטָל or a בָּשָׂת and yet the person did not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting for YHWH. While similar to vv3-7, the emphasis is upon the act of not bringing a gift to YHWH and so implied is the gift being offered to another god. Rooke explains the rationale for the prohibition applying to the בָּשָׂת although she does not directly relate her argument to 17:8-9, ‘religious syncretism on the part of the foreigner threatens the holiness of God by threatening the holiness of the people as a whole’. A condition of being included within the Israelite community is ‘respect[ing] the God without whom the community would not exist’. Thus, given the seriousness of the situation, the apodosis in v9b applies the וֹתֲךָו penalty consistent with the first situation in vv3-7; the וֹתֲךָו penalty represents permanent exclusion from God’s presence irrespective of the penalty referring to exile or death.

The following two paragraphs, vv10-12 and vv13-14, focus upon the prohibition against eating blood. Verses 10-12 address the problem, the consequence, and the rationale of the

---

5 The quotative frames in vv1-3 suggests that Moses is the recipient of the whole speech, which he is to mediate to Aaron, his sons, and to all the sons of Israel. Contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, p. 1465; Schwartz, "Profane Slaughter", p. 17. The emphatic word order with כָּרָת in the clause-initial position highlights the instruction to follow.


7 Contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, p. 1464, who argues that the first situation in vv3-4 is primarily concerned with food, while the second situation in vv8-9 is concerned with sacrifice. I would contend that both situations are primarily about sacrifice. Verses 3-4 ensure that any slaughtered livestock is to be presented at the entrance of the tent of meeting so that its blood can be given to YHWH, whereas vv8-9 focus upon the bringing of the two gifts, the וכל and the כל, exclusively to YHWH. While both situations have different emphases, each are concerned with giving to YHWH what belongs to him.


penalty for when an Israelite or a resident foreigner in the midst of Israel has eaten blood. The arrangement of vv10-12 is significant. There is thematic equivalence between v10 and v12.\(^\text{10}\) Verse 10 introduces the situation where an Israelite or a resident foreigner eats any blood, the apodosis then unambiguously conveys the consequence; YHWH will set 'his face' (נحوا פִּי) against the one (lit. 'against the life'; במשם) who has eaten blood and the offender will be cut off from his people.\(^\text{11}\) Rendtorff observes the intensification of 17:10 from the previous penalty for eating blood in 7:27 through the use of the active and the first person address.\(^\text{12}\) Verse 12 then prohibits any 'life' from the Israelites (כְּלִיָּמֶשׁ חָמֶם) and the resident foreigner from eating blood. Thus, v10 outlines the situation and the penalty, while v12 categorically prohibits the situation from arising. The rationale for the penalty is arranged between the case and the prohibition in v11, and has two phases of logic. First, the 'life of the flesh' (נפש הבשר) is in the blood and second, YHWH has given blood to the Israelites for their lives.\(^\text{13}\) The final clause in v11 then gives the reason for God giving blood as the means of כפר, which is that blood makes כפר by representing life.\(^\text{14}\) The logic of vv10-12 suggests that blood is symbolic for life and thus the one who

---

\(^{10}\) Schwartz, 'Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood', p. 45, observes that v10 and v12 repeat the law and thus frame the rationale. In Schwartz's view, this highlights the motive rather than the law. This, however, does not mean that a chiastic arrangement exists, contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1469; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 220.


\(^{12}\) Rendtorff, 'Another Prolegomenon', p. 25.

\(^{13}\) Intriguingly, YHWH is giving the blood to the Israelites for the function of כפר, but God gives the blood from that which belongs to him. Thus, there is a mutuality of 'giving' blood (see also Schwartz, 'Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood', pp. 49-51). Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1473, who argues that this is a correction; Israel is not to assume that the nation gives blood to YHWH, but rather God gives the blood to Israel.

\(^{14}\) The significance of כפר in v11 does not actually change my overall argument and so I will resist entering into the debate about כפר. However, Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, pp. 1474-1479, argues that v1 refers to the blood of the זבח שלמים which has given יִשְׂרָאֵל the 'life of the flesh' (v11), and has two phases of logic. First, the 'life of the flesh' (בנפשם) is in the blood and second, YHWH has given blood to the Israelites for their lives. The arrangement of vv10-12 is significant. There is thematic equivalence between v10 and v12. Verse 10 introduces the situation where an Israelite or a resident foreigner eats any blood, the apodosis then unambiguously conveys the consequence; YHWH will set 'his face' (נحوا פִּי) against the one (lit. 'against the life'; במשם) who has eaten blood and the offender will be cut off from his people. Rendtorff observes the intensification of 17:10 from the previous penalty for eating blood in 7:27 through the use of the active and the first person address. Verse 12 then prohibits any 'life' from the Israelites (כְּלִיָּמֶשׁ חָמֶם) and the resident foreigner from eating blood. Thus, v10 outlines the situation and the penalty, while v12 categorically prohibits the situation from arising. The rationale for the penalty is arranged between the case and the prohibition in v11, and has two phases of logic. First, the 'life of the flesh' (נפש הבשר) is in the blood and second, YHWH has given blood to the Israelites for their lives. The final clause in v11 then gives the reason for God giving blood as the means of כפר, which is that blood makes כפר by representing life. The logic of vv10-12 suggests that blood is symbolic for life and thus the one who
consumes the 'life' of another will bear the penalty (וּבָגֵר) of that life." The justification for the penalty is that eating blood is a refusal to honour what God has given for a particular purpose i.e. כפר. Thus, the intent of this third paragraph is to dissuade the Israelite and the גר from eating blood because they honour YHWH and his provision by not doing so.

The fourth paragraph in vv13-14 relates to the previous situations. What happens in the situation of hunting? This is not an act of slaughter for the purpose of sacrifice and so the situation in vv13-14 addresses uncertainty. Verse 13 unambiguously clarifies that for the Israelite and the גר who hunt a living creature that is permissible to be eaten i.e. it is pure, they still must pour out (ושפך) its blood and cover it with dust (בעפר). Verse 14 repeats once more the reason for this instruction, which is that the 'life of all flesh' is in its blood and conversely the blood is its life. Again, the logic of v14 strengthens the symbolic understanding of blood with the life of the living creature. The final paragraph in the episodic schema, vv15-16, continues the focus upon eating by clarifying that any person who eats a carcass or what has been torn by wild animals must bathe, wash his clothes, and be impure – and thus separated from approaching God – until evening. If, however, an Israelite or a גר refuses to submit to the purification ritual of washing and bathing, then

149-156. This argument has strong opponents such as Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 274-275, and Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 321. The outcome of the discussion, however, does not affect my understanding of the arrangement of Leviticus 17.

15. For the symbolic use of blood, see Schwartz, 'Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood', pp. 56-57. Contrary to Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 320, who argues the symbolism of blood to mean, 'to forfeit the means of propitiation'. Yet Kiuchi is making a connection in the text that is not present. The relationship between blood and life, and thus the symbolic understanding of blood as life, is made explicit in v11α. Kiuchi is confusing the consequence of eating the blood with the symbolic meaning of blood.

16. I agree with Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1481, that וָשָּׁפַךְ לְאֵצָד יְדוֹר וַעֲפָר is the apodosis and so is a non-negotiable command dependent upon the situation in v13a. See also Sklar, Leviticus, p. 222.

17. See also Rendtorff, 'Another Prolegomenon', p. 25; Schwartz, 'Prohibitions Concerning the 'Eating' of Blood', p. 63.

18. The carcasses at this point are not necessarily referring to those killed by hunting, but refers generally to any carcass of an animal that can usually be eaten. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 277; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 324; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 222; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 246.
he shall carry (שׁוֹנ) his iniquity (v.16); that is, persisting in the condition of impurity is the choice to bear the consequence of his rebellion.¹⁰

Thus, the arrangement of the five paragraphs in the episodic schema demonstrates logic by sequential connectedness. The first two situations in vv3-7 and vv8-9 address the problem of idolatry and seek to persuade the Israelites to bring their sacrifices before YHWH so that the blood and fat can be given to him. The third situation in vv10-12 then focuses upon the issue of blood introduced in vv3-9 and addresses why blood is not to be eaten and its consequence of permanent separation from God’s sanctuary and the people. The fourth situation in vv13-14 addresses the situation of hunting where the blood is still to be poured out on the ground and not to be eaten. The fifth situation in vv15-16 continues the subject of eating in relation to a carcass or an animal torn by animals and conveys the consequence of impurity. Once more the text maintains a future orientation that seeks to affect the future actions of the newly formed Israelite nation and thus maintains a deliberative disposition. The intent is to dissuade Israel at Sinai from continuing any practices of idolatry they learnt in Egypt i.e. no longer sacrificing to idols or eating blood.¹¹ Although the instruction dissuades, it also acts to persuade the fledgling Israelite community to honour what belongs to God whether that be a gift that rightfully belongs to him as a sign of relational order and fellowship or refraining from eating blood in order to remember that blood is God’s provision for כפר.

1.2 The Arrangement and Intent of Leviticus 18

Within the arrangement of Leviticus so far, Leviticus 18 is the first episode where the majority of the schema progresses through a list of pithy apodictic law (vv6-23). Each

¹⁰ See also Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1488. Although the reason for the penalty is not stated explicitly, it is easy to surmise that the refusal not to submit to a purificatory ritual is a decision to remain in a state of separation from God, which is an act of rebellion. Thus, the Israelite carries the consequence of that rebellion for him or herself.

¹¹ See also Sklar, Leviticus, p. 219, ‘following this command would help stop idolatry and syncretism (v. 7), and would unify the Israelites in their worship of the Lord.’
principle of prohibition in vv6-23 is a complete idea in itself and so each represents a paragraph in the schema. The first prohibition in v6 fronts both the subject (איש אשה) and the indirect object (אלא ילשא בשרו), as an XP clause, highlighting both the ‘everyone’ and any of the ‘kin of his flesh’ before proceeding to the prohibition that the Israelite must not approach his kin to expose his or her nakedness. The list of prohibitions in vv7-16 then applies the principle of v6 to examples of familial relationships. While vv17-20 still prohibits exposing the nakedness of, or lying sexually with, another, the focus is now upon offence outside of the familial relationship. Verse 21, however, breaks the information flow by shifting the topic of the prohibition to ‘from your seed’ (מקודם), which they are not to give to Molech, and so avoid profaning the name of ‘your God’. The final two prohibitions in vv22-23 address two situations where the act of sexual offence is no longer between a man and a woman, but rather between two men (v22) or with an animal (v23).

Although the emphasis of the prohibitions changes at two points (v21, v22), the

---

22 The consecutive repetition of איש in this instance, and any other in Leviticus, gives a distributive sense ‘everyone’ or, more precisely, ‘every man’, as discussed by GKC, §123d. Schwartz, ‘Prohibitions Concerning the ‘Eating’ of Blood’, p. 39, suggests though that the combination of איש איש, the inclusion of the ‘י, together with the penalty, is ‘a device designed by the author of Leviticus 17 for his own unique use’.


24 The reason why I have chosen to include v17 with vv18-20 and not with vv7-16 is that vv7-16 prohibits exposing the nakedness of those who are connected by kinship. However, there is no explicit familial-kinship tie in v17 between the one being addressed (the second person singular i.e. the Israelite) and the mother or daughter. The familial tie is between the mother and daughter alone. This is a shift in focus from vv6-16 and so v17 belongs with vv18-20 (see also Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 329). A counter-argument could be though that v17 uses the same language and semantic structures as vv6-16. Also, it could be argued that v17 is not continuous with vv18-20, so there is a stronger conceptual relationship based on the similarity of language with vv6-16. Thus, for these reasons, Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, pp. 1545-46, offers the possibility that v17 is a transitional verse from the prohibitions against exposing the nakedness of another, namely kin (vv6-16), to relational offence outside of the family relationship (vv18-20).

25 I acknowledge that within the past two decades, questions have started to emerge about what precisely 18:22 is prohibiting. For instance, Nihan, From Priestly Torah, pp. 436-437, argues that the phraseאיש לא יטבש משבכ אישא suggests that the prohibition is aimed primarily not at the active partner but at the
common theme is the prohibition of sexual acts causing relational disorder with YHWH their covenant God.\(^6\)

However, the list of prohibitions in vv6-23 is framed by paraenesis in vv2-5 and vv24-30, making the disposition and intent of the instructions explicit. The initial XP clause in v2b לאו יוהי אלהיכם is a declaration that thematises the whole schema in Leviticus 18. The repetition of this declaratory clause, or its shortened form את־חקתי, at significant points confirms its thematic purpose (v6, v21, v30).\(^6\) This declaration identifies the one who is speaking and commanding as Israel’s covenant God.\(^6\) Verse 3 then dissuades Israel from persisting in behaviour representative of Egypt and from adopting Canaanite behaviour once in the land. In contrast, v4 fronts the two direct objects אשר ימשמשי and אשר ימשמשי before the main verbs תשמרו ותשמרו, which highlights what they are to do and keep; namely, YHWH’s judgments and his statutes. The repetition in v5 of the verbal ideas of both and and in relation to both and as and, albeit using a different syntactic and focus structure, reinforces the importance of doing YHWH’s commands and develops the rationale – he shall live by doing them. The clause יחי בהם suggests that the

\(^{6}\) I acknowledge scholars have tended to distinguish between את־חקתי and את־משפטי based on its thematic associations i.e. the extended version with the covenant relationship and the shortened version with God’s holiness. However, the similar semantic structure suggests that את־חקתי is a shortened version of the longer thematic declaration. This would then make sense of the occurrence of the thematic statement in Leviticus 18 where the longer version is used in v2b, while the shortened version is interspersed throughout the chapter in v6, v21, and v30. See also W. Zimmerli, *I Am Yahveh* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1982), pp. 2-4, 24.

\(^{6}\) I agree with M. Douglas, *Justice as the Cornerstone: An Interpretation of Leviticus 18–20*, *Interpretation* 53 (1999), p. 346, that the primary issue is one of covenant faithfulness, which is hard to ignore given the paraenetic frame and the repeated use of the refrain את־חקתי. I would disagree though that the listed offences are cultic.

\(^{6}\) I agree with M. Douglas, *Justice as the Cornerstone: An Interpretation of Leviticus 18–20*, *Interpretation* 53 (1999), p. 346, that the primary issue is one of covenant faithfulness, which is hard to ignore given the paraenetic frame and the repeated use of the refrain את־חקתי. I would disagree though that the listed offences are cultic.
outcome of obedience to command is life. This beginning paraenesis is concluded with the thematic XP clause אני יהוה.

The paraenesis closing the episodic schema in vv24-30 has four phases of logic. The first in vv24-25 begins with an unmarked Px clause in v24א. אליהו בכה אלה. The initial verbal idea is an exhortative prohibition not to make 'yourselves' impure and the demonstrative אלה is anaphoric referring to the list of prohibitions in vv6-23. There is no ambiguity. The Israelites are not to cause themselves to become impure by any of the listed behaviours. Verse 24א gives the rationale, which is that the nations, whom God is driving out from before the Israelites, became impure (נטמאו) by these behaviours. Morales helpfully clarifies the claim of v24; YHWH is not suggesting that Israel's distinctiveness lies in ethnicity, but rather 'it is the uncleanness of sinfulness that informs Israel's call to be separate from the nations'. Verse 25 then develops the consequences of this impurity further by stating that even the land became impure (ותטמאו) and God punished its iniquity. In turn, the land then vomited out its inhabitants. Curiously, the verbal sequence in v25 uses the wayyiqtol suggesting both the land becoming impure and vomiting out its inhabitants are past events although the conquest is still in the future within the persuasive situation. Thus, the depiction of the land's personification and subsequent action belies that the text was written when the conquest of the land, at the very least, has occurred. It is possible, therefore, that the real author has broken from the persuasive situation to address the real (rhetorical) situation of Israel directly in the land irrespective of the historical era. This, however, is a fleeting moment; the episodic schema as a whole sustains the Israel at Sinai situation. The impact, however, is to dissuade Israel from

---

28. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 293; Rooker, Leviticus, p. 241; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 228. Milgrom is also quite clear that this is distinctive from D where the emphasis is life as reward. However, Milgrom's explanation has a different nuance to that suggested above. He states, 'the laws themselves have the inherent power to grant life' (Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1523).

29. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1578. N.B. The verbal stem תטמאו is a hithpael, which lends a reflexive meaning.


participating in the impurities of the previous nations so as they can be set apart in a pure condition for their covenant God.

The second phase of logic in vv26-28 bears similarities to the first with a few differences. Verse 26 contrasts the positive command to keep YHWH’s statutes and judgments with the native-born and outsider (יִשְׂרָאֵל) avoiding (lit. ‘You shall not do’) all ‘these abominations’. Like v24a, v27 then conveys the rationale; the people of the land did these 'abominations' and so caused the land to be impure. Verse 28 then explicates the implication of vv24-25, which is that if Israel defiles the land by their impurities, then the land will vomit Israel out, just as it did to its previous nations. The third phase of logic in v29 outlines the penalty for adopting Canaanite behaviour, which again refers to permanent exclusion from God’s presence irrespective of the penalty being exile or death. Verse 30 then expresses the intent of the episode, which is to dissuade the Israelites from becoming impure by participating in any of the ‘abominations’ prohibited within the list. By being dissuaded from participating in the impurities of the Canaanites, the Israelite community

---

30 Joosten, People and Land, p. 68, observes that the reason 18:26 is extended to the תטמאו is that they too are living in the land so, ‘As a sojourner among the Israelites he must submit to certain prescriptions for fear of desecrating the land.’

31 The meaning of the niphal תֵּטָמֵה in 20:29 is contested and could refer to exile or to the death penalty. While I am sympathetic to the meaning of exile, I recognise that either way the conceptual basis of the text is the offender(s) being cut off from access to God’s presence. For the view for תטמאו refers to exile see Levine, Leviticus, p. 242, and Milgrom, Leviticus 7–22, p. 158.2. For the view that the תטמאו penalty refers to the death of the offender, see Wenham, Leviticus, pp. 242-243. Sklar, Leviticus, p. 136, notes that the תטמאו penalty refers both to exile and ‘to suffering premature death’. He comments, ‘In either case, the sinner was removed from the covenant community and regarded as the Lord’s enemy’.

32 Please note that the language of תטמאו refers to ethical impurity rather than ritual impurity (see also W. Houston, ‘Towards an Integrated Reading of the Dietary Laws of Leviticus’ in The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception, ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler, VTS 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003, pp. 158-159). Yet contrary to Houston, ‘Towards an Integrated Reading’, pp. 158-159, although there is a similarity in language between Leviticus 11-15 and Leviticus 18, there is a distinction between ethical and ritual impurity seen in the consequences. As Klawans notes, the consequence of ritual impurity has impermanence, whilst ethical impurity has a permanent consequence (J. Klawans, Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism, New York: Oxford, 2000, p. 26). The application of impurity and holiness language to the ethical domain of the people in the land reflects the thematic development as the text progresses from the camp paradigm in Leviticus 1–16 to life in the land in Leviticus 17–21.
is motivated to align their practices with the command of YHWH so they can have life in the land.

1.3 The Arrangement and Intent of Leviticus 19

Previously in Leviticus 18, the thematic declaration אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲלָלְמָנָם is the rationale for why Israel is to keep YHWH’s statutes and ordinances. Instead of becoming impure by the way of life representative of Egypt or the nations in the land, Israel must follow YHWH’s statutes since he is their covenant God. This thematic declaration continues into Leviticus 19, but with a different emphasis due to a shift in focus in the introductory paraenesis (v2b). The pithy paraenetic introduction אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲלָלְמָנָם (Xp + Px) first fronts the descriptor for the kind of people Israel is to be in imitation of their covenant God - holy. Yet the use of the yiqtol תִּהְיוּ places the orientation of the paraenesis in the future i.e. ‘you shall be holy’. This future orientation reinforces the intent to motivate the Israel at Sinai community to embody their holy status so that they reflect the character of the God to whom they belong. Who YHWH is in the essence of his being is to inform who Israel is in the essence of the nation’s being. Thus, the disposition of the instruction continues to be deliberative.

The following instruction, structured within four paragraphs (vv3-19, vv20-22, vv23-32, vv33-37), recalls YHWH’s command for Israel particularly within the context of the land. The first paragraph in vv3-19 reflects the concerns of the Sinaitic Decalogue, albeit not following the arrangement of Exodus 20:1-17. YHWH unambiguously addresses issues of

---

\[\text{footnote}^{36}\] Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, p. 1624 imports the idea of being separate from the nations at this point stating, ‘Thus the imitatio dei implied by this verse is that just as God differs from human beings, so Israel should differ from the nations (20:26), a meaning corroborated by the generalization that encloses this chapter (v.37): Israel is holy only if it observes YHWH’s commandments’. While distinctiveness from the nations is an aspect of Israel’s holiness present in 20:26, this does not mean that this idea is present at this point in the text. A more helpful approach is to follow how the logic of the text develops as the global schema progresses, rather than importing later ideas into earlier parts of the text. At this point in H’s arrangement (Lev. 19), how Israel is to embody being holy is by reflecting relational order as commanded in vv3-37.

relational order and disorder with parents (v3a), within the Israel-God relationship (vv3b-8, v12, v19), and within the community (vv9-18). The second paragraph in vv20-22 anticipates the situation where a man lies (תִּשְׁבַּח) with a female slave promised to another man, yet she is not ransomed. The text is unambiguous about the penalty for the relational offence being an הָנָס הַנַּחַל gift before YHWH, which will overcome the break in relationship (נלון נ). The third paragraph in vv23-32 is extended instruction focusing upon various commands after Israel has entered the land (v23a). This instruction is mainly a list of prohibitions encompassing topics like not eating fruit from trees Israel has planted until the fifth year (vv23-25), not eating meat with blood in it (v26a), not practising divination (vv26b-28, v31), not allowing the land to fall into prostitution, revering YHWH's Sabbaths and his sanctuary (v29), and showing honour to the elderly (v32). In v32, the text purposefully relates the honouring of the aged with fearing YHWH. The final paragraph in vv33-37 balances command with paraenesis. The first set of commands in vv33-34 prohibits the oppression of the resident foreigner (זד) in Israel's midst and then commands Israel to relate to the foreigner as though he is an Israelite. The paraenesis in v34bβ conveys the rationale, which is that they were once resident foreigners in the land of Egypt. The second set of commands in vv35-36 prohibits the twisting of justice and


30 There are explicit conceptual correspondences between Ex 20:4//Lev 19:4b, Ex 20:7//19:12, Ex 20:8//Lev 19:3, Ex 20:12//Lev 19:3, and Ex 20:15//Lev 19:11a. The prohibition against murder in Exodus 20:13 could be implied within Leviticus 19:16aβ (see also Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 353) and also 19:27. Similarly, Leviticus 19:11 prohibits deceiving another man about his neighbour, which arguably could imply Exodus 20:16 where Israel is prohibited from answering a neighbour with lies (see also Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 351, Wenham, Leviticus, p. 267). The only omissions could be the seventh prohibition (Ex. 20:14) not to commit adultery. However, given the proximity of Leviticus 18 and 20, this omission is understandable. There is also no reasonable rationale available to us as to why the tenth command from the Sinaitic Decalogue is absent from Leviticus 19. Given the strong correspondence, however, it is feasible to argue that Leviticus 19:3-18 echoes the Sinaitic Decalogue. Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1601, who observes that H was aware of the Sinaitic Decalogue and influenced by it, but states strongly, 'Thus I disagree with R. Levi (Lev. Rab. 24:5) that the Decalogue is embodied in this chapter'.

N.B. Joosten clarifies about 19:34bβ and similar refrains in the Book of the Covenant, 'There is no reason to
motivates the community to use right (צדק) measuring weights. Once more, the reason why Israel is to act justly is that the one who is speaking and commanding is YHWH their God who brought them out of the land of Egypt.\textsuperscript{39} Thus, the text purposefully modifies the thematic declaration אֲנִי יְהוָה אֲלֹהֵיכֶם with the exodus tradition to relate the declaration of YHWH as their covenant God with the event that established the relationship of belonging. The purpose of recollecting the identity-forming event of the exodus is to shape and form the identity of Israel at Sinai. How they relate to others within the wider community is to reflect both the character and works of the God to whom they belong.

The final statement of paraenesis in v37, which simultaneously closes the embedded episode as well as the paragraph, reiterates the need for Israel to keep and do all YHWH's statutes and ordinances. Thus, the arrangement of Leviticus 19, framed by paraenesis, accentuates that who Israel is to be is to reflect who YHWH is and so how Israel acts is also to reflect the actions and character of the God to whom they belong. While vv2-19 reflects the Sinaitic Covenant, the remaining paragraphs within the schema extend beyond the Decalogue to address issues specific to life in the land.\textsuperscript{40} The intent is to shape and form Israel into a nation who reflects their status as God's covenant people who are set apart in relational order with their covenant God.

\textsuperscript{39} Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, pp. 1709-1713, who seems to separate v36b\textsuperscript{β} from the preceding instruction about using just measurements so that it contrasts with the use of the exodus tradition in 18:2b–3a. He understands the use of the self-declaration clause to be in continuity with the \textsuperscript{7}v instruction in v35, rather than the command in v36. While there is an athnach pausing the information flow between the command about measurements and the self-declaration clause, it is not strong enough to suggest that 19:36b\textsuperscript{β} belongs with 19:37.

\textsuperscript{40} I prefer the language of Leviticus 19 extending the Sinaitic Decalogue to the land, rather than Leviticus 19 being a 'new Decalogue' as per Milgrom, 'Changing Concept of Holiness', p. 73.

\textsuperscript{39} I prefer the language of Leviticus 19 extending the Sinaitic Decalogue to the land, rather than Leviticus 19 being a 'new Decalogue' as per Milgrom, 'Changing Concept of Holiness', p. 73.
1.4 The Arrangement and Intent of Leviticus 20

From a literary perspective, two discrete frames in vv2-6/v27 and then vv7-8/vv22-26 seem to enclose the list of penalties for relational offence within Leviticus 20.* The first thematic frame concerns penalties for idolatry (vv2-6, v27) and the second thematic frame, composed of paraenetic material, provides the motivation for obedience (vv7-8, vv22-26).* However, these two frames are not as clear as scholars such as Milgrom have supposed. There are no prominent pragmatic markers to suggest that the paraenesis beginning in v7 and v22 marks the opening of new paragraphs. The text integrates the paraenesis into the first two paragraphs of the episodic schema in vv2-8 and vv9-26, which is significant for the rhetorical strategy of this embedded episode.

The first paragraph of the episodic schema, vv2-8, begins with the situation of relational offence where a man from either the sons of Israel or from the resident foreigner (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) gives 'his seed' (מֵמְזַרעוּ) to Molech (v2).4 The penalty is described twice in v2. In the first instance, the text uses the emphatic execution formula מֵמְזַרﬠו יָמוֹת, while the second describes how the offender shall die; the fence shall die; the fence where a man from either the sons of Israel or from the resident foreigner (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל) begins with the situation of relational offence and then vv2-6/vv22-26 frame, composed of paraenetic material, provides the motivation for obedience (vv7-8, vv22-26) and then vv27-46, Burnside argues against the notion of v27 'balancing' vv2-6, but concedes that v2 and v27 form a frame since both verses involve penalty for offence and also idolatry, J. P. Burnside, 'The Medium and the Message: Necromancy and the Literary Context of Leviticus 20' in Text, Time, and Temple: Literary, Historical and Ritual Studies in Leviticus, ed. F. Landy, L. M. Trevaskis, and B. D. Bibb (HBM 64, Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2015), p. 44.

---

* See Hartley, Leviticus, p. 333; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 368; Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1728; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 254.
* Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1728, Burnside argues against the notion of v27 ‘balancing’ vv2-6, but concedes that vv2-6/vv22-26 frame since both verses involve penalty for offence and also idolatry.
* Joosten, People and Land, p. 67, argues that although the resident foreigner is included in 20.2, this does not mean that the resident foreigner has become a ‘proselyte’, but rather that ‘Molech-worship, be it at the hand of Israelites or of resident aliens, pollutes the sanctuary.’ Thus, 20.2 is prohibiting all Molech-worship in the land, which restricts the resident foreigner’s participation irrespective of their understanding of YHWH.
* N.B. The placing of כַּיָּדוֹ הָאֲדָמָּי in the clause-initial position to form an Xp clause structure highlights the identity of the people who are to stone the offender. Also, Joosten, People and Land, p. 44 observes the identical function between the כַּיָּדוֹ הָאֲדָמָּי in 20.2 where they act as both judge and executioner with the כְּיָדוֹ הָאֲדָמָּי in 24.14 and 46. Moreover, in 24.23, Moses speaks to the sons of Israel who then complete YHWH’s command to stone the blasphemer. Thus, the association between the three terms of address, while each having a distinct emphasis, refers to a similar group of people. Joosten, People and Land, p. 46, also notes though that the כַּיָּדוֹ הָאֲדָמָּי is a term belonging to the implied author’s context and so ‘the author of H lapses into a mode of speech which is not in tune with the fictional context but instead with his own historical
the offence requires the severest of penalties because it involves both idolatry and murder; thus, the community must enact the penalty immediately. Verse 3 then develops the consequence of the offence further when YHWH speaks directly by use of the first person as to how he will act against the man. First, he will set his presence (אתן א新たים) against the offender and second, he will cause the offender to be cut off from amongst his people. The rationale, as signalled by the י conjunction, is that the man has made YHWH’s sanctuary impure and has profaned his holy name. Milgrom rightly notes that this is the first time that idolatry is said to defile YHWH’s sanctuary and his holy name. However, this is not the first time in the global schema where there is consequence for defiling YHWH’s sanctuary. We have seen from the episodic schemas in Leviticus 11–15 that the consequence of ritual impurity is separation from YHWH temporarily until restored to a condition of purity, while remaining in a condition of impurity will have the consequence of death.

Thus, 20:3 is consistent with the logic of P’s theology, while at the same time it develops the principle to encompass ethical impurity, although due to the ethical nature context. He expects his audience to understand what is meant by the term [...] not because their imagination has followed the projection of the fictional Israel-in-the-desert into a setting in the land, but because they are themselves living in the land’. This ‘lapse’ by the implied author is not unheard of (see my comment on 18:25 on p. 204-205) and is very much possible.

46 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, pp. 1728, 1729.

47 As Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1733, observes, there is a play on נתן between the offender giving (נתן) his ‘seed’ to Molech in v2 and so YHWH declaring that he will set (נתן) his face against the offender. This play on נתן suggests that the consequence in v3 is an example of the Lex Talionis.

48 Joosten, People and Land, p. 67, succinctly identifies the issue in 20:2–6. ‘The problem with sins against YHWH is not first and foremost that they contaminate others in some way. The matter is much more serious: those sins defile the earthy dwelling of God, and thus raise the possibility that God will leave his earthly dwelling and, therefore, his people.’ While this is true, I question whether the emphasis in H (and even P) is the consequence of God’s departure so much as the consequence to the people if YHWH’s name and his sanctuary is profaned (e.g. 18:24-29, 26:16-33; cf. 15:31) i.e. death and exile of the people will ensue, rather than God leaving. I acknowledge though that Joosten, People and Land, p. 127, admits that 20:3 does not ‘specify that defilement of the sanctuary will lead to the departure of the godhead’, but still argues for the presence of the idea based especially upon 26:31.

49 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1734.

50 Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1734, acknowledges that ‘P’s only explicit statement to this effect is in regard to the ritual impurity of genital fluxes (15:31) and then continues, ‘Nonetheless, that H regards Molek worship, which takes place outside the sanctuary, capable of polluting the sanctuary indicates that it accepts and continues P’s doctrine of “Dorian Gray”; that is, severe impurity committed anywhere registers on the face of the sanctuary’. Yet as I note above, the rationale and penalty in 20:3 is equivalent to Israel persisting in her impurity (15:31), not the temporary separation that is the consequence of genital discharge.
of the offence, the consequence is more severe. There is no provision for restoration; idolatry defiles YHWH’s sanctuary and his name and so the consequence is permanent separation as conveyed by the חترت covenant penalty (v3). Verses 4-5 then outline the scenario where the fail to bring justice; YHWH will not only cause the offender to be cut off, but also his clan (בּוּדָּם וּבַשְׁמֵי). Verse 6 then applies the same logic to the situation where a man turns to necromancers. The language of prostitution once more suggests that the relational offence is against YHWH, and so God will enact the חترت covenant penalty. Irrespective of whether this is exile or death, the idea is that there will be permanent exclusion from God, his covenant community, and thus his presence. Consistent with vv1-5, this is an outworking of the lex talionis. The final verse of the episodic schema, v27, reactivates the same situation and penalty from v6, which is to put to death any man or woman who takes part in necromancy.

The warning and penalty of necromancy in v6 is then followed by paraenesis in vv7-8. Rather than prostituting themselves to other gods and to necromancers, God’s covenant people are to set themselves apart (והתקדשתם) and are to be holy for the reason that YHWH is their God. This is a different emphasis from Leviticus 18 and 19. The rationale in this instance is not imitation of YHWH’s nature, but rather because YHWH belongs exclusively to the people as their covenant God. The use of the thematic statement accentuates the covenant relationship and, used in association with the command for the nation to set themselves apart, emphasises the mutuality of relationship. An outworking of this mutuality is that Israel is to keep and do YHWH’s statutes (v8). The final clause in v8

---

35 See also Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, p. 371, who states, ‘On the other hand, utilizing the motif of cleanness and uncleanness and the defilement of the sanctuary in chs. 11 – 15, ch. 20 integrates the theme of defilement with so-called moral conduct’.


37 Thus, contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, p. 1739, vv7-8 is a contrast to vv2-6 and thus continues the flow of logic in the paragraph schema. There is no break. Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, p. 373, is indecisive noting that ‘the hypercontextual nature of this commandment makes it likely that the verses belong to both the preceding and following material.’ See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 338.

38 See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 338.
is an XP clause declaring that the one speaking, and thus commanding, is YHWH who has sanctified Israel. Israel is to be set apart because YHWH is her covenant God and the nation is to do YHWH’s instruction since her covenant God has sanctified Israel. Thus, the arrangement of the first paragraph progresses from the consequences of idolatry to a rationale for why Israel is to set themselves apart to YHWH – they belong to YHWH just as he belongs to the nation.\(^5\) The future orientation of vv2-8 suggests that Leviticus 20 seeks to influence the future behaviour of the newly-formed covenant nation and thus is reflective of a deliberative disposition. The intent, therefore, is to form Israel’s character and identity to be reflective of their holy status belonging to YHWH.

For the first time in the global arrangement, Israel’s sanctification is explicitly stated to be both Israel’s responsibility and YHWH’s work. In a sense, Milgrom helpfully observes that Israel’s status of holiness is an ‘innovation’ to H or, to be more precise, to Leviticus 17–21.\(^5\) In Leviticus 1–10, there is an emphasis upon the priesthood being set apart, and thus sharing the status of being ‘holy’, for the purpose of belonging as God’s servants in his sanctuary. The episodes in Leviticus 17–21 extend this idea to the people in the land, although there is a critical development.\(^5\) While Leviticus 1–10 pertains to the domain of Israel in the camp, Leviticus 17–21 extends the state of holiness to Israel in the land encompassing both the people of Israel (Lev. 17–20) and the priesthood (Lev. 21). The whole of Israel is to be set apart for the purpose of belonging to YHWH and later in 25:55,

\(^5\) J. L’Hour, ‘L’impur et le saint dans le Premier Testament à partir du livre du Lévitique Partie II: Le saint et sa rencontre avec l’impur et le Pur’, *ZAW* 116/1 (2004), p. 39, clarifies this idea of YHWH belonging to Israel helpfully by stating, ‘YHWH is the God of Israel, not in the sense that he is the property of Israel, but in the sense that he has attached himself to Israel’.


\(^5\) Contrary to the argument of Kugler, ‘Holiness’, pp. 16-17. While Kugler wishes to see the distinction between holiness language in Leviticus 17–26, and 18–22 as being a ‘contrast’ in theologies, my preference is to view Leviticus 18–22 deliberately extending the Israel at Sinai paradigm to Israel’s life in the land. This is a much more constructive viewpoint.
what has been implied is stated explicitly; they will belong to YHWH as his servants in the land.\textsuperscript{58}

Echoing the logic of vv2-8, the second paragraph in vv9-26 progresses from instruction outlining the penalties for relational offence (vv9-21) to paraenesis conveying the rationale for obedience (vv22-26). The list of penalties for relational offence in vv9-21 begins with the penalty for when an Israelite dishonours his father and his mother (v9).\textsuperscript{59} Once more the text uses the execution formula יומת and then adds a reason for the penalty – the Israelite has dishonoured his father and his mother. The place of אביו ואימו (an Xp clause) in the clause-initial position in v9a β highlights who was dishonoured, since the identity of the ones who are dishonoured is the critical factor. The consequence is that the offender's own blood is upon him (בדמי). Verses 10-16 then focus upon situations of relational offence where the death penalty (יומת) is the consequence following from v9. Afterwards, vv17-18 progress to relational offence where the penalty is being cut off (כרת) and the list concludes in vv19-21 with the penalty of barrenness.\textsuperscript{60} The way that the instructions are grouped suggests that the type of penalty shapes the arrangement, rather than the kind of offence or the identity of the offenders.\textsuperscript{61} However, it is worth noting that the nature of the relational offence in vv10-21 distinctly shifts to sexual offence. This raises the question of why the situation of dishonouring one's parents heads the list in v9. Milgrom observes, 'without respect for parents, all other family relationships are liable to collapse.'\textsuperscript{62} In the hierarchy of relational order, a child breaking relationship with his or her father and mother is a cause of relational disorder that could lead to disordered family

\textsuperscript{58} See Joosten, \textit{People and Land}, 132, pp. 197-199.
\textsuperscript{59} While the verbal root קָלָל can mean 'to curse' or 'to dishonour', v9 is probably meant to be the antithesis of 19:3a ('Everyone shall honour his mother and his father') and so 'to dishonour' is an appropriate translation. See also Sklar, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 256; Wenham, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 273. For those preferring the translation 'to curse', see Hartley, \textit{Leviticus}, pp. 338-339; Kiuchi, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 375.
\textsuperscript{60} See also Jenson, \textit{Graded Holiness}, p. 144.
\textsuperscript{61} For others who argue for the kind of penalty being the organising principle of vv9-21, please see Kiuchi. \textit{Leviticus}, pp. 369, 375; Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 17–22}, p. 1742; Sklar, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 254.
\textsuperscript{62} Milgrom, \textit{Leviticus 17–22}, p. 1745.
This is then a plausible reason for the penalty for cursing one's parents is arranged before penalties involving relational-sexual offence within a familial context (vv10-12) and within the community (vv13-16).

The list in vv9-21 culminates once more in paraenesis (vv22-26). Verse 22 presents a familiar juxtaposition between Israel keeping and doing YHWH's statutes and ordinances (v22) and the expectation that they will not walk in the statutes of the nations whom YHWH has sent out before Israel (v23). The reason why Israel is to keep YHWH's statutes is so that the land, into which YHWH is bringing his nation, will not vomit Israel out (v22b). Otherwise stated, the reason why Israel is not to walk in the other nations' statutes is that YHWH detested the previous inhabitants (v23b). The intent of the text within the persuasive situation is being stated explicitly; vv22-23 is motivating Israel to walk in YHWH's statutes so they too do not become detestable to YHWH. Verse 24 recalls God's promise of land, where the promise is a past event even within the persuasive situation, although the conquest of land is still a future event. He is giving Israel the land of the other nations, which flows with milk and honey, as their inheritance as an outworking of the mutual and exclusive covenant relationship. The recurrence of the thematic statement in v24bβ is once more a declaration of the identity of the one who is speaking and who has spoken. This declaration represents a significant development thematically within Leviticus' macrostructure. To this point, the thematic statement has been related to the exodus motif, but in v24bβ the thematic statement identifies the one who is and who has spoken with the one who has separated (יהביחב) Israel from the other nations. Thus, the paraenesis establishes the reason for why Israel should keep and do YHWH's statutes and

---


⁶⁶ N.B. Milgrom observes continuity between v22a and vv9-21 and also states that v22a shares similarities with v8a, which in turn closes vv1-7 as a unit. Thus, Milgrom observes continuity where his delimitation actually seeks discontinuity. Thus, it is feasible that vv9-26 are a unit considering that v22a also continues with the rest of the paraenesis. Similarly, v8 culminates vv1-7 as a paragraph. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, p. 1759.
not the statutes of the other nations; YHWH has gifted the land as Israel's inheritance as their covenant God so that Israel can be separate from the surrounding peoples.

The repetition of the verbal root בדלי between the final clause of v24 and the beginning of v25 forms a tail-head link between the two verses and thus connects YHWH separating Israel from the other peoples with the food instructions from Leviticus 11. Israel is to separate the pure from the impure in the spheres of landed animals, birds, and swarming creatures, which YHWH has set apart as such. In essence, Israel is to imitate YHWH's action of separation by how the nation makes the separation between pure and impure food. The food laws then become an analogy for how YHWH separated Israel who is to remain pure in her distinction and separation.⁶⁵ The purpose of this analogy is to help Israel embody the worldview that YHWH has separated the nation from the other peoples so that they can be in a condition of purity in the land.⁶⁶ Verse 26 then develops the rationale of the analogy further, which is that Israel is to be set apart for YHWH both in imitation of YHWH's holiness and because their covenant God has separated Israel from the peoples to belong solely to him.⁶⁶ Thus, the disposition of vv9-26 continues to be deliberative. The impact of vv9-26 is to dissuade Israel from walking in the statues of the other nations and so persuade the new covenant community to embody her identity of belonging to YHWH in separateness and purity.

⁶⁵ See also Houston, 'Towards an Integrated Reading', p. 158; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 263. Contrary to J. Blenkinsopp, 'Structure of P', CBQ 38 (1976), p. 291, who views the relationship between the food laws and the instruction for Israel to be separate from the nations as follows, 'We may take this as an important clue to P's understanding of the occupation of the land as a prerequisite for fulfilling the demands of holiness by physical separation from the Gentile world.'

⁶⁶ Jenson, Graded Holiness, p. 146, understands the conceptual basis of this idea of separation to be 'God dwelling in the midst of the whole people'. Thus, there is a possibility that the conceptual basis is aligned with P although H is extending the domain to land and people.

⁶⁷ N.B. Milgrom, Leviticus 7–22, p. 1761, views vv24b-26 as a chiastic arrangement, using the four-fold repetition of בדלי. In this arrangement, there is equivalence between v24b and v26 and so accentuating the relationship between YHWH setting apart Israel from the peoples with Israel's responsibility to imitate YHWH's holiness. However, v25a and v26b do not share equivalence per se because the logic is continuous and one unit of thought. Thus, while a chiastic arrangement is nothing more than a nice idea, the association is certainly present between v24b and v26.
Thus, the movement from instruction (vv 2-6, vv 9-21) to paraenesis (vv 7-8, vv 22-26) is part of the text's rhetorical strategy to evince the motivation for why Israel is to embody her status of being holy and so not prostitute themselves to other gods or practices (vv 2-8), or follow the ways of the other nations (vv 9-27). The reason in the first movement is YHWH having sanctified Israel and he, their covenant God, belongs to them (vv 2-8). The second movement develops the first, which is that YHWH has separated Israel from the nations and so they must in turn set themselves apart to belong solely to him. Thus, the repeated movement from instruction to paraenesis connects both sides of covenant mutuality and Israel's responsibility in that relationship.

1.5 The Arrangement and Intent of Leviticus 21:1-15

The beginning quotative frame in 21:1 changes the addressees solely to the Aaronic priesthood. The speech begins with the XP clause in 21:1כַּעֲמָיו לֹא יִטְמָא לְנַפְשָׁם, and is the head theme for the whole schema. This topic is a broad concept at first commanding the priesthood not to become impure for 'anyone' (לְנַפְשׂ) among his people. This head thematic referent is also the topic for the first paragraph. The first paragraph schema progresses in vv 2-3 to list his blood relatives (שארו) who are exceptions to this principle, which culminates in the unmarried sister for whom a priest may defile himself (v 3). The sequential flow of the schema is then broken at the beginning of v 4, v 5, and v 6, by use of asyndeton. The impact is to draw attention to what is being said in these verses. Verse 4 is a prohibition against a priest becoming impure as a 'husband' (בעל) among his people and so profaning himself. The second instance of asyndeton in v 5 highlights the prohibition against taking part in mourning rituals that mark their bodies. Verse 6, the third instance

\[\text{The meaning of v 4 has caused confusion, particularly the phrase בעמיו בעל. See Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, pp. 1800-1801, for a detailed survey of the various interpretative options. I have rendered this phrase above as 'a husband among his people' and takes the prohibition to mean that he is not to defile himself by participating in the mourning rites of any of his wife's family. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 348; Joosten, People and Land, p. 82; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 264. This is contrary to Wenham, Leviticus, p. 290, who states that the 'most plausible interpretation' is to prohibit the priest from 'joining himself in marriage to a woman of doubtful character'. Yet this does not take into account the phrase בעמיו בעל as Hartley's suggestion does.}\]
of asyndeton, then highlights the reason for why the priesthood is to ensure that they are not defiled, which is that they are holy to their God and are not to profane the name of YHWH.\textsuperscript{69} Verse 6bβ conveys the rationale for why they are to maintain their holy state, which is that they draw near with the food offerings of YHWH. Thus, the arrangement of the schema focuses first upon the exceptions on whose behalf the Aaronic priests may defile themselves (vv2-3), but then prohibits specific situations in which the priesthood may not be defiled or profaned (vv4-5). The schema culminates with the rationale for vv1-5 centring upon the priestly responsibility to maintain their state of being holy since their vocation is to offer the bread of their God as a food offering (v6).

Verse 7 then shifts the topic to who the Aaronic priests are not to marry, namely a prostitute or a divorced woman. This topic shift is significant enough to suggest the beginning of a new paragraph schema, although still within the domain of the head theme introduced in 1bβ. The remainder of the paragraph in v7bβ-8 accentuates the rationale for this prohibition by reactivating the theme of holiness once more. However, while v7bβ is unambiguous, v8 is not as clear due to the sudden use of the second person.\textsuperscript{70} Irrespective though of who is being instructed in v8, the emphasis is still upon the necessity for the priesthood to remain holy since their covenant God, who set apart both the priesthood and Israel, is holy. Thus, the four-fold repetition of קדש in v7bβ-8 emphasises priestly responsibility because of their distinctive status within Israel and their task serving YHWH in his sanctuary. The intent is to motivate the Aaronic priesthood to embody their state of being holy in order to reflect the character of their God who has set them apart. The

\textsuperscript{69} Verse 6 is an Xp clause, which does not mark the beginning of a new paragraph, but rather highlights the state of קדש that the priesthood is to maintain.

\textsuperscript{70} Hartley, Leviticus, p. 348, acknowledges that the use of the 2nd person in v8 could be a direct address to the priesthood, especially in light of v1. However, he is also persuaded that the direct address of the 'you' could be Israel and so the congregation is given the responsibility for ensuring that the priesthood maintains their holy state. The problem with this understanding is that v8 then claims that the priesthood belongs to the people if the lamed prefix is possessive, יהיה לך קדש. The odd nature of v8 leads Noth, Leviticus, p. 156, to conclude that it is a secondary interpolation. However, the ambiguity does not affect the overall argument of this section and so at this point I will not attempt to offer a solution to the problem.
paragraph does not conclude with the paraenesis in v8, however. The paragraph schema continues in v9 addressing the penalty for the daughter of a priest in the situation where she has prostituted herself. The reason why this occurs after the paraenesis is that the situation is where the priest has not directly profaned himself, but has been indirectly profaned by the actions of his daughter.

Although the \textit{vav} consecutive at the beginning of v10 suggests schematic continuity the shift in topic to focus upon the high priest suggests the beginning of a new paragraph. The logic of the arrangement seems to redress the issues already raised in relation to the priesthood, but now in relation to the greater responsibility of the high priest. Verses 10-12 restrict the high priest from participating in mourning rites (v10) and from viewing the dead bodies, even of his father and mother (v11). Verse 12 gives the rationale for the greater restriction, which is that he shall not leave the sanctuary due to the danger of profaning the sanctuary of his God. Jenson clarifies this restriction further when he observes that the central issue is also about contact with the dead, both for the high priest and for the priesthood, stating,

\begin{quote}
The laws thus affirm the incompatibility between death and the cultic personnel, while also recognizing the inevitable occurrence of death. The graded distancing from death points to the character of the living God who dwelt at the centre of the sanctuary, who could not be touched by death at all.\footnote{Jenson, \textit{Graded Holiness}, p. 129.}
\end{quote}

Verses 13-15 then reactivates the issue of who the high priest is and is not to marry. He is to avoid profaning his seed because YHWH has set him apart. Thus, this final paragraph in the schema, with the greater restrictions, heightens the greater responsibility of the high priest not to profane both God's sanctuary and his seed and, in doing so, heightens the danger of the high priest profaning what YHWH has set apart as his own. The progression of the episodic schema from the priesthood generally (vv1-9) to the high priest (vv10-15)
is part of the strategy of the text to accentuate the high priest's greater responsibility, and so the intent is to dissuade the high priest from profaning YHWH's sanctuary.

1.6 The Arrangement and Intent of Leviticus 21:16-23

The addressee of the speech report is now solely Aaron suggesting that the instructions in vv17-23 are his, and future high priests', responsibility. The initial XP clause in v17αβ topicalises the episodic schema as the head theme, which is a prohibition against a man of Aaronic lineage, and who has a blemish (محمد), from offering the 'bread of his God'. Verse 21 reiterates this head theme once more after vv18-20 explicates particular examples of 'blemishes' that would hinder a man from Aaron's line from fulfilling the priestly task of approaching YHWH.32 The schema then concludes with a juxtaposition between permission for the blemished man to eat from 'the bread of his God' (v22) and the restriction upon his priestly tasks because of his blemish (v23). The rationale in v23cג repeats the clause from the conclusion of 21:15: יִהְיֶה מַכְדֵּשׁ, ב אַל יהוה. This association between physical blemishes hindering the priestly task with the concept of קדש suggests that only 'the whole' can serve YHWH in his presence. This is not suggesting though that 'physical wholeness corresponds to the holiness of his [the priestly] task', as Hartley states.34 Instead, wholeness shares the semantic domain of purity and so too a lack of wholeness shares the semantic domain of impurity. Thus, since impurity represents

---

32 Milgrom questions why the priestly instruction addresses physical imperfections and allows for a glaring omission of ethical imperfections (Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1821). He dismisses the idea that the ritual and ethical demands of קדש for the priesthood are included also within the ethical commands for Israel. He argues instead that the focus on physical blemishes are to bear equivalence with 22:22-24. While there is equivalence, this lies in the fact that nothing with a blemish is allowed in God's presence. Just as the gifts need to be unblemished, so too God's servants that offer them must be unblemished because their task requires approaching YHWH. Yet Milgrom is mistaken to dismiss the notion that ethical demands in Leviticus 18–20 include the priesthood. Whilst the priesthood is distinct from the people, their status as being set apart is as a smaller subset of the people, not exclusion. Thus, Leviticus 21 tightens the demands for the priesthood in certain aspects of mourning the dead and in marriage, but this is in addition to what is commanded in Leviticus 18–20.

33 The only difference between v15αβ and v23cג is the use of the 3rd person masculine singular pronominal suffix in v15 in contrast with the 3rd person plural in v23cג.

34 Hartley, Leviticus, p. 351. Wenham, Leviticus, p. 292, also states, 'The idea emerges clearly that holiness finds physical expression in wholeness and normality' See also Douglas, Purity and Danger, pp. 51-52.
incompleteness, it profanes what is holy, namely YHWH’s sanctuary. Thus, wholeness is not an expression of what it means to be holy, but rather is the means of maintaining their state of being holy, namely being in a condition of purity and thus accepted in God’s presence.\footnote{See also Rooker, Leviticus, p. 276, ‘Thus God’s perfection demanded the higher degree of perfection possible among those who minister and among the offerings that were presented to him.’}

Thus, there is thematic coherence between 21:1-15 and 21:16-23, which suggests that the intent of both episodes is to ensure the priesthood reflects their status of being set apart by YHWH. The logic of both episodes evinces the relationship between the status of the priesthood and the success of their priestly task. They are to maintain their holy status because of their task i.e. offering the bread of their covenant God and so the implication being that if their status is profaned, and so they profane YHWH’s sanctuary, then their task of offering the food offerings of YHWH will fail. Thus, the intent of this episode is to dissuade the Aaronic priesthood from profaning YHWH’s sanctuary by being in a condition of incompleteness, which in this instance is to ensure that no man with a blemish may approach YHWH with food offerings in his sanctuary.

1.7 The Disposition and Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 17–21

As part of the rhetorical strategy of the text, Leviticus 17–21 sustains a future orientation seeking to influence Israel’s future actions and character as they possess and dwell in the land. The text consistently displays a deliberative disposition. Also, this disposition of the text is further evidenced by the use of paraenesis as a device within the rhetorical strategy to make the persuasive intent of the text explicit. Along with these features of the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 17–21, there are other dimensions that I have mentioned in passing throughout the above analysis and which are worth establishing further before exploring the next episodic schema in 22:1-16.
The first feature is the progression within Leviticus 19 from instruction embodying the Sinaitic Decalogue in vv3-18 to then extending these instructions in vv19-37 to relational and social issues in the land (vv19-37). This progression suggests that relational order within the community, whether it be relating to the elderly, the resident foreigner, or ensuring that the weights for measuring are just, are an outworking of the principles within the Sinaitic Decalogue. In doing so, framing these relational issues within the persuasive situation motivates all Israelite generations in the land to reflect relational order established in how the nation was formed and who formed it, namely YHWH their God. If this is a plausible suggestion, then Leviticus 19 being enclosed by Leviticus 18 and 20 may not be a coincidence since these two chapters warn about two inter-related dangers. The first danger is persisting in the behaviours of Egypt and adopting the Canaanite way of life since the consequence would be the nation being in an impure condition. The second danger then is the real possibility of exile for all Israelite generations in the land if they profane the place where God's presence resides within the land, first within the tabernacle and then the temple.

The second feature of the episode's strategy is the movement from YHWH addressing the people (Lev. 17–20) to YHWH addressing the priesthood (Lev. 21). By addressing both the people and the priesthood, the text extends and develops the necessity for both people and priesthood to maintain their status of being holy. For the first time in the global schema, as noted above, the state of holiness encompasses the people and, in doing so, extends the state of holiness from relational order with YHWH within the ritual domain to relational order with YHWH within the ethical domain. In extending the state of holiness to the wider nation, there is an application of the idea of belonging to the people as well. Previously in Leviticus 6–7 and 8:1-36, the priesthood is set apart to belong to YHWH as

---

76 I recognise that L’Hour, ‘L’impur et le saint’, Partie II, p. 50, also uses the language of the Holiness Code ‘extending the sacred to the whole of Israel’ (my translation). In his understanding of how H ‘extends’ P, he also sees a movement from a ‘collective ethic’ to an ‘individual morality’. However, whilst H certainly employs both the singular second person and also the plural, Leviticus 18–20 still maintains an emphasis upon collective guilt and accountability.
his servants and now Leviticus 18–20 explicitly extends this same logic to the Israelite nation who, as YHWH's new covenant community, are set apart from the nations to belong to him. For this reason of the mutuality of belonging, Israel is to keep and do YHWH's commands. The inclusion of the priesthood within the episodic schema therefore suggests that they are not 'above' the ethical dimension, in fact they have greater responsibility to maintain their holy state since they are set apart for YHWH as his servants to offer his food offerings. The greater responsibility is due to the weightiness of their task and their greater access to YHWH's presence. As this development occurs, the thematic referent for the global schema is then re-introduced, אני יהוה אלהיכם, אטנ קדש אלעזרים, with a more prominent use of paraenesis. These developments work together as part of the text's strategy to persuade the people and priesthood to reflect their status of being a people who belong to their covenant God, just as YHWH belongs to the nation as their God. The use of the exodus tradition modifying the thematic referent within the paraenesis deliberately calls Israel at Sinai to shape their identity and their worldview by the formative event of the exodus.

These two aspects of the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 17–21 suggests that the aim is to inculcate YHWH's worldview within Israel at Sinai. The self-understanding of the text is that the instruction is divinely-given and mediated, rather than a human construct of a particular culture seeking to define their identity and maintain societal order. Thus, the instructions given by YHWH are to be identity-defining instruction for all future generations in the land. Thus, the sum of the whole text in Leviticus 17–21 forms Israel's self-identity, and so also their character and behaviour, to be reflective of their covenant God to whom they belong. Furthermore, Leviticus 17–21 persuades Israel to desist from the ways of life they learnt in Egypt that could cause the nation to become impure, and so causing separation from God's presence. In desisting, Israel is then motivated to pursue relational order and wholeness with YHWH their God and so by extension with one another in wider community. So, through the use of sequential connectedness and by framing the instruction within the persuasive situation of Israel at Sinai, the text aims to
motivate all future generations in the land to embody relational wholeness with their covenant God so as to reflect their status as a nation belonging to YHWH.

2. Leviticus 22:1-16: Instructions for the Priesthood about the 'Holy Things'

While Leviticus 22:1-16 is a new episode, it is sequentially connected to 21:16-23 through the continuity of addressees (priesthood), by reactivating the situation where a man approaches from all the seed of Aaron (v3αβ cf. 21:17), and by the repetition of the thematic referent רכינא יהוה מקדשים at the conclusion of the schema (v16; see also 21:8αγ, 21:15αβ, 21:23cβ). However, although there is a significant topical and thematic connection with Leviticus 21, 22:1-16 distinctively integrates the head theme into the second quotative frame in v2. Verse 2a begins with the familiar command for Moses to speak to Aaron and his sons, which then continues with a sequence of wayiqtol + yiqtol verbs (ויהי ...) והם יתקלו). The use of the jussive in v2b suggests the intent of the schema is to motivate the priesthood to separate themselves from the holy things of YHWH and to dissuade them from acting in a way that profanes YHWH’s holy name.

Whilst the first paragraph in vv1-2 topicalises the whole schema, the initial XP clause topicalises v3 as a pithy paragraph focusing upon the situation where an Aaronic priest approaches YHWH’s holy things in an impure condition. The logic of the paragraph culminates with the כחר penalty where, in this instance, the offending priest is cut off from YHWH’s presence. As we have noted above in relation to the instruction about impurities in Leviticus 13–14, the consequence of impurity is that a person is separated from the presence of YHWH until he or she is restored to a condition of purity. A priest though who enters God’s presence in an impure condition has the consequence of permanent exclusion from YHWH’s presence since there is a greater responsibility due to greater

77 See also Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1845, who notes the continuity between Leviticus 21 and Leviticus 22 on the basis of the thematic links. Ruwe, Heiligkeitsgesetz, pp. 251-256, views Leviticus 21:1–22:16 as a unit due to structural and thematic coherence.
78 See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 354.
access to YHWH’s presence (cf. 7:20). The repetition of the thematic referent consoli-
dates the second paragraph.

The third paragraph in vv4-9 then addresses the more specific situation of when an
Aaronic priest has a צירע or a discharge and is therefore prohibited from eating the priestly
portion (בקדשים). The logic of the paragraph clarifies the cause of impurity (vv4c-6) and
the process for being restored to a condition of purity after which the priest can eat his
prebends (vv6-7). The paragraph schema concludes with paraenesis in v9. As Milgrom
notes, the use of paraenesis is a warning to keep YHWH’s commands so as to avoid the
danger of bearing sin ‘upon himself’ and so die since they have been profaned. The
repetition of the extended thematic formula consolidates the paragraph,
but in doing so indirectly gives the reason for the penalty – YHWH himself has set them
apart. Thus, the paraenesis in v9, dissuading the priesthood from profaning what is holy
since YHWH has consecrated the priesthood, reaffirms the text’s intent from v2 and
expands this intent by communicating its rationale.

The XP structure beginning the final paragraph, vv10-16, shifts the topic to prohibit an
unauthorised person (זר) from eating the ‘holy things’ (see also v13d). The paragraph
schema progresses through a series of clarifications about who may not and who may eat
the prebends (vv10b-13), after which v14 then outlines the process for reparation if

---

79 Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, p. 1853, surmises that the כרת penalty is either the end of the priest’s line or ‘death by divine agency’. Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 273, considers the כרת penalty at this point to mean exile, death, or no longer being allowed to serve at the altar (see also Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 355). How one understands the כרת penalty in this instance does not make a difference to the consequence as being one of permanent exclusion.

80 Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, p. 1855, clarifies that the priest is unable to eat the prebends until after he has washed himself with water (v6c5). Thus, the impure priest must wait until evening and then bathing is a condition of eating.

81 See Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, p. 1858, who states, ‘This hortatory verse is appended to the laws of vv. 4-8 as a warning to the priests that because of their status any impurity prohibition they violate is deserving of capital punishment at the hands of God.’

82 See also Milgrom, *Leviticus* 17–22, p. 1860. While Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 271, agrees the priesthood are those whom YHWH has set apart, I would disagree with the means that Sklar suggests. The priesthood’s obedience to command is an outcome of their holy status, rather than the means of their consecration. They are set apart for their task when they are anointed as priests and so their behaviour must be aligned to their status.
anyone eats the 'holy things' unwittingly (בשגגה). Verses 15-16 culminate both the paragraph and episodic schema with paraenesis prohibiting the profaning of the 'holy things' presented to YHWH. The expanded thematic referent is repeated once more at the end of v16 to give the rationale for the prohibition, but this time what YHWH has set apart refers not to the priesthood, but to their share of the food gifts (the 'holy things'). The repetition of this refrain is a device within the rhetorical strategy of the text to accentuate that no one is to profane what YHWH has set apart and especially what is set apart to belong to him. Thus, the logic of the arrangement and the future orientation of the text suggests that the disposition is still deliberative. Leviticus 22:1-16 functions, therefore, as a warning and so dissuades the priesthood from profaning what is holy to God by accentuating the consequence of ritual failure.

3. Leviticus 22:17-33: When a Gift is and is Not Acceptable

The XP structure beginning the speech report in v18bβ topicalises the first paragraph schema by introducing the situation where a man from the house of Israel or from the resident foreigner offers his gift (vow, free-will, or an עולה) for YHWH (v18bβ). The first paragraph schema then progresses in vv19-20 by contrasting what is needed for the offerer's acceptance (לרצנכם), namely a male from the cattle, flock, or a goat that is תמים, with what will hinder acceptance, which is a blemished (מום) animal. The second paragraph in vv21-25 maintains a similar emphasis upon what is and is not acceptable, but within the topic of offering a שלמים זבח. The arrangement of the paragraph has two phases of logic. The first phase in vv21-23 describes in greater length the kind of blemish that is not acceptable, while the second phase of logic in vv24-25 prohibits the mutilating of animals in the land and especially from being offered to YHWH.

---

83 Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1870; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 272.
84 The issue here is not that תמים is the central characteristic of holiness, but that this is the criterion for acceptance into God's presence. Thus, it is more likely that תמים is in the semantic domain of purity since it is language of 'condition' rather than of 'status'. Contrary to Douglas, Purity and Danger, pp. 64-65; Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1873.
Verse 27 introduces the head theme of the third paragraph using a topicalising XP structure that initiates a situation where an ox, sheep, or goat is born and it is acceptable as an offering by fire to YHWH. There are two phases of logic within the arrangement. The first in vv27-28 is a juxtaposition between when the newly born livestock is acceptable (v27c), namely after the seventh day, and a prohibition against killing both the young and the mother in one day (v28). The second phase of logic in vv28-30 is dependent upon the protasis in v28a, which is when a thanksgiving gift is sacrificed to YHWH. In this situation, the offerer has the responsibility of sacrificing it for the offerer’s acceptance and for it to be eaten on the day of sacrifice (see also 7:15).

The episodic schema culminates in vv31-33 with paraenesis that both restates and develops the thematic referent אֱלֹהִי אֲנִי. The paraenesis begins in v31 with the familiar instruction to keep and do YHWH's commands. The declaration אֱלֹהִי אֲנִי at the conclusion of v31 is the reason for obedience; the one commanding is YHWH and by extension of all that his name embodies has the right to expect obedience from his nation. Verses 32-33 then develop the global thematic referent further. After v32a prohibits profaning YHWH's name, v32b then suggests the consequence of adhering to the prohibition, which is that YHWH will be sanctified (וֹנֶקֶדֵשֵׁנִי) in the midst of Israel. By virtue of Israel not profaning YHWH's name, they are ensuring that YHWH is set apart amongst the people. The choice of the first person niphal is significant; prominence is given to the one who is sanctified, rather than the ones (the people) doing the setting apart. Moreover, Hess recognises that the use of the niphal 'can be a command or a promise' since the ‘central claim' of the clause can be translated 'I must be acknowledged as holy by the Israelites,' and 'and I will be acknowledged as holy among the Israelites'. Thus, Israel’s responsibility is to ensure YHWH is sanctified and, the consequence of failing to do so is that YHWH will sanctify himself. The modified global thematic referent is then declared in v32b וּנְקֵדֵשֵׁנִי אֱלֹהִי אֲנִי.

—Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1880, hesitantly offers this suggestion, although recognising the complexity of vv24-25.
—Hess, 'Leviticus', p. 780.
The use of this refrain in relation with וקדש accentuates the mutuality of קדש within the covenant relationship (see also 10:3). YHWH is to be set apart amongst his covenant people just as he has set them apart. Verse 33, however, continues to expand upon יהוה from v32b by expounding upon YHWH’s identity further as the one who brought Israel from the land of Egypt to be their covenant God. The statement of YHWH’s identity in vv32b-33 is unparalleled within the global schema of Leviticus. The thematic referent יהוה is modified by both descriptors: he has consecrated and redeemed Israel. Thus, vv32b-33 relates the theme of ‘the one who has sanctified you’ with the exodus tradition, and done so with the goal of covenant relationship.

The significance of this development within the global schema cannot be understated. The function of 22:32b is essentially a development of the principle from 10:3. Like 10:3, 22:32b uses the niphal of קדש expressing that YHWH be sanctified in the midst of the people. There is, however, a different emphasis in 22:32b in comparison with 10:3 in terms of who is near whom. In 10:3, the use of קרוב with the first person pronominal suffix places the emphasis upon those who are near YHWH; thus, it is the priest who approaches God and, in doing so, must ensure YHWH is sanctified. Leviticus 22:32b is a Px clause where, although the focus is upon YHWH being sanctified, the prepositional phrase בתוך ישראל identifies where he is to be sanctified, namely among the sons of Israel. This then reflects a conceptual development within the global schema since now the people, rather than just the priesthood, are being instructed to ensure that YHWH is sanctified in their

---

87. See also Müller, ‘The Sanctifying Divine Voice’, p. 82. He states in relation to 22:31-33, ‘A concept of reciprocal sanctification is related to the exhortation to observe the commandments’. I disagree with Müller though that the means of sanctification is ‘through his voice in order to make them observe his commandments’ (Müller, ‘The Sanctifying Divine Voice’, p. 83). The means of YHWH sanctifying is related to the exodus event in 22:33. Also, the view above is contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1889, who argues, ‘To render it “who made you holy” is to contravene one of the basic axioms of the priestly establishment: only the sanctuary and its priests are “made” holy. Israel, however, although not innately holy, can strive for holiness (19:2). That is, God provides, through his commandments, the means by which Israel can attain holiness.’

88. In this instance Milgrom, Leviticus 17–22, p. 1888, renders the niphal not as a reflexive, but rather as ‘I may be sanctified’.
It is both the priests' and the nation's responsibility as an outworking of the mutuality of the covenant relationship. While the declaration 'I am YHWH your God' is the global thematic referent, the relationship between 10:3 and 22:32b suggests that these two principles may encompass the whole text and is the persuasive intent of the whole. Certainly, the principle in 22:32b makes explicit what has been implied throughout Leviticus 16–22 and also encompasses the following episodes in Leviticus 23–27.

Thus, within the persuasive situation, there is a concern for the Israelites to avoid profaning YHWH's name and so avoid ritual failure. The instructions maintain a future orientation seeking to influence the future behaviour of both the priests and nation and thus reflects a deliberative disposition. The use of paraenesis is a significant part of the text's rhetorical strategy as it relates the responsibility of the offerer to bring a gift that will be acceptable on his or her behalf with Israel's responsibility for ensuring that YHWH is sanctified among them. The intent is to persuade the Israelite community to embody their status of being holy by honouring YHWH with acceptable gifts and, in doing so, ensure that YHWH is sanctified in their midst.

4. Leviticus 23: YHWH's Appointed Times

The XP clause beginning the speech in 23:2bβ topicals the episodic schema with the head theme of YHWH's appointed times that the sons of Israel are to proclaim as YHWH's 'holy festal days'. Each paragraph of the episodic schema then describes an appointed time to be observed for YHWH until the concluding quotative frame in v40 consolidates the whole by narrating Moses' obedience; he spoke the appointed times to the sons of

---

89 In this context, the thematic development occurring in 22:32 is not as extraordinary or 'striking' as Kugler, 'Holiness', p. 16, perceives. Kugler views 22:32 to be incompatible theologically within Leviticus 1–16 and indeed as a 'corrective' to Leviticus 1–16 (Kugler, 'Holiness', p. 27).

90 Please see Joosten, People and Land, pp. 133-134, for an overview of the argument for rendering קדש מקראי as 'holy festal' days rather than holy assemblies or holy convocations.
There are five observations about how the episodic schema progresses that will aid our understanding of Leviticus 23’s arrangement and its rhetorical strategy.

First, the episodic schema seems to progress without peculiarity within the first two paragraphs. The first paragraph in vv1-2 is simply the beginning sequence of quotative frames and the head theme statement. Verse 3, also with an initial XP clause, topicalises the second paragraph to focus upon the contrast between the six days where the Israelites can do work and the seventh day that is to be a Sabbath for YHWH (cf. Ex. 35:2aα).

However, v4 unexpectedly begins a new paragraph schema with a cataphoric XP topicalising clause reiterating the head theme already introduced in v2bβ. This redundancy acts to distinguish the Sabbath instructions within the schema from those beginning in v4. While this level of redundancy leads Milgrom to argue that vv1-2aα is the original quotative frame and v4 the original head theme for the schema, this does not need to be the case. Simply, v4 is reactivating the head theme to distinguish the instruction about the Sabbath and, by repeating the head theme, the rest of the schema can then develop focusing on the festal days Israel is to proclaim for YHWH.

The second observation is that v5, beginning with a temporal frame, shifts the theme to focus upon the Passover for YHWH (יהוה פסח), which is the thematic referent for vv6-8. This paragraph schema closes with a sequence of redundant quotative frames in vv9-10bα, which leads to the third observation; the sequence of redundant quotative frames in vv9-10bα is the first of four occurrences in the remainder of the schema (vv9-10bα,

---

91 See also Rooker, *Leviticus*, p. 281, who states, ‘The chapter closes (23:44) with the declaration that Moses had announced the appointed feasts to the Israelites. Clearly the chapter is a unified whole’.
93 Even if vv2bβ-3 is a later interpolation of the text, this strengthens the argument for a purposeful shaping of Leviticus 23 where the instructions about the Sabbath are distinguished within the schema, rather than causing disconnection within the text. For an argument for vv2bβ-3 as a later addition, see Knohl, ‘The Priestly Torah’, p. 72; J. Milgrom, ‘H₂ in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah’ in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. R. Rendtorff and R. A. Kugler (VTS 93, Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2003), p. 29; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, pp. 1954-1955; Noth, *Leviticus*, p. 166.
vv23-24α, v26, vv33-34α). The redundant quotative frames in vv9-10β pause the information flow so that the initial clause structure in v10β can focus upon the situation where Israel comes into the land that YHWH is giving them, they reap a harvest, and then they are to bring a sheaf of their first harvest to the priest. This sheaf becomes the thematic referent for the paragraph schema concluding in v14 with the declaration that the gift to YHWH is to be a permanent statute for their generations in all their dwelling places. While v14 consolidates vv9-14 as a paragraph, vv15-16 continues the temporal sequence from v14 and focuses upon the offering of a new מנה to YHWH after which vv17-21 then continues to unfold the offering process of this new מנה. Once more, the declaration in v21, which is that the gift is to be a permanent statute for the Israelite generations in all dwelling places, seems to culminate the paragraph schema. The initial XP clause in v22, however, continues the schema unexpectedly with a repetition of 19:9-10 and so highlights God's provision for the poor and the resident foreigner amongst the Israelites.

The second set of sequential redundant quotative frames in vv23-24α marks schematic discontinuity from v22, which allows v24αβ to shift the topic to a memorial Sabbath, marked by a war cry, as a holy assembly. The third redundant quotative frame in v26 also pre-empts a change in topic in v27 to the Day of Atonement, which is the thematic referent for the paragraph schema in vv27-32. The fourth sequence of redundant quotative frames in vv33-34α occurs before the theme shift in v34 to the Feast of Booths for YHWH. Verses 34-36 outline how the Israelites are not to do work for the first and

---

* Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 371, also notes the recurrence of quotative frames, although not their redundancy. However, similar to my observations above, he does observe their pragmatic function to distinguish each unit of thought and to remind the implied audience that the instructions being spoken have been 'specifically ordained by God'.

** See also Milgrom, 23–27, p. 1982, who observes that the quotative frame in vv9-10α introduces the first-fruits gift.

*** As noted by Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 374; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2010; Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 284. Milgrom notes that 19:10a is omitted in 23:22, but that there is a logical omission with v10a addressing the grape harvest, which is not seasonal for the time that this festival is celebrated. See also Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 284; Wenham, *Leviticus*, pp. 304-305.
eighth day, while the seven days in between are for offering food gifts to YHWH.

Unexpectedly, the theme of the feast of booths recurs in the final paragraph, vv39-43, explaining the feast in more detail including the rationale in v43, which establishes the relationship between the feast of booths and the exodus motif.

The fourth observation then is that an Xp summary statement of the episodic schema beginning vv37-38 interrupts and also distinguishes the two paragraphs, vv34-36 and 39-43, which focus on the feast of booths to YHWH.\(^9\) The initial anaphoric demonstrative in v37 refers to all the appointed times addressed within the episodic schema and also identifies the purpose of the instructions, which is so that the Israelites can bring their food gifts to YHWH.\(^9\) Moreover, v38 clarifies that these gifts are in addition to the Sabbaths, their usual gifts, those that are vowed, and the gifts that are voluntary. This raises a question about why this summary statement is not arranged at the conclusion prior to the closing quotative frame narrating that Moses spoke all the appointed times to the Israelites.

The fifth observation is that apart from the instruction about the Sabbath in v3, the first and final paragraphs (vv5-8, vv39-43) concern feasts that are associated with the exodus tradition. The first, the Passover in vv5-8, occurs after the redundant cataphoric topicalising clause in v4 and the exodus tradition is implied, whereas the explicit mention of the purpose of the Feast of Booths in v43 alludes directly to YHWH bringing Israel from Egypt. The thematic referent in v43, אָלְמָא יְהוָה אֲלָדוֹתֵם, then follows. Thus, the summary statement does not conclude the speech report so that the final emphasis of the

---

\(^9\) Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2033, suggests that vv37-38 is the original summary statement and thus a discontinuity marker for the schema, forming an inclusio with v4. This suggests that vv39-43 is a later addendum. This logic, however, is problematic because if vv39-43 is a composition of three sources (as per Milgrom), then not only is this an intricate work of redaction, seamlessly editing clauses together, but the implied editor has reproduced the rationale in v43 in a way that reflects H ideology. Milgrom tries to justify v43 by stating, 'it may be the work of an exilic tradent (Hr) who wished to authenticate his additions' (Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2036).

\(^{99}\) Due to the summary nature of v37, Knohl, 'The Priestly Torah', p. 95, argues that v37 was the original conclusion to the PT source for the material.
arrangement, before the concluding quotative frame, is the allusion to the exodus event and the declaration of the global thematic referent."

Thus, the theme of the episodic schema is the appointed times of YHWH that the Israelites are to proclaim as holy festal days (vv1-2, v4). The purpose of the episodic schema is so that the Israelites will bring their food offerings to YHWH at these appointed times (v37). This purpose together with the future orientation of the instruction suggests that text seeks to influence the future actions of the newly-formed nation and also events within the life of Israel. Once more, the emphasis of the episode's logic is upon setting apart YHWH what belongs to him and, in this case, this pertains to feast days and gifts. Part of the text's rhetorical strategy is to accentuate the exodus motif with the Passover (vv5-8) and the Feast of Booths (vv39-43) framing the instruction for YHWH's festal days. The text is also arranged, however, according to the appointed times in the first half of the year (vv4-8), those that are for life specifically in the land (vv9-22), and then those that are in the second half of the year (vv23-36, vv39-43)."" Thus, the intent of Leviticus 23 is to form the identity, character, and behaviour, of the new covenant community at Sinai, with values and beliefs established in the exodus event and the identity of their covenant God – YHWH. Leviticus 23 accentuates two particular values; first, the respect due to what belongs to YHWH, which in this instance are appointed times namely the Sabbath, feasts, and food offerings that belong to him, and second, to make provision for the poor and the resident foreigner who live within the Israelite community. By inculcating these values, the covenant community may ensure that YHWH is sanctified in their midst and thus exemplifies both 10:3 and 22:32b.

100 Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 372-373; Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2036-2053; Noth, Leviticus, p. 166. Noth, Leviticus, p. 166, argues that the addition of vv39-43 after the summary statement in vv37-38 shows an ‘inner inconsistency in the whole’. Yet there is actually considerable cohesion to the episode as demonstrated above.

101 See also Sklar, Leviticus, pp. 277, 284; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 300.
5. **Leviticus 24:1-9: The Light of the Lamp and the Twelve Loaves of Bread**

Unusually, the episodic schema begins with a single quotative frame recalling YHWH speaking to Moses after which the speech report begins in vv2-9 with an imperative to command the sons of Israel. Also, this is the first time since 17:2 where צוה is used in relation to the sons of Israel, which heightens Israel’s responsibility for the instruction that follows. The command is for the sons of Israel to bring olive oil, pressed to assure its purity, so that the light of the lamp can be kept burning continually ( תמיד). The arrangement of vv3-4 accentuates by use of repetition that Aaron is to ensure that the lamps are tended continuously before YHWH, from evening until morning, as a permanent statute for all generations. The purpose of the lamp being kept burning through the night is to represent God’s continual presence amongst his people within the place that represents his kingship. It is worth clarifying what this paragraph does not do, which is to accentuate the willingness of the high priest to serve YHWH always. Rather, the three-fold repetition of תמיד in v2, v3, and v4, suggests that the theme and thus the referent that shapes the schema is a concern for the lamps to be burning constantly. This will require the high priest arranging and tending the lamps; the text emphasises the responsibility of the task, rather than the willingness of the high priest in his service.

---

102. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2086, suggests that the use of צוה in v2 forms an inclusio with v23. While there might be word association, it is a loose relationship since the command in v2 is an access point into the following speech, and v23 relates the completion of YHWH’s command not related to the speech report in vv2-9.

103. Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2091, attributes v4 as a later addition for the purpose of clarifying ‘that the lampstand did not consist of a single lamp.’ However, the repetition, and even redundancy, represents a choice by the implied editor to include the text within the arrangement. Its impact is to highlight where the lampstand is to be arranged, namely before YHWH.

104. See also Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, p. 437; Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 287. Contrary to Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 402. However, Kiuchi is mistaken to jump from the light of the fire symbolising ‘the Lord’s presence’ to the statement, ‘it is definitely related to the condition of the human heart.’ There is no need to make such an assumption, especially since this makes the intent of the text anthropocentric.


The second paragraph in vv5-9 focuses upon the bread to be set before YHWH. The logic of the paragraph begins in v5 with instructions for twelve loaves of bread to be baked from semolina flour after which v6 specifies where they are to be arranged, which is upon the gold table before YHWH in two piles of six loaves (v6). Verse 7 then prescribes pure frankincense to be set by the two piles of six loaves; the purpose of the bread is for a remembrance, as a food offering for YHWH. The prepositional phrase בהשבת in the clause-initial position in v8 highlights when the bread is to be arranged before YHWH as a permanent statute from the sons of Israel. Verse 9 clarifies that a portion of the bread belongs to the priesthood as a most holy part of their share of food offerings presented to YHWH. Thus, the shape of the arrangement accentuates the twelve loaves of bread to be placed before YHWH and their purpose, namely for a remembrance and as a permanent covenant. Also, the twelve loaves suggest that the bread represents the twelve tribes and thus the whole nation. Further still, the setting of these loaves before YHWH, and continuously on each Sabbath, suggests that the remembrance is for his people.

Thus, the juxtaposition of the arrangement is quite purposeful and is part of the text's rhetorical strategy. The first paragraph accentuates that the light representing God's presence amongst his people is to be kept burning continuously, while the second paragraph focuses upon how the sons of Israel are to give bread food-offerings to YHWH as a remembrance of the twelve tribes of Israel. The juxtaposition within 24:1-9 requires this community to acknowledge God's permanent presence amongst them and also the need for YHWH to remember the twelve tribes. There is, therefore, an inherent warning within vv1-9 about the purity of YHWH's presence in Israel's midst. The future orientation of the instructions suggests a deliberative disposition to the text where the text intends to influence the future actions of both people and priesthood. The intent of the text within

---

See also Milgrom, Leviticus 23-27, p. 2095. Contrary to Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 438-439. This remembrance for the twelve tribes is so that YHWH will remember favourably (as per Sklar, Leviticus, p. 290), rather than a representation of the ‘table fellowship’ between YHWH and the twelve tribes (as per Hartley, Leviticus, p. 402).
the persuasive situation is to motivate the Israelites to keep providing the oil and the bread according to command and, in doing so, reminding the nation that God's presence is pure and cannot be taken lightly or be compromised amongst the nation.

### 6. Leviticus 24:10-23: The Israelites Adhere to Command

The sudden shift in 24:10 to a narrative about the son of an Israelite woman and an Egyptian father marks a significant point of departure from the previous instruction in 24:1-9. The narrative focuses upon this son, a half Israelite, using YHWH's name with a curse in the camp (v11). The detail about the offence occurring within the camp would be easy to glance over, yet the whole text of Leviticus so far has had a concern for the sanctuary and for YHWH's name not to be profaned since the consequence would be exclusion from YHWH's presence. The paragraph concludes in v12 with the son placed in custody until the purpose of YHWH is made clear. This concluding note in v12 suggests that there is ambiguity as to the consequence of the offence due to the offender being half-Israelite and half-Egyptian. The ambiguity of this situation is the foil for the rest of the episodic schema.

---

“Contrary to J. Weingreen, ‘The Case of the Blasphemer (Leviticus XXIV 10ff)’, VTS 22 (1972), p. 120, who views the offence being uttering YHWH’s name in the context of a curse. For a response to Weingreen, please see R. R. Hutton, ‘The Case of the Blasphemer (Leviticus XXIV 10ff)’, VT 49 (1999), pp. 532-541. Brichto, Problem of ‘Curse’, p. 157, argues that the root בך used in v1b can refer to ‘a whole range of offenses against man and God’, which leads to the ambiguity causing Israel to seek clarity ‘because the offense was undefined and, till that moment, not provided with a stipulated penalty’ (H. C. Brichto, The Problem of ‘curse’ in the Hebrew Bible, Philadelphia, PA: SBL, 1968, p. 158). Chavel, Oracular Law, p. 47, highlights though that we should not be overly concerned with the ‘precise aspect of the case that baffled Moses and sent him to seek an oracle.’ This, however, is unsatisfactory. Bibb, Ritual Words, p. 154, asks his readers to remember that the biblical text rarely instructs about blasphemy directly, which is also true in this instance, and so we cannot know precisely the nature of the curse. He prefers a more general understanding stating, ‘It is not clear whether the curse involves using the name of Yahweh in a negative statement about the opponent, or saying something negative about Yahweh. In light of the concerns about profaning the name of Yahweh in other Holiness texts, I prefer the latter reading. The name of Yahweh must not be profaned in any way, and his holiness is part dependent on the people making it so.’ See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 434 n. 11 c; Lee, Between Law and Narrative, p. 56 fn. 10, pp. 66-67; Levine, Leviticus, p. 166; Nihan, From Priestly Torah, pp. 513-514; Milgrom, Leviticus 23-27, p. 2109.

See also Bibb, Ritual Words, p. 153, ‘Earlier in the text, being in the camp requires more diligence than being outside the camp because of the closer proximity to the sanctuary (and the main concern is defilement, in any case). Now, however, the sanctity of the Israelite community is at stake.’
The second paragraph in vv13-16 begins with a quotative frame where YHWH is said to speak to Moses addressing the situation of the Israelite woman's son. The situation is clarified in v14; they are to take the one who cursed outside of the camp, with those having heard him pressing their hands on the offender's head, and then the whole congregation is to stone him. The second quotative frame in v15 then directs Moses to speak to the Israelites as YHWH outlines the principle of the penalty so that there is no longer ambiguity. The logic of the speech unfolds through three paragraphs, vv15-16, 17-18, and vv19-22. The first paragraph in vv15-16 communicates the reason for the stoning, which is that anyone who curses 'his God' is to carry his own sin (v15a§) and thus v16 prescribes the death penalty. Thus, as Lee observes, the instruction of vv15-16 'represent[s] the sole material concerned with the issues of the narrative sequence: the abuse of the divine name.' In an instance of sequential connectedness, v17 then shifts the topic to a situation where a man slays any human life and so begins the second paragraph schema. There is no ambiguity within v17, the penalty of killing another is that the offender will surely die and thus the lex talionis is once more evoked. Verse 19 then shifts the topic to address the situation where anyone injures another, which can be more literally understood as causing a 'blemish' (מום). This third paragraph, however, continues

---

\*I understand the act of hand-pressing to be one of both identification and transference. Those who heard YHWH's name cursed would be complicit, albeit involuntarily, and thus share guilt. The hand-pressing therefore identifies those who heard with the offender and in doing so transfers their guilt to the one stoned. Implied then is that his death functions as a means of מום not only for his own offence but also for those who are tainted by association. Bibb, *Ritual Words*, p. 155, helpfully notes that, like Leviticus 16, 'the man must bear the iniquity away from the people, accepting back the contagion that he had unleashed in the community.' See also Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 291. Contrary to Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 409-410. Also, YHWH's instruction gives authority to the ש creditor function as both jury and judge (see also P. Bovati, *Re-Establishing Justice: Legal Terms, Concepts and Procedures in the Hebrew Bible*, JSOTS 105, Sheffield: JSOT, 1994, pp. 229-233). \*

\*The quotative frame in v15 is a Xp clause focus structure that highlights the identity of those being addressed, namely the sons of Israel. The reason for the prominence is to heighten their responsibility as recipients of the speech event; they are to ensure obedience to command.

\*See Lee, *Between Law and Narrative*, pp. 58-60, for a rigorous analysis of the clause structures and how each paragraph forms, using his language, 'command sets'.


to define situations of the *lex talionis* culminating in vv21-22 with two clarifications. First, anyone who slays livestock will need to make reparation, whereas the taking of a human life requires death (v21); and second, this instruction is the same for the resident foreigner and the native-born (v22). The episodic schema returns to the narrative in v23 relating how Moses spoke to the sons of Israel and they did as YHWH commanded Moses; they took the one who cursed outside of the camp and stoned him.

The arrangement of the juxtaposition between narrative and instruction is a deliberate part of the rhetorical strategy in 24:10-23. The outline of the arrangement above suggests that the narrative in vv10-12 acts as a foil for further instruction that brings clarity on the point of law that the situation of the narrative raises. Thus, the narrative is acting within the schema as a case where ambiguity exists and so the second paragraph (vv13-16) in the schema clarifies the penalty. In an instance of sequential connectedness, vv17-22 then addresses the issue of the *lex talionis* in relation to the taking of life or hurting a neighbour. However, the arrangement of this episode has a second function. The episodic schema in Leviticus 17–21 begins with a command for the whole congregation to do as YHWH...
commands and concludes with a quotative frame outlining that Moses spoke all the words
to the priesthood and to the Israelites. There is no statement that the Israelites did as
YHWH commanded, but neither does there need to be. The text tends to use a compliance
formula when there is juxtaposition between narrative and instruction (Lev. 8-10, 16).
This occurs in 24:10-23 and so fittingly exemplifies the Israelites doing as YHWH
commanded Moses.

However, before attending to the issue of how 24:10-23 coheres within the global schema,
the disposition of the text still needs to be resolved. Although 24:10-23 displays a past
orientation in the narrative elements of the text (vv10-12, v23) and then a future
orientation in the instructions (vv13-22), the kind of impact the juxtaposition is shaped to
effect is still to form and shape the future actions and priorities of the covenant nation. By
the narrative exemplifying what is desired, even though it has a past orientation, it still
seeks to engender in the nation the necessity of obedience i.e. doing as YHWH has
commanded. Thus, the text still maintains a deliberative disposition.

Within my exploration of the global schema so far, I have suggested that the thematic
referent has been the declaration יוהי אני. At critical points within the schema, 10:3 and
22:32 instruct that YHWH must be sanctified by those who are near him and in the midst
of Israel (10:3, 22:32). Leviticus 22:32 also extends the principle of 10:3 to the people of
Israel explicitly and the clause before the statement that God is to be sanctified in the
midst of Israel prohibits the profaning of YHWH's name. Since the concern for YHWH's
name has prominence within the global schema, it makes sense that the case exemplifying
Israel's obedience centres upon the issue of cursing YHWH's name. Just as exemplifying the
priesthood's obedience to command was critical in Leviticus 8–10 and 16:34, exemplifying
Israel's obedience to command is also critical. YHWH's sanctuary is in their midst and so
they too need to adhere to command so that there is life in his presence and not exclusion.
However, the resumption of the narrative recalling Israel's obedience occurs only at the
conclusion of the episodic schema. Between the narrative in vv10-14 and v23, the
instruction in vv15-22 illustrates and clarifies the *lex talionis*. The final point of law in v22 accentuates the same penalty for the resident foreigner as for the native-born suggesting a concern for justice; that is, there is not to be a lighter or a harsher penalty for either. There is no ambiguity. The slaying of any human life is prohibited and the *lex talionis* then informs the penalty.

7. Leviticus 25:1–26:46: The Statutes that YHWH Set Between Himself and Israel

The episodic schema of Leviticus 25–26 begins with instruction for Israel's life in the land (25:2-7) and concludes with the consequences if Israel persistently walks in hostility against YHWH (26:27-45). There is a movement within the schema from Israel entering the land, which YHWH is giving the nation, to a possibility of Israel's exit from the land. Within this overall movement, the paragraphs of the episodic schema are sequentially connected and there is a sustained future orientation of the text evincing that the kind of intent is to shape the future actions and character of the covenant community in the land.

The protasis in v2a topicalises the first paragraph schema, at the very least, to focus upon the future event of Israel settling in the land. Intriguingly, the apodosis in v2b personifies the land as having a Sabbath for YHWH. The impact is to infer that the 'land too is to enjoy a sabbatical rest as an expression of its relationship to Yahweh.' The remainder of the paragraph schema addresses Israel in the second person singular focusing upon what

---

*n* Bergsma, *Jubilee*, p. 82, observes that Leviticus 25 would flow most naturally from Leviticus 23 since his understanding is that the contribution of the chapter concerns religious observances, while there is an 'obscure' relationship between Leviticus 24 and Leviticus 25. Yet if we understand the two episodes in Leviticus 24 to provide a warning about God's presence amongst his people, then the development into Leviticus 25–26 is quite logical. After being warned about God's presence, and after being motivated to intercede for God's covenant people, Leviticus 25–26 then moves forward to the concluding concerns of the book, which is to make explicit what has been theologically implied from the beginning; namely, the land and people belong to YHWH (Lev. 25) and so the future of God's people in the land is conditional upon their covenant obedience and later repentance (Lev. 26).

* C. J. H. Wright, 'What Happened Every Seven Years in Israel? Old Testament Sabbatical Institutions for Land, Debts and Slaves Part 1', *EQ* 56 (1984), p. 131, acknowledges that the idea of the land having a sabbath for YHWH is an expansion of Exodus 23:10-11. In Wright's view, the implied editor is interpreting the Jubilee year in light of Exodus 23:12.

* Wright, 'What Happened Every Seven years in Israel?', p. 132.
can be done in the six years preceding the Sabbath year (v3) and then drawing a contrast between what cannot and can be done in the seventh year (vv4-5). The conclusion of the paragraph schema gives the reason for why Israel is not to reap their harvest in the seventh year, which is that the Sabbath of the land shall yield food for the people, inclusive of their slaves, the resident foreigner, their livestock, and the wild animals (vv6-7). The next two paragraphs, vv8-12 and vv13-24, continue the situation of Israel being in the land, but with a new emphasis on the 'seven times seven years' (v8α). This is, however, the access referent for the rest of the paragraph schema that coheres around the topic of the fiftieth year, which is to be a jubilee for Israel where each person returns to his property and clan (vv9-10). This jubilee is declared to be 'for you' (לכם; vv10, 11), that is for Israel, and is to be holy to them (v12).

The third paragraph of the schema, vv13-24, clarifies the relational implications of the jubilee. The repetition of the prohibition against exploiting each other in v14 and v17 is the main focus of the paragraph. Moreover, vv17b-18 then explains that by not taking advantage of another they are in fact fearing God where the consequence of obedience is living securely in the land. Verses 19-22 depict this life in the land as one of flourishing and blessing. This paragraph schema also encompasses vv23-24, which functions as a point of transition in the episodic schema. The fronting of והארץ highlights what specifically is not to be sold i.e. the land (v23α) after which two clauses introduced by the conjunction explain the rationale; first, the land belongs to YHWH and second, the

---

121. Bergsma, *Jubilee*, p. 82, suggests that Leviticus 25 has the same significance in H as Leviticus 16 does in P stating, 'the Day of Purgation and the Jubilee are the climactic observances in the cultic and social spheres, respectively; are linked by a common day of proclamation.' This is an idea worth considering, especially with regards to the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus. However, at this point, an assessment of this idea is beyond the scope of this study.

122. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, p. 2178, observes that the repetition of the prohibition in v14 and v17 is 'for the sake of the introverted structure'. While this is a fair comment, the repetition (although not verbatim) also accentuates the prohibition. The impact is to highlight the relational consequence and to express that obedience to this prohibition reflects relational order with YHWH.

123. See also Joosten, *People and Land*, p. 58; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, p. 2188.
Israelites are resident foreigners and strangers (v23). Joosten articulates the relationship between the two statements of justification as follows, 'The Israelites are viewed as people coming from elsewhere and finding refuge in the land of YHWH, who in turn accords to them the right to settle on and live off his land.' Following this logic, v24 affirms that with all the land the Israelites possess, they are to have the right of redemption. Thus, this paragraph maintains a focus upon the land as per the prior paragraphs of the episodic schema, but changes the focus to the right of redemption, which becomes a focal point for the following paragraph (vv25-34). Verse 25 topicalises the paragraph schema in vv25-34 by introducing the situation where an Israelite brother becomes poor and sells part of the land that is his possession. This topic, however, shifts in v35 to the situation when an Israelite brother becomes so poor that he is no longer able to sustain himself (v35). This shift in situation begins a new paragraph in vv35-38 where the concern is for the Israelite community to support that brother and not gain from his changed financial situation. Verses 35-38 then concludes with the thematic referent property that with

---

104 Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2185, notes the following about the clause 'יִהְיֶה וּצְרָעָה אַלָּחֶם', 'The larger implication of 'the land is mine' is that the land is holy. In the priestly system whatever belongs to God is sacred. Whereas P restricts the sacred sphere to the sanctuary, H extends its borders to embrace the entire land. Thus the doctrine of the 'holy land', though not explicitly stated, is implied'.

105 Joosten, People and Land, p. 59.

106 Worth noting is what the text is not claiming. R. Westbrook, 'Redemption of Land', Israel Law Review 3 (1971), p. 369, observes that Leviticus 25 does not instruct the redeemer to return the land to its owner. The Jubilee is when all lands are returned. Westbrook notes, 'Whether the redeemer's task is to return it to the owner before then, or merely to make sure that it stays in the family in the meanwhile, is not clear.'

107 See also Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, pp. 2188-2189.

108 I recognise that there are two other Xp clauses within vv24-34, which are v29a and v34a, and so each could also topicalise paragraphs. However, each Xp clause is in continuity with v25 where an Israelite becomes poor and so needs to sell property. In the case of v29a, the XP clause concerns the selling of a house within a walled city, while v32 clarifies that the cities of the Levites, which are their possession, can always be redeemed. Thus, the Xp structure focuses on the identity of the cities belonging to the Levites, rather than beginning a new phase of logic within the schema. So, although vv24-34 could be delimited into three paragraphs (vv24-28, vv29-31, vv32-34), I have chosen to delimit vv24-34 as one paragraph schema that makes two clarifications in the cases of the house in the walled city and also about the Levite cities. This then preserves the repetition of the clause בּֽיַלְדֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל at the beginning of each paragraph in v25, v35, and v39.
relative clause describing the identity of YHWH as the one who brought Israel out of Egypt to give the nation the land and to be their God (see also 11:45).129

While vv35-38 focuses upon the instruction for the Israelites to support and not gain profitably from their Israelite brother’s plight, vv39-43 prohibits the poor Israelite, who needs to sell himself, from being a slave; instead, he is to be treated as a paid servant or as a resident foreigner until the year of jubilee (v40), and then he can return to his possession i.e. his allotment of land (v41a). Verse 42 conveys the rationale for this radical treatment of the Israelite brother; they are already servants belonging to YHWH, who has brought them out of Egypt, and so an Israelite is not to be transferred to the possession of another (v42). For this reason, the paragraph schema in vv39-43 concludes with a contrast; they are prohibited from ruling over an Israelite with oppression but instead they are to fear their covenant God (v43). Again, in contrast, the following paragraph (vv44-46) in the episodic schema 'restricts' slave ownership to male and female slaves from the other nations that belong to the Israelites.130 The paragraph concludes in v46 by repeating the prohibition from v43a; an Israelite is not to rule over another Israelite oppressively.131

Verses 47-55 address the situation where a resident foreigner becomes wealthy and an Israelite brother becomes poor with the need to sell himself to the resident foreigner (v47). The paragraph unfolds the process by which a kinsman may redeem that Israelite

129. Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2212, notes the association with the Sinaitic Decalogue, yet Exodus 20:1-2 only relates YHWH's identity as the one speaking with his work of bringing Israel out from Egypt. Leviticus 25:38, however, does not merely identify YHWH with his work in the exodus event, but this association is extended to reflect the purpose of the exodus event, namely for him to be their God. The giving of the land is associated with YHWH being Israel's covenant God. The two theological strands are inextricably related. This means that not only is Israel's possession of the land related to her obedience (see also Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2212), but in a related matter, is also dependent upon YHWH being the nation's God.


131. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2232. I also acknowledge that there is a textual relationship between Exodus 21:3-6 and Leviticus 25:44-46. Levinson, 'The Birth of the Lemma', p. 621, demonstrates how H has reworked both the protasis and conclusion from Exodus 21:3-6 to give the law in 25:44-46 a 'new application'. A more detailed rhetorical analysis that explores the paragraph level of Leviticus 25–26 would need to ask how this textual relationship is part of the text's rhetorical strategy.
brother. Milgrom notes that this provision is not optional, but rather the able relative is 'obligated to redeem the land of his kinsperson sold (or forfeited) to another.' Once more the paragraph schema concludes by affirming that the people of Israel belong to YHWH as slaves since he brought them out of Egypt. This logic associates the status of Israel as belonging to YHWH as slaves on the basis of the exodus event with the thematic referent אלייכם יהוה אני. The implication of this paraenetic conclusion is unambiguous. As Milgrom states,

Its implication is clear: as God redeemed you from Egypt in the time of your national need, should you not do the same when your brothers find themselves in slavery in the time of their individual need?  

The thematic referent consolidates 25:47-55 as a paragraph, which enables the sequence of two pithy paragraphs in 26:1 and 26:2 before the covenant blessings and curses dominate the rest of the episodic schema. First, 26:1 prohibits the making of idols, images, and sacred stone, and from setting up these stones as objects of worship. To balance what Israel is not to do, 26:2 then instructs the Israelites to keep YHWH's Sabbaths and to fear his sanctuary. Although there is schematic discontinuity between 25:55 and 26:1, the prohibition and command of 26:1-2 are a conceptual extension of 25:47-55 since they are practical implications of Israel’s status as YHWH's people. Leviticus 26:1-2 casts the focus forward to the covenant blessings and curses that will be invoked in the instance that Israel obeys or disobeys these commands.

135. Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, pp. 2275-2276, notes that vv1-2 echoes Exodus 20:2-3, 8, which is the first two and fourth commands in the Sinaitic Decalogue. Milgrom relates this then to Leviticus 19 observing, 'Thus these verses may be an incipit of all the ritual and ethical injunctions contained in chap. 19, implying that YHWH's blessings and cures that follow (vv. 3-45) are invoked on Israel for its obedience or disobedience of all of God's commands' (Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, pp. 2276-2277). See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, pp. 449-450; Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 328.
Thus, the episodic schema so far has progressed from a focus on land to a focus upon people. The first three paragraphs (25:8-12, 25:13-24, 25:25-34) focus upon situations, namely that of the Sabbath and the Jubilee years, which point to the status of the land as belonging to YHWH. Leviticus 25:23-24 transitions the focus from the status of the land to the status of Israel. This transition is achieved by 25:23-24 giving the reason for why the land is not to be sold permanently; Israel belongs to YHWH as his servants. The paragraphs within 25:25-46 then sustain this focus by addressing situations where the Israelites are not to be sold into slavery. Thus, the rhetorical strategy of the text’s arrangement is to accentuate that both the land and the people of Israel belong to YHWH, which is the rationale for the blessings and curses unfolded in the rest of the episodic schema (26:3-45).

Leviticus 26:3-46 progresses through six paragraphs where each begins with a condition defining whether Israel is walking by YHWH’s statutes (vv3-13) or if they are no longer hearing YHWH (vv14-17, vv18-20, vv21-22, vv23-26, vv27-45). The first protasis in v3 has two Xp clauses deliberately placing את מצותי and את מצותי הבכורה in the clause-initial position to highlight where Israel is walking and what they are keeping, namely the statutes and commands belonging to YHWH.\(^{16}\) The apodosis in vv5-13 then progresses through a series of Px clauses describing how YHWH will give Israel his favour by causing Israel to flourish (vv5-8), giving peace in the land (vv7-8), and by keeping his covenant with Israel where he will put his presence amongst them (vv9-12).\(^{17}\) As Milgrom observes, YHWH will act in

---

16 Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23-27, pp. 2292-2293, also notes the fronting of את מצותי and את מצותי הבכורה, but he only notes the highlighting of the first personal pronominal suffix. While this is true, the use of the Xp clause is to highlight the identity of the X, which in this case are the phrases , ‘my statutes’ and ‘my judgments’.

17 The use of משכני in v4 refers to God’s presence and more precisely his sanctuary in the tabernacle since it is designed and made with the purpose that God’s presence would be in the midst of his people. This, of course, extends to the temple in the rhetorical situation (See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 463; Joosten, *People and Land*, p. 125; Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 329; contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 2299). This anticipates the continued future presence of Israel’s covenant God in the tabernacle (persuasive situation) and in the temple (rhetorical situation) without abhorrence. However, this understanding does not discount that there could be an echo of an Edenic relational order in vv11-12, which is dependent upon faithfulness within the covenant relationship. For the Edenic allusion, see also Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23–27, p. 230; Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 316; Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 330.
reciprocation of Israel's behaviour; if Israel walks in YHWH's instruction (v3a), then YHWH will walk in their midst (v12a). Moreover, the purpose of Israel's redemption will be realised in the context of obedience: God will be present among his people and there will be life as he declares them to be his people and him to be their God. The paragraph culminates with the thematic referent, the self-declaration of YHWH, that he, their God, brought the Israelites out from Egypt so that their identity is no longer as slaves (v13). Joosten relates the logic of vv12-13 within the conceptual framework of H stating,

We may conclude that the use of the covenant formula in H links up with the thought-complex attached to the Exodus event. The god YHWH acquired by a group of worshippers by liberating the Israelites from slavery in Egypt, whom he intended to settle on his land so that they might serve him in his sanctuary and in their daily lives.

In stark contrast though, vv14-15 introduces two sequential protases. The first condition in v14 simply introduces the situation where Israel is neither hearing nor doing any of 'these' commands, while the second condition in v15 is deliberately discursive expanding upon the first. In doing so, this second condition mirrors the pragmatic and syntactic structures of v13 by placing בחקתי and את־משפטי in the clause-initial position to highlight what Israel rejects and abhors, and so making clear that part of the condition is Israel having broken the covenant. The beginning XP clause in v16, where YHWH declares he will do 'this' (cataphoric demonstrative), then moves the schema forward with the description of how he will set himself against Israel, namely by sending terror and defeat (vv16-17).

The following protases in v18, v21, v23, and v27, then describe situations that accumulate and, as each situation reacts to the continued stubbornness of Israel, the consequences of

---

140. The direct object את האלה refers to, at the very least, Leviticus 17–26. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2304.
Israel’s rebellion also intensify.\(^\text{141}\) The protasis in v18 uses the anaphoric demonstrative referring back to the events described in vv16-17 with the force of ‘if after this you are not listening to me’ (ואם־עד־אלה). The beginning of the apodosis then declares that YHWH will add to their discipline seven times for their sins. This begins a pattern where each protasis refers back to the previous case where YHWH has disciplined his people and yet observes that if Israel is still hostile then he will add another seven times to their affliction or upon their punishment. YHWH’s actions against Israel’s stubborn rebellion reaches a crescendo in the final paragraph where the land is laid to waste (vv27-35) and those that are left will perish amongst the nations (vv36-39).\(^\text{141}\) Notably, there is reversal in v40 where Israel confesses her iniquities after which YHWH declares he will remember Israel and the land on the basis of the Abrahamic covenant (vv42-45). The thematic referent \(אלהים יהוה אני\) recurs twice at the end of the paragraph and thus at the end of the episodic schema in vv44-45. The first instance is the reason for why YHWH will not break his covenant with Israel; he is their God (v44). The second concludes the entire schema where YHWH recalls his motivation for the exodus event – to be Israel’s God (v45).

Once more, the text does not break from the Israel at Sinai setting and the future orientation of the text indicates that the kind of impact that Leviticus 25–26 intends is to influence the future actions of the nation in the land. Within the persuasive situation, the intent is to warn this first generation of Israelites who belong solely to YHWH as his servants that they are to walk in YHWH’s statutes in the land. Just as YHWH can give the land, so too he can take the land away. If Israel walks in hostility to YHWH, then YHWH will be hostile to Israel. This is all predicated on the land and the people belonging to YHWH. Thus, the movement of logic from establishing YHWH’s ownership (Leviticus 25) to the implications of YHWH’s ownership (Leviticus 26) is intrinsic to the text’s rhetorical strategy. Thus, the intent of Leviticus 25-26 is to shape the self-identity of Israel at Sinai as


\(^{142}\) See also Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 320.
a nation who belongs to YHWH as his servants and whose future land also belongs to their covenant God. By shaping the internal worldview of Israel, Leviticus 25–26 motivates Israel to faithfully walk according to YHWH’s statutes and commands so that there is flourishing and life in God’s presence and so dissuades Israel from persisting in rebellious behaviour in the future.

8. **Leviticus 27: Giving to YHWH What Belongs to Him**

This final episode, Leviticus 27, is far from a disjunctive unit within the global schema, but is a fitting conclusion to the book. After the previous episode accentuates both Israel and the land as belonging to YHWH, Leviticus 27 reinforces how Israel can sanctify YHWH, their covenant God, who is present in their midst, namely by giving to YHWH all that belongs to him. It is notable that the book concludes positively by demonstrating what relational order looks like. This is achieved by a five-paragraph arrangement where each paragraph focuses either on giving willingly to YHWH (vv2-13, vv14-25) or giving to YHWH what already belongs to him (vv26-27, vv28-29, vv30-33).

This understanding of Leviticus 27 sounds similar to that of both Douglas and Sklar, but our argument differs from both scholars at critical points. Douglas observes that the issue of the chapter is ‘the things that have been consecrated and the things that belong to the Lord’.

Yet, this seems to reduce the concept underlying the text that moves from the beginning emphasis of giving to YHWH and thus fulfilling what has been vowed to the idea of giving all that belongs to YHWH by the end of the speech. Sklar identifies the basic assumption of the chapter to be, ‘commitments to the lord must be honoured’.

---

143. This fittingness is a different idea to Milgrom, ‘H in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah’, p. 27, who refers to Douglas’ ring structure and notes the purpose of Leviticus 27 as being an ‘appendix […] chosen by H to close H’s book of Leviticus because it deals with consecrations (and vows) to the sanctuary.’ Contrary to Noth, Leviticus, p. 203, who states that Leviticus 27 ‘is clearly a later supplement to the Laws of Holiness, and particularly to Jubilee year regulations, but has no special connections in content.’

144. Douglas, Leviticus as Literature, p. 244.

145. Douglas, Leviticus as Literature, p. 244.

146. Sklar, Leviticus, p. 334.
though, Sklar’s statement seems once more to reduce the complexity of the speech's conceptual framework, since neither the instructions about the dedicated firstborn livestock (vv26-27) nor about the tithes (vv30-33) concern a commitment to YHWH. In the instance of the dedicated firstborn in vv26-27, what has been dedicated belongs to YHWH in the first instance. Furthermore, there is no overarching action of vow, consecration, dedication, or devotion, associated with the tithe in vv30-33. Simply, the tithe belongs to YHWH and so it is to be given to him.

Thus, the intent of Leviticus 27 is not dissuasive or one of command. Consistent with the rest of Leviticus, the episode maintains a future orientation where the disposition of the text is to shape the nation’s future actions. The intent is to motivate the covenant community at Sinai, and all future generations of Israelites, to honour what belongs to YHWH whether by giving willingly or by giving that which naturally belongs to him. By adhering to this instruction, Israel learns that as a nation, and in a land that belongs to YHWH, they are to sanctify all that belongs to him. Leviticus 27 achieves this intent by providing positive case laws (vv2aβ-25) and prohibiting certain actions with livestock, property, and humans, that belong to YHWH (v26, v28). Similarly, the prohibitions point to the central idea, which is that Israel is to honour all that belongs to YHWH.

9. Conclusion: The Rhetorical Strategy and Persuasive Intent of Leviticus

The progression of the global schema, and thus the progression of Leviticus’ argument within its arrangement, is through the use of sequential connectedness. This sequential connectedness is part of the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus. The beginning and end, Leviticus 1–7 and 27, emphasise giving to YHWH what belongs to him and so each episode forms a ‘book-end’ to hold the whole text together. Within these ‘book-ends’, the episodes progress from honouring what is holy (including God himself) within the ritual domain to honouring what is holy (including people and God) in the land. I have argued for YHWH’s declaration in 10:3 being the cohering integrating referent within Leviticus 1–16, while the declaratory clause, ‘I am YHWH your God’ first introduced in 11:44a emerges as the
overarching thematic referent for the global schema. Why is YHWH to be sanctified by those who draw near to him and glorified before the people? The answer is, he is their covenant God.

Before I summarise the persuasive intent of the sum of the episodes within the global arrangement of Leviticus, which is the goal of the third step in the rhetorical-critical framework and so also the goal of Chapters Four and Five in this thesis, it is worth synthesising how the 'argument' of Leviticus' unfolds through its sequentially connected global schema. Leviticus 1–7 exemplifies the principle of 10:3 by instructing how the nation is to approach YHWH with their gifts and by constraining the holy to the holy. Leviticus 8–10 models priestly obedience, which exemplifies YHWH being sanctified by the priesthood and being glorified before his people. The example of Nadab and Abihu's death though is a warning that YHWH will ensure that he is glorified before the people through his justice. The introduction of the task to distinguish between the holy and the common and between the impure and pure in 10:10 is to ensure that YHWH is sanctified by those who approach him. This then is the theme of Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15 that teaches about the distinction between purity and impurity. In doing so, the episodes teach Israel at Sinai that impurity is contagious and that the consequence of impurity is exclusion. There is, therefore, a warning about future rebellion; if the nation remains in a condition of impurity, they will profane YHWH's sanctuary and so death (or permanent exile) will be the consequence. This warning then acts as a foil for Leviticus 16, which resolves the threat of Israel's impurities through the institution of the Day of Atonement; by purifying and removing Israel's impurities from the sanctuary, Israel can live with YHWH dwelling amongst his people in the sanctuary.

Leviticus 16 provides a 'bridge' between the emphasis upon ritual impurity in Leviticus 12, 13–14, and 15 and ethical impurity/purity in Leviticus 17–21. Leviticus 17–21 instructs how both people and priesthood are to ensure that YHWH is both sanctified and glorified in their midst by ensuring that Israel gives to YHWH what belongs to him (Lev. 17), by
Israel being a holy people set apart from the nation to belong to YHWH (Lev. 18–20), while the priesthood is to maintain their holy status so that they can successfully offer the food gifts for YHWH (Lev. 21). While the two episodes in Leviticus 22 follow sequentially from Leviticus 21, the function of 22:17-33 is to re-introduce the principle from 10:3 (see 22:32) and to extend it explicitly to the people in the land. In doing so, 22:32 highlights the mutuality of the covenant relationship. YHWH is to be sanctified by Israel just as he has sanctified them.

Leviticus 23 returns to the theme of respecting what belongs to YHWH, but this time in relation to his appointed times and festal days. Leviticus 24 then is a critical bridge from the instructions about honouring what YHWH has set apart as holy (Lev. 17–23) to the emphases of Leviticus 25–26. Leviticus 24 warns in vv1-4 that God's presence is in their midst (24:1-4), which motivates the nation to make intercession before YHWH, asking their covenant God to remember the whole nation (24:5-9). Curiously, 24:10-23 is then an example, in a situation where YHWH's name has been profaned, of Israel's obedience by inquiring of YHWH and then following his command to ensure that offence is dealt with inside the community. The impact is to model the response required of God's covenant people when offence has profaned YHWH's name. Leviticus 25–26 then elicits what has been implied from the beginning, which is that both land and nation belong to YHWH and so the future of God's people in the land is conditional upon their obedience, otherwise exile will ensue. Thus, Leviticus 27 being the final episode of the global schema unfolds the implication of Leviticus 25–26, which is that Israel is to give to YHWH what belongs to him.

Thus, to conclude Chapters Three and Four and therefore the third step in the adopted rhetorical-critical framework, the sequential connectedness of the global arrangement accentuates how YHWH is to be sanctified and glorified first within the ritual domain of the tabernacle being in the midst of the camp (Lev. 1–16) and then within the ethical and ritual domains of life in the land (Lev. 17–27). Also, each episode within Leviticus'
arrangement evinces a deliberative disposition seeking to influence the future actions of the newly-formed covenant nation. The persuasive intent, therefore, of the sum of the parts in Leviticus' arrangement is to form the Israelite covenant community at Sinai into a people and priesthood who ensure that YHWH is sanctified and glorified in their midst (10:3, 22:32b). The aim is also to dissuade the community from remaining in a condition of impurity in the future otherwise exile will ensue. The reason for this persuasive intent is encompassed in the thematic referent, YHWH is their God.
CHAPTER FIVE

The Rhetorical Strategy of Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27

After an examination of the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus, I suggested that the persuasive intent of the whole text is to form Israel at Sinai into a covenant community who sanctifies and glorifies their covenant God. The goal is for YHWH to dwell with his people and for his soul not to abhor them (Lev. 26:11-12). Having established this argument for the persuasive intent of the sum of Leviticus' parts (episodes), which is the culmination of steps 1-3 of this study's rhetorical-critical framework, this chapter explores the rhetorical strategy and persuasive intent at a paragraph level within the episodic schemas. The goal is to provide a sample detailed analysis of step three in the rhetorical-critical framework, which is an analysis of the text's rhetorical strategy. Since this chapter will undertake an in-depth analysis of only two episodes within the arrangement, this allows for an analysis of the argumentation of the text at a paragraph level whereas Chapters Three and Four only provided an outline of the arrangement at the episodic level. The aim of providing this sample is to demonstrate consistency between the macro-level analysis of Leviticus' rhetorical strategy in Chapters Three and Four and a micro-level analysis. For the purposes of this study, this chapter will confine its analysis to the episodes at the beginning and end of Leviticus' arrangement, Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27. The reason for this decision is that Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27 function as the 'book-ends' between which the rest of the episodes are organised sequentially and so they hold together the global schema as a whole text.

1. The Rhetorical Strategy and Persuasive Intent of Leviticus 1–7

The beginning 1:1 accentuates the continuity of the narrative from the book of Exodus and so Leviticus begins assuming the YHWH's glory, and thus his presence, is now
in the midst of his covenant nation. The intent of YHWH speaking is so that Moses can mediate instruction to the sons of Israel, which, more immediately in Leviticus 1–7, is so that the Israelites can bring their gifts to YHWH at Sinai (7:37-38). There are four embedded episodes within the arrangement of Leviticus 1–7 (1:3–3:17, 4:1–5:26, 6:1–7:21, 7:22-36), each marked by a theme shift. The first embedded episode addresses the people of Israel with 1:3–3:17 focusing upon the three gifts of approach to YHWH, while the second in 4:1–5:26 focuses upon the two gifts that overcome and restore relational offence. The third embedded episode in 6:1–7:21 addresses the priesthood conveying their responsibility in regard to the holy within each offering process. The final embedded episode, 7:22-36, instructs the people of Israel about their responsibility within the fellowship sacrifice. This section will examine the arrangement and logic of each embedded episode, following the delimitation already undertaken in Chapter Two. By doing so, I will suggest the persuasive intent of each embedded episode as well as the rhetorical strategy and intent of Leviticus 1–7 as a whole.

1.1 The Arrangement and Argument of Leviticus 1:2b–3:17

Leviticus 1:1–3:17 begins with a major case in 1:2b where the protasis simply outlines the situation where a man from among the Israelites wishes to present a gift to YHWH from the livestock. In its concise manner, the protasis sets the direction that the entire text moves towards, which is ליהוה. The apodosis in v2 is an Xp clause where the two prepositional phrases מן־הצאן מן־הבקר in the clause-initial position before the yiqtol תקריבו highlights the kind of livestock that the Israelite can present, namely from the cattle or

---

1 See also Ska, 'La structure', p. 339, who accentuates the significance of YHWH's presence in the midst of his people at the beginning of Leviticus in continuity with Exodus 40:34-35. Although, in Ska's view, 1:1 signals a major point within the wider pericope of Exodus 19–Numbers 10.
2 See pp. 84-89 in Chapter Two.
3 See also Lee, Between Law and Narrative, p. 221.
from the flock. As discussed in Chapter Two, this first major case governs every kind of gift in 1:3–3:17 where the offerer simply wishes to approach YHWH.

After the first major case in 1:2, 1:3–3:17 progresses through three different gift instructions (שלמים זבח, מנחה, עולה שלמים) beginning with the offerer simply wishing to approach YHWH in 1:3-17. The minor protases in 1:3α (XP*), 1:10α (XP*), and 1:14α (XP), either topicalise or thematise each paragraph by focusing upon the עולה (v3α) or the type of livestock or bird (v10α, v14α). Wenham observes that the first paragraph in vv3-9, which focuses upon the gift of a bull, is more detailed and so is the exemplar, while the following two paragraphs in the schema are more summative. For instance, the first עולה case in vv3-9 includes the additional phrase ירהו אתו לרצנו לפני יהוה (v3αγ), which is then omitted in the following two paragraphs for the flock (vv10-13) and the bird (vv14-17). For this reason, more weight will be given in the analysis below to the first paragraph in vv3-9, which focuses upon the bull as an עולה.

While the protasis in 1:3α is brief, the apodosis is discursive, narrating the ritual process through a series of yiqtol (v3αβ, v3αγ) and then wiqatal verb sequences (vv4-9). The initial yiqtol verbs, each using the verbal root כקר, in v3αβ and v3αγ lend a future orientation to the whole paragraph schema. Furthermore, each occurs in an Xp clause where the fronted element is either the attributes of the chắc the offerer is to bring (v3αβ) or the location where the gift is to be brought (v3αγ). The effect is to highlight the necessity of approaching with a.chars that fulfils the characteristics of being male and without blemish, as well as offering the gift at the correct location. Verse 3αγ clarifies the reason why the

---

4 See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 8. Contrary to Knierim, Text and Concept, p. 11, who denies a relationship between v2αβ and v3γ-9, let alone a wider unit such as 1:3–3:17.
5 N.B. The asterisk signals that 1:3α and v10 is a grammatical Px structure where the predicate is placed before the subject. However, in this instance, the predicate is functioning as a pragmatic subject and therefore the clause has the pragmatic function of a topicalising XP clause.
6 Wenham, Leviticus, p. 49. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 15.
7 See also Lee, Between Law and Narrative, p. 222, who observes, ‘The persistence of syntactical disjuncture within series of commands on a distinct topic raises the prominence of specific essential characteristics of the offering [...] prior to clauses of a greater degree of syntactical continuity prescribing the course of action to follow’.
offerer must draw near with the gift embodying the requisite attributes and at the
correction location, which is that the gift must be accepted before YHWH (לתרון לפני יהוה).
Jenson observes that the use of the prepositional phrase לפני יהוה suggests the 'permanent
dwelling of God'. Thus, the only gift acceptable in YHWH's presence is that which
exemplifies the particular attributes. I recognise though that this understanding of לפני יהוה in v3ay is quite contentious. The problem is the semantic antecedent for the third
person singular masculine pronominal suffix modifying רצון. Is the antecedent referring to
アジア in v2a, which is the antecedent for the third person masculine singular pronominal
suffix in v3aα that modifies קרבן, or is the antecedent קרבן in v3aα? Trevaskis suggests that
proximity sways the argument towards the antecedent referring to the gift's acceptance
rather than the offerer's acceptance. However, the logic of v3 is concerned with the offerer
bringing an exemplar with the right attributes at the correct location and so presenting the
animal for its acceptance makes sense within the progression of v3.

The rest of the schema progresses through a series of ṭqatal verbal sequences where each
introduces a new movement or phase within the ritual process. Also, each ritual
movement within vv4-9 is conditional upon the first act of drawing near with an עלה from
the cattle that is male and without blemish. In the first three movements in vv4-5, the
offerer is active, while the priests are passive. The first movement is the offerer pressing his
hand upon the head of the bull, which quickly leads to the second movement; the offering
is accepted for the offerer. This is a second act of acceptance that is distinct from the first
in v3ay. Previously in v3ay, the offering is accepted because it complies with the

---

8 Jenson, Graded Holiness, p. 113.
9 Trevaskis, Holiness, p. 182.
10 See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 19, 'The sacrifice is to be offered according to the prescribed ritual so that it
may be ראנה, "acceptable," before YHWH.' This logic is contrary to Bibb, Ritual Words, p. 91; Knierim, Text and
Concept, pp. 34-36; Levine, Leviticus, p. 6; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 149; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 95; Watts, Leviticus
1–10, p. 188; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 55.
11 The ṭqatal verbal sequences govern the particular movements within the ritual process and so provide a
'forward-moving prescriptiveness', which causes the text to progress through the schema and so also through
the ritual process towards its goal. See also Knierim, Text and Concept, pp. 36, 53.
conditions of being male and נחמיה. Verse 4b is an act of acceptance where the gift is now being accepted 'for him' (לו); that is, the gift is accepted for the offerer so that the following ritual process can have a כפר function on the offerer’s behalf. However, this two-stage acceptance process does not represent the scholarly status quo position. For example, Knierim argues that v3aγ and v4b represent one act of acceptance where the offerer is the one being accepted. In contrast, Milgrom contends for two stages of acceptance, but the offerer is the one being accepted both times. Trevaskis, however, maintains the two-stage acceptance process where the first stage in v3aγ is for the gift’s acceptance, as per my explanation above, and the second stage being for the offerer’s acceptance. Whilst the third person masculine pronominal suffix modifying רצה in v3aγ can reasonably refer to the gift as the antecedent, the second act of acceptance in v4b is conditional upon the main action in v4a, which is the act of the offerer as he presses his hand down on the bull’s head. The act of hand pressing establishes a relationship between the bull and the offerer where the offering can then be accepted for the offerer (v4b; לו נרצה). Moreover, the purpose of this relationship is for the purpose of כפר on the offerer’s behalf.

After the completion of the acceptance process in vv3-4, the offerer then enacts the third movement in v5a, the slaughter of the bull before YHWH. The act of the offerer slaughtering the bull is the decisive moment where the offerer surrenders the gift from his ownership to the property of YHWH. This view is not contrary to the view of the animal

---

12 Knierim, Text and Concept, p. 35.
14 Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 181-182.
15 Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 182, 183.
16 See also Gane, Cult and Character, p. 53, who states, ‘the biblical text specifies leaning one hand on the head of a victim are those in which the identity of the offerer, to whom ownership of the victim is attributed and therefore to whom the benefits of the sacrifice accrue, needs to be indicated.’
17 The view expressed above is not contrary to the view of the animal being a substitution for the offerer. The two sequential phrases עליו לכפר לו ורצה in v4b with the use of the two prepositions + 3rd person pronominal suffix suggests that the gift is being used ‘for him’ and on his behalf. Thus, there is a substitutionary emphasis within the text. This does not negate ownership also being a part of the text’s logic. See also Knierim, Text and Concept, pp. 36-37. Contrary to Gane, Cult and Character, pp. 54-56; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 152. Gilders, Blood Ritual, p. 75, is sympathetic to Knierim’s and Milgrom’s explanations, but warns about articulating an explanation that we cannot confirm was the understanding of the Israelites.
being a substitution for the offerer. In v4b, the two prepositional phrases יִלְכֹּר and יִלְכֹּר לְלֹא and the purpose conveyed by the infinitive construct is 'on his behalf'. Thus, there is a substitutionary emphasis within the text. This though does not negate ownership from being part of the text's logic. The act of slaughter is the decisive point where the gift is surrendered from the possession of the offerer and thus is where transference of ownership takes place.⁴

The fourth movement in v5b and v5c narrates the priest drawing near with the blood and sprinkling it upon and around the altar.⁵ Once the blood rite is complete,⁶ the rest of the process involves the slaughtered animal. In quick succession, the remaining movements narrate the stripping and cutting up of the slaughtered gift (fifth movement; v6), placing both fire and wood on the altar (sixth movement; v7), arranging the pieces of the הָלַע הָלַע על על the fire (seventh movement; v8), washing the entrails (eighth movement; v9a), and then causing the whole to smoke (ninth movement; v9b). After this final movement, v9bβ declares this to be an עלי with the appositional phrase אש רַרְבָּתָה לְהָמִית describing its function for YHWH. However, there is a spectrum of meaning for the phrase רַרְבָּתָה, with

⁴ See also Knierim, Text and Concept, pp. 36-37. Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 152, who views the understanding of ownership with the hand-pressing rite to be the only plausible explanation after other views have been eliminated. Moreover, Trevaskis, Holiness, pp. 195-196, implies that substitution and ownership are polar arguments, preferring the argument for substitution. However, it is plausible for these not to be polar arguments.

⁵ While drawing near and splattering the blood are two distinct ritual acts in the text, we have included both actions in the one ritual movement since the drawing near with the blood has the intent of sprinkling the blood upon and around the altar. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 199, notes that the parallelism in the semantic structure of v5b and v5c implies that the two actions are not 'two different steps in the ritual but rather the same act in two different ways. That is, the priests present the blood by splashing it around the altar.'

⁶ While the priestly actions with the blood do very much have an atoning function, the blood rite including the pouring out of the blood at the foundation of the altar, is also the means by which the blood is given to YHWH. Noth, Leviticus, p. 22, observes, 'This blood-rite originates from the notion that the life of the sacrificial animal resides in its blood (cf. 17:31), and that the life as such belongs to God'. See also Knierim, Text and Concept, p. 57; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 156; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 200. However, the notion of the blood belonging to YHWH is still an implied concept and will not be made explicit until the conclusion of Leviticus 3.

⁷ Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 156, assumes that the offerer is the one stripping and cutting here.
the problematic term being ניחוח, ranging from 'pleasing aroma' to a 'soothing aroma'.

While the two ideas of pleasing and soothing are related, the understanding of 'soothing aroma' is preferred since the aroma allows for the offerer, who is not תמים, to approach YHWH through the process of surrendering the gift that is תמים and causing the gift to smoke. It makes sense that the aroma is both pleasing and soothing.

This final movement of the בקר gift being caused to smoke as a soothing aroma signals the completion of the process, but it is not the goal. The direction that the ritual process constantly moves is towards the presence of YHWH (יהוה; see v3αγ, v5a, v9) and also the offerer's acceptance is conditional upon the gift exemplifying the correct attributes. We can reasonably suggest then that the soothing aroma allows for the acceptance of the offerer in the presence of YHWH, which is the goal of the paragraph schema. Therefore, the logic of the עולה gift instruction in 1:3-9 conveys the idea that acceptance before YHWH requires a life that is one of integrity and wholeness. The offerer, not exemplifying integrity, surrenders a costly gift that is without blemish so that he can draw near in acceptance. The goal of the ritual process, therefore, is acceptance before God. This is a slightly different emphasis to Knierim who argues that the goal is the offerer's proximity to YHWH.

Thus, the argumentation of 1:3-17 as a rhetorical unit can be nuanced in the following way: the offerer draws near before YHWH with a gift that is male and without blemish for

---


23 Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pp. 77-80, pp. 82-83; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 207, 210; Wenham, Leviticus, pp. 49, 56.

24 Contrary to Watts, Ritual and Rhetoric, pp. 71-73, who views the עולה as 'giving up something of great value' and thus emphasizes this deal of self-denial. Worth noting is that every gift, except for the שלמים זבח is given wholly to YHWH by the Israelite, except that in every other instance YHWH gives a part of the gift to the officiating priest. Also, there is no suggestion in the text that the self-sacrifice is on behalf of the priesthood. Furthermore, there is no hint that the intent is to motivate the 'the people to provide financial support' (see Watts, Ritual and Rhetoric, p. 73).

25 See Knierim, Text and Concept, pp. 78, 90.
acceptance on the offerer’s behalf, who himself is not morally blameless. The offerer surrenders the gift to YHWH through death for כפר for him. The transmission of the whole gift by fire when caused to smoke has the effect of a soothing aroma for YHWH and the offerer being accepted in the presence of God. There is an overall movement from distance from YHWH with a living animal to being in the presence of YHWH with a surrendered whole gift. The intent is to maintain order within the Israelite community by reinforcing values that the Israelite is to embody in the present and in the future; this belief is that a life of integrity and wholeness is paramount for acceptance in the presence of YHWH. Thus, the persuasive intent of vv3-17, as the Israelite community hears the exemplar offering being read, followed by the instructions for the flock and the bird, is to motivate the Israelite to pursue ethical integrity so that he or she can be accepted in the presence of YHWH.

The major protasis in 2:1α shifts the theme to when anyone brings a מנחה to YHWH. The apodosis beginning in 2:1αβ first prescribes the use of סולת (semolina flour), after which vv1b-2 progresses through a series of wqatal verbal sequences describing two major movements within the ritual process (vv1b-2a, v2b). The first movement focuses upon the offerer as he or she pours olive oil on the flour (v1b), including the incense (v1c), and then brings the pre-prepared mixture to the Aaronic priest (v2a). The bringing and relinquishing of the particular ingredients in v2a transitions the logic of the text to focus upon the actions of the priest in the second movement. The priest is then to take a full handful ‘from there’ (>:</א מָשִׁלֶּכָּא), which refers not only to a handful of flour and oil, but also all the incense. Verse 2c calls the gift an אזכרה at the point where the priest causes the flour, oil, and incense to smoke on the altar. It is unclear as to who is remembering and what the offering is representing as a remembrance. However, the ritual process reaches its goal in the text with the appositional refrain, ליהוה ניחח ריח אשה. Although this refrain suggests the completion of the ritual process of the gift given to YHWH, v3 continues the paragraph schema prescribing the leftovers from the gift to be given to Aaron and his sons.

---

6 Knierim, Text and Concept, p. 78.
The refrain יְהוָה (see also 10aβ) is then an [X]P clause declaring the remaining portion of the gift for Aaron and his sons as most holy from the food offering to YHWH.

The rest of the episodic schema in vv4-16 then develops through a sequence of three minor cases: when the מנחה is oven-baked or prepared on a griddle (vv4-6), is pan-cooked (vv7-10), or when the מנחה is offered as a first-fruits gift (vv14-16). While the logic in vv4-6 accentuates the ingredients to be included as well as precluded, vv7-10 emphasises that the acceptance of the gift as it is raised up, caused to smoke, and gives a soothing aroma to YHWH, is conditional upon the offerer making the מנחה from the correct combination of ingredients. The final paragraph in vv14-16, and so the final phase of logic within the instructions, is distinctive since it gives permission for the inclusion of leaven and honey and so cannot be offered as a soothing aroma for YHWH.

A remaining issue is why vv11-13 interrupts the progression of the episodic schema from the minor cases where the מנחה functions as a soothing aroma (vv1-10) to the final paragraph where the מנחה is simply a food offering for YHWH. The beginning of v11 is prominent within the episodic schema by the use of asyndeton + an XP clause where כל־המנחה (X) is modified by the relative clause лиָּוָה תְּכַרְּבוּ אשר before the predicate לא תעשה חמץ. The syntax highlights the application of the following instruction to all מנחה offered to YHWH and focuses upon the prohibition restricting the inclusion of leaven within the מנחה. The following כי conjunction introduces an Xp clause that gives the rationale for the exclusion of leaven. The fronting of כל־יד브ש כָּל־לִחשָׁא before the yiqtol תכישר highlights that leaven and honey are not to be caused to smoke as a food offering for YHWH. However, while v11 restricts the inclusion of leaven and honey, v12 then gives permission for their inclusion when offering a first fruits gift since this particular type of מנחה is not for a soothing aroma for YHWH. Verse 12b reiterates the essential point of v11;

—N.B. This is a declaratory clause-focus structure. However, the expected subject, an initial independent pronoun, has been omitted. For this reason, the omitted subject is marked as [X] to note that it is implied.
yeast and honey cannot be offered on the altar where the gift would have the intention of being a soothing aroma once caused to smoke. The repetition in vv11-12 suggests that, for whatever reason, yeast and honey being caused to smoke on the altar is unacceptable to YHWH. The symbolic domain of leaven and honey is not immediately obvious, however. Considering the background command in Exodus 12:15-17, the prohibition against the inclusion of leaven is unsurprising. YHWH relates the imperative for removing and excluding leaven from the bread with the ḥeratic penalty if this command is broken (Ex. 12:15, 19). However, the exclusion of honey in Leviticus 2:11-13 is curious considering its positive symbolism in the Pentateuchal narrative. So far, honey symbolises the abundance of blessing in the land by use of the repeated phrase, ‘a land flowing with milk and honey’ (Ex. 3:8, 17; 13:5; 33:3; Num. 13:27; 14:8). Moreover, the contrast between the עלל ומנחה instructions is intriguing. The logic of each עלל process in 1:3-17 highlights the condition of the gift having the characteristics of being male and תמים, whereas the condition of the acceptability of the מנה is upon what is excluded. If the attribute of being תמים is critical for understanding the עלל עלל, then maybe what is being excluded, namely yeast and honey, is also significant for why the מנה functions as a remembrance.

While vv11-12 focus upon what is to be excluded from the מנה, מנה is an XP clause placing ומלך ומעל in the clause-initial position, which highlights that all the gifts of Israel's מנה are to be seasoned with salt. So, the gift’s acceptance not only hinges upon what is excluded, but also upon the inclusion of salt. This is then balanced with v13b, which prohibits the ‘ceasing’ (תשבית) of ‘the salt of the covenant of your God from upon your מנה. Notably, the addition of אלהיך בירת אליהו modifies מלח and so supplies the symbolic domain of מלח – the covenant of Israel's God. Since the symbolic domain of covenant with the מנה is explicitly supplied, it is plausible that the exclusion of yeast and honey is also connected with the covenant. This suggestion is strengthened when considering the meaning and purpose of the מנה offering. Wenham observes that the term מנה is used in Genesis, Judges, and 1-2 Kings for both cereal and animal offerings.
that are being given as a tribute in a range of relational contexts, such as between a worshipper and God (Gen. 4:3-4), between brothers (Gen. 32:22, 33:10), or to a vassal king (1 Sam. 8:2, 8:6; 2 Kgs. 17:3). In each instance, there is a differential in the power status between the offerer and the one receiving the gift. In each instance, the מנחה is given to display faithfulness and submission, or the refusal to gift a מנחה is to refuse allegiance (see 1 Sam. 10:27). The notion, therefore, that the מנחה is a gift of allegiance and submission in a relational context where there is an inequality in power is germane to the ANE. The nature of this relationship in the case of the YHWH-Israel relationship is one of covenant, which, again, is not against the grain of the use of the מנחה within its ancient Near Eastern context. So it is plausible that the exclusion of leaven and honey with the inclusion of salt in association with the מנחה suggests that the remembrance function also concerns the covenant. Based on this logic, an offerer presenting a מנחה is remembering the covenant and so represents his or her covenant allegiance to YHWH. At the very least then, by purposefully avoiding leaven and honey in the preparation of the מנחה gift, the offerer remembers to avoid that which could hinder acceptance in covenant relationship with YHWH, while purposefully including the salt of the covenant reminds the offerer to pursue covenant allegiance.  

Therefore, the argumentation of 2:1-16 can be summarised as follows, an offerer presents flour, oil, and incense before YHWH, excluding yeast and honey and including the salt of the covenant to remember covenant allegiance; a part of the gift is caused to smoke as a  

---

*a* Wenham, *Leviticus*, p. 69. See Genesis 4:3, 4:4, 32:22, 43:15, 43:25, 43:26; Judges 3:15, 3:17, 6:18, 3:19-23, 1 Kgs 4:21, 2 Kgs. 8:8, 20:12. This is a different emphasis to G. A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in their Social and Political Importance* (HSM, Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1987), p. 31, who argues that the מנחה could either mean ‘tax or tribute payment’, but primarily to the temple (not associated with covenant allegiance), or to a ‘cereal offering’. He argues that both can equally ‘co-exist at one time in Israelite culture.’  

*b* For example, Abel before YHWH (human/divine; Gen. 4:3-4) and Jacob before Esau (guilty brother/offended brother; Gen 32:22, 33:13).  


*d* Contrary to Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 32, who argues that the memorial is for God to ‘remember this person in covenant faithfulness’. Also, Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, pp. 72-73. The onus though is upon the offerer including and excluding ingredients, which could suggest that the one who is remembering, in this instance, is the offerer.
remembrance, which has a soothing aroma for YHWH, while the rest of the gift belongs to the priests as a most holy part of the offering. The intent of 2:1-16 is to persuade the Israelite community to avoid that which hinders their acceptance, while remembering their covenant allegiance to their covenant God.

The protasis in 3:1a shifts the theme from the הכהנים לשלמים in 3:1-17. Each minor protasis after this topic shift is either a ־א + Xp (v1aβ, v7a) or ־א + XP*(v6αa, v12a) structure initiating each paragraph to focus upon the particular kind of livestock for the whether it be from the cattle (v1aβ-5), from the flock (v6), a lamb (vv7-11), or a goat (v12-16). While there are minor variations between the ritual processes narrated in vv1-5, vv7-11, and vv12-16, the cattle לשלמים is the most complete and is, therefore, an exemplar of the ritual process.

After the ־א + Xp structure in v1aβ focusing the paragraph schema upon the cattle לשלמים, the apodosis begins with an Xp asyndetic clause that places the attributes of the gift being male or female and being תמים in the clause-initial position for prominence; that is, v1 accentuates that irrespective of the gift being male or female, it must be תמים to be presented before YHWH (לפי היה). The rest of the apodosis describes the ritual process

35 N.B The asterisk acknowledges that the clause-focus structures in v6aα and v12α are pragmatic structures. That is, the grammatical pattern is Px, but the clause-initial predicate is functioning as the pragmatic subject. Thus, the grammatical Px structure has the pragmatic function of a topicalising XP clause-focus structure.

36 There are four variations between vv1-6, vv7-11, and vv12-16, which do not affect the logic or meaning of the text significantly. First, in v2, the third movement uses the full noun phrase יבג ארון זבח וקרובים, whereas in v8 there is no need to re-identify the sons of Aaron as 'the priests' and thus זבח וקרובים is omitted. Second, the ritual process of the goat, beginning in v12, does not repeat the prerequisite attributes of the animal as per v1 and v6. The absence does not suggest that the goat need be תמים, but rather, by this point, the animal having the correct attributes is implied within the text. Third, there are points where the detail of the ritual process deviates from vv6b-5, but these differences are due to a different animal being used. For example, in v9, the instruction does not begin with the fat covering the inner parts, but rather the first fat part is to be removed from along the tail, לולב האלהים המה לעמג עזרה. Fourth, the digression of the fifth movement already observed in v5, where the text clarifies how the fat is caused to smoke - the fat parts are upon the עלה offering, which is upon the wood, which is upon the altar - is missing in the ritual processes of the lamb (v11) and the goat (v16). The effect of this omission in both instances is to accentuate the repetition of the fourth movement, which is not shortened or omitted. The emphasis is still very much upon the fat that is being offered as a food offering for YHWH.
through a \textit{wøqatal} sequence; as the paragraph schema progresses so too does the ritual process through five major ritual movements. The first is the offerer pressing his hand upon the head of the offering (v2a; cf. v8a, v13a). The second is the offerer slaughtering the offering at the entrance of the tent of meeting (v2b; cf. v8b, v13b). In the third movement (v2c), the priest sprinkles the blood of the offering upon and around the altar (cf. v8c, v13c).\textsuperscript{34} However, the fourth movement in vv3-4 (see also vv9-10, vv14-15) is distinctive from the movements within v2. Although \textit{הקריב} continues the \textit{wøqatal} sequence, there is an extended direct object chain in vv3a\textsuperscript{-}4 describing the fat parts from the \textit{בזכ〜שלמים} that are to be caused to smoke (the fifth movement; v5a).\textsuperscript{35} Although \textit{הקריב} in v5a continues the \textit{wøqatal} sequence noting the responsibility of the Aaronic priest in this fifth movement, the following prepositional phrases modify \textit{המכה}. By doing so, v5 digresses by narrating the various layers of what has been placed upon the altar. This cumulative effect is to highlight where the fat parts are to be caused to smoke. Only after this digression does v5 conclude with the [X]P refrain, \textit{ואה〜לייווה}. Once more, the goal of the ritual process is for the sacrifice to be a food gift as a soothing aroma for YHWH.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{34} Sklar, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 102, observes that, unlike the \textit{שלמים} offering, there is no mention of the blood having an atoning function within the ritual instruction of Leviticus 3. He understands this function to be implied in the text since the same process is followed as per the \textit{שלמים} offering. He states, 'This is no great surprise, since the sinful offeror would still need atonement when approaching a most holy God' (Sklar, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 102). Yet the Hebrew language loves using repetition and would not hesitate to repeat the same language of \textit{Ｃףר} if there is the same purpose. However, the sprinkling of blood is not only for purification, it is also the means of giving to YHWH what belongs to him. The \textit{בזכ〜שלמים} is always offered with the \textit{שלמים} and so acceptance and atonement has already been secured before YHWH. There is no reason for the atoning function to be repeated.

\textsuperscript{35} Kiuchi, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 79, suggests that the ‘fat and kidneys symbolise something of the offerer’ since the act of hand pressing identifies the offering with the offerer. Yet there is no suggestion in the text that the offering is on behalf of the offerer as there is in the \textit{שלמים} offering (14). Thus, the fat portions are not necessarily representative of anything other than what is explicit in the text, which is that the fat belongs to YHWH.

\textsuperscript{36} While the widely accepted view is that \textit{ריח} represents the best part of the animal, Kiuchi, \textit{Leviticus}, p. 79, takes a more negative view by understanding that \textit{ריח} is not inherently desirable, but rather represents what is detestable. The key, for Kiuchi, is that the \textit{ריח} is burnt as a soothing aroma. He then states, ‘Therefore the offerer must completely destroy it by fire and, of course, its destruction is inevitably pleasing to the Lord. The burning of fat symbolizes the destruction of detestable things within a human's inner being.' Yet causing an animal to smoke is the means of giving to YHWH the offering as a gift by fire and is part of the process of
As noted above, the אָּם + XP* structure beginning v6 introduces the situation where the offerer’s gift for a שָלָם בֵּיה יִבּוּן is from the flock. The apodosis is then an Xp structure with the attributes of the gift being in the clause-initial position before the yiqtol כְּרוּבִּין. The impact is to accentuate the necessity to offer a gift that is תִּימָס irrespective of whether the gift is male or female. Thus, the function of this pithy paragraph in v6 is to highlight the attributes of a gift from the flock before the ritual processes for a lamb (vv7-11) or a goat (vv12-16).

The apodoses in the paragraph schemas of vv7-11 and vv12-16 follow a similar process to vv2-5. However, there are two points within the episodic schema where the information flow of the text is broken. The first instance occurs in v16 at the conclusion of the goat ritual process where лиוהי אָּם רֵיחַ נְחָח does not immediately follow רֵיחַ אָּם לִיהוֹה. Previously, the text uses the phrase лиוהי אָּם רֵיחַ נְחָח (v5) or the summarised phrase כְּלַיְיוֹלָה ליוהי אָּם (v11). In v16, however, כל־חלב has been inserted between רֵיחַ נְחָח and ליוהי אָּם and so כל־חלב ליוהי forms a distinctive XP clause at the end of the instructions declaring that all fat belongs to YHWH. Watts also observes that the sudden declaration כל־חלב лиוהי ‘shatters’ the repetition of the refrain, but does not give a reason for how the sudden break in the refrain contributes to the rhetorical strategy of the text. The second instance is the use of asyndeton at the beginning of v17 before an [X]P clause declares an everlasting statute for all generations and in all of Israel’s dwelling-places; the statute is that all fat and all blood

transferring the offering to his possession. There is no hint in the text that the gift being caused to smoke is about destroying the gift and in doing so destroying something detestable in the offerer’s nature, but rather the intent is quite the opposite; the gift is caused to smoke as a pleasing and soothing aroma for YHWH.

Hartley, Leviticus, p. 37, makes the observation that the concluding phrase in v5, v11, and v16, differ not only in length, but also in whether or not the phrase includes the construction אָּם לִיהוֹה, which v5 does not. His conjecture is that лиוהי אָּם רֵיחַ נְחָח is unusual, ‘perhaps suggesting a textual error’. While composition factors may be at work as to why a variation exists within each instance of the concluding statement, the addition of כל־חלב may also be significant drawing the hearers’ attention specifically to the fat being offered as a reminder of the offering’s purpose.

See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 269, 287-288; Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 214; Wenham, Leviticus, p. 74.

Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 287.
is not to be eaten." This prohibition is categorical not only for the בְּכָהָל כְּלֵד, but for any livestock slaughtered. However, the chain of XP/[X]P/Xp structures in vv 16a-17 suggests prominence and so is perhaps the most significant part of the episodic schema. In each paragraph schema (exception is v6), the blood is splattered around the altar and then the rest poured out at its base, while the fat is caused to smoke to YHWH. Verses 16a-17 convey the rationale, which is that fat and also blood belong to YHWH. It is true that the text gives no explicit reason in vv 16a-17 for why the blood is forbidden to be eaten. Yet כל-דם shares a syntagmatic relation with כל-חלב. This syntagmatic relation is created by the juxtaposition of כל-דם with כל-חלב. This suggests that the reason for why the fat is prohibited is shared by the blood as well, and v 16 explicitly states the rationale for the fat; all fat belongs to YHWH.

Thus, having explored the arrangement of 3:1-17, we can summarise the argumentation of the שלמים as follows: The offerer presents a gift without blemish to YHWH and gives to God what belongs to him as a soothing aroma. However, an Israelite hearing this instruction would know that there is an entire part of the ritual process missing from Leviticus 3. Instructions for the שלמים are also given in later texts and if we put all the details together, we have a much fuller picture of what the whole ritual procedure is, if indeed that is our purpose. However, this is not the task of this chapter, which is seeking to

---

40. N.B. The subject of the clause מֵחָקְעָל שְׁעֵלָה לֶדְרוּתֵנִּים בֶּן מַשָּׂכָתֵנִּים has been omitted and is therefore acknowledged in the clause-focus structure as [X]. Its absence highlights the predicate as prominent and has a declarative function.
41. See also Levine, Leviticus, p. 17; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 106; Watts, Leviticus 1-10, pp. 288, 290-291; Contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, p. 216.
42. Leviticus 17:10-12 explicates what is implied by the syntax and pragmatic structures in 3:16-17, which is that the blood also belongs to YHWH.
43. For example, the memorial meal is only inferred with the fat portions being caused to be smoke as the offering by fire, as well as in the concluding prohibition in v17 that the fat and the blood are not to be eaten. There is no mention of the non-meat part of the בְּכָהָל כְּלֵד that belongs to the priests as per Leviticus 7:12-14. There is also no clarification in Leviticus 3 about how the בְּכָהָל כְּלֵד may be used to offer thanksgiving (Lev. 7:12-15) or as a vow or freewill offering (Lev. 7:16-18). Neither is there an emphasis upon preserving the purity of the sacrifice before YHWH, which is present in Leviticus 7:19-21. As we have already mentioned above, the meal of the slaughtered animal that the family is to share together is only implied within the text (see Lev. 7:17-21, Deut. 12:17-18).
understand the logic and persuasive intent of the text as it has been shaped. So, to probe the logic of the text, we need to ask what intent is operational within the text without importing later information into its meaning. First, the schema of each paragraph moves increasingly towards YHWH (v1, v6, v7, v12). Second, the discursive nature of each fourth movement within the ritual process, along with the addition of כל־חלב in v16, and the universal prohibition of eating both the fat and the blood in v17, focuses attention upon giving to YHWH what belongs to him – the fat and the blood. The third observation then is the meaning of the term בֶּן שלמים. While the term בֶּן refers generally to slaughter in a sacrificial context, the root שלם is fundamentally a relational term that shares the meaning of peace, fellowship, and wholeness within a particular relationship.

Thus, if we take into account what the text emphasises by the way in which the ritual process of the בֶּן שלמים has been arranged in 3:1-16, we can add a further nuance to the argument of the text, *The offerer presents a gift without blemish to YHWH, and gives to YHWH what belongs to him as a sign of whole relationship.* Given this logic, I suggest that the persuasive intent of the text is to give to YHWH what belongs to him. This emphasis falls quite naturally into the בֶּן שלמים as a fellowship meal.

As noted in Chapter Two, as the hearers or readers of the text progress from the עָלָה instruction in 1:3-17 to the בֶּן שלמים in 3:1-17, they add each kind of gift to their mental representation of the episodic schema in 1:2–3:17. By progressing through the schema, the hearer learns that what YHWH desires as an Israelite approaches him is a life of wholeness and integrity (1:3-17), actively remembering the covenant of his or her God (2:1-16), and also giving to YHWH what belongs to him (3:1-17). This logic at the outset of the book is not a coincidence. The intent of the whole text is to persuade the new covenant

---

45 See Noth, *Leviticus*, pp. 30-31. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 218, observes though that הבן שלמים is used in a particular way in biblical texts to mean a ‘slain offering whose meat is eaten by the worshiper.’ However, whether we take the broader meaning offered above, or Milgrom’s more specific understanding, it will not affect the meaning of Leviticus 3 as a whole.

community in an Israel at Sinai situation to be a community ensuring that YHWH is sanctified and glorified in their midst (10:3). These three ideas in 1:3–3:17, introduced and repeated at the beginning of the book, are also replayed throughout the whole text as the means by which Israel is to sanctify and glorify their covenant God who is present among them. For instance, the conceptual basis of 1:3-17, which is that the life accepted in the presence of YHWH is conditional upon a life of wholeness and integrity, is re-introduced once more in Leviticus 11 where the episode teaches the distinction between what is pure and impure. The opposite to this, the notion of impurity, is developed with the episodic schemas of Leviticus 12, 13–14, and 15, while Leviticus 18–20 extends this idea to the nation in the land and the need for Israel to maintain their state of holiness by means of being in a pure condition if they are to live in the land with YHWH in their midst. The second idea from 2:1-16 emerges into prominence with the introduction of the declaratory XP statement, 'I am YHWH your God' in 18:2. The covenant relationship is the reason why Israel has the responsibility of ensuring that YHWH is both sanctified and glorified in their midst. The third idea derived from 3:1-16, which is that they are to give to YHWH what belongs to him, emerges throughout the book, particularly in the episodic schemas of chapters 17–21, 22, 23, 25–26, and 27. The next episodic schema in 4:1–5:26 addresses situations where offence threatens the wholeness of covenant relationship with YHWH.

1.2 The Arrangement and Argument of Leviticus 4:1–5:26

The major protasis in 4:2αβ represents a theme shift to focus upon a situation where an Israelite (נפש) commits an unintentional offence against any of YHWH's commands that are not to be done. While there has been much discussion about the precise meaning of ושנה, the idea of 'unintentional' is generally acceptable; this status quo, however, is not

---

47 See also, Douglas, 'Poetic Structure', pp. 250-251. Douglas observes the importance of the theme particularly in relation to how Leviticus 27 culminates the book. Although, she does not observe the significance of Leviticus 3 introducing this idea. Her focus is more upon the 'disposal of the holy things of the Lord' (Douglas, 'Poetic Structure', p. 250).
the case with the more significant disagreement about whether מְצָאָה refers to what is prohibited by YHWH or encompasses anything that YHWH has commanded. The implication of this disagreement is significant. It is the difference between the offender having failed to do a particular command (i.e. out of omission) or having done what has been prohibited. How one reasons through this disagreement depends upon whether the relative clause איש לא תשעה is to be understood in a broad sense, as per Watts. At this point, there is no ambiguity. The protasis outlines the specific situation of an unintentional offence from any of YHWH’s commands, which are not to be done, and thus maintains a prohibitive sense. This does not preclude an offence of omission being part of later logic in the instructions. This overarching major case, which lacks an apodosis, prefaces the five following minor cases that each topicalise a paragraph within the episodic schema. Each minor case, with the exception of vv32-35, prescribes the ritual process according to who committed the offence: a priest (vv3-12), the congregation of Israel (vv13-21), a leader (vv22-26), and an individual from the people of the land (vv27-31). Verses 32-35 narrate the process where a lamb is the offering, rather than a bull or a goat. The first two minor cases in vv3-12 and vv13-21 are

---

4 While generally the various translations of ‘unwitting’, ‘inadvertent’, or ‘unintentional’ are accepted, the disagreement lies in what is understood by ‘inadvertent’. For example, Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 228, argues that ‘inadvertent’ offence involves either ‘negligence or ignorance. Either the offender knows the law but involuntarily violates it or he acts knowingly but is unaware he did wrong’ (see also Levine, Leviticus, p. 19). Hartley, Leviticus, p. 59, observes in contrast to Milgrom that unconsciousness of the command is primary in מְצָאָה (see also Hess, Leviticus’, p. 61). Hartley aligns his logic with that of Kiuchi; however, Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 91-92, suggests that the meaning is existential in that the offender ‘hides himself from the LORD without knowing’ and in this state of hiding, the offender breaks a particular command. This is a shift of perspective from his earlier work where he argues that מְצָאָה refers to unconsciousness or inadvertence (see Kiuchi, Purification Offering, p. 31). Watts, Leviticus 1–16, p. 329, argues for the meaning to ‘stray accidentally’ and while he aligns himself more to the performative understanding of Milgrom and Levine, the meaning of ‘straying accidentally’ does not concern itself at this point in the text with whether the command was known or not. Nihan, ‘The Templization of Israel’, p. 97 fn. 8, concludes that situations of both inadvertent and unconscious offence may be assumed. This chapter will use the idea of ‘unintentional irrespective of whether the command was known or unknown’ recognising with Nihan that it could refer to both situations.


47 See Watts, Leviticus 1–16, p. 329.
more detailed and with distinctive emphases, whereas the following cases are more summative and repetitive. The following analysis will examine the logic of the first two paragraphs focusing upon the priest (vv3-12) and the Israelite community (vv13-21).

The minor protases in v3 and v13 are XP clauses that place the subject in the clause-initial position, which topicalises the paragraph. However, the topic is also the identity of the one who has caused the offence and so the progression of the apodoses, and thus the paragraph schemas, are contingent upon the identity of the offender. In the instance of v3a, the situation is when an anointed priest sins (יחֵטָא) and, moreover, the priest is not only responsible for his offence, but also the prepositional phrase לָאָשֵׁמָת חַטָּא conveys that the people also bear the guilt of the priest’s offence. The apodosis beginning in v3b progresses through a series of וְשָׁגָтал clauses, which, after the yiqtol governing the protasis in v3a, has a future orientation. The first action of the ritual process is the offending priest drawing near (הקריב) with a bull, which is to be חטאת. The prepositional phrase + relative clause על התחאת אسرعة חטאת, which interrupts the information flow between the main verb הפר and its object פיּר, deliberately draws attention to the anointed priest bearing responsibility for his sinful act. Furthermore, there is a sense of motion as the priest submits himself to the ritual process by bringing his bull, which is כֹּבֵּשׁ, ‘to YHWH for a sin offering’ (לָיָהָה לָחַטאת). The directional verb בָּא beginning the

---

\(^{50}\) The absence of חטאת is due to the proximity of this first minor protasis in v3 to the major protasis in v2, whereas this notion of חטאת is repeated in the other cases to reintroduce and remind hearers that these cases are for unintentional offence.

\(^{50}\) There has been much discussion and debate about the primary meaning of the protasis and summarising the points of contention is beyond the task of this chapter. At the risk of polarising, there tends to be two main options for the rendering of חטאת. The first is based on the piel form of חטאת and after its function, ‘purification offering’ (Gane, Cult and Character, xx; Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 55-57; Jenson, Graded Holiness, p. 156; Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, pp. 253-255; Wenham, Leviticus, pp. 88-89), while the second is simply ‘sin offering’ on the basis that the root of חטאת is the qal stem חטאת meaning ‘sin, offence’. Kiuchi, Leviticus, pp. 90-91, decides that the translation ‘sin offering’ should be maintained because of the ‘familiarity of the term ‘sin”, although the meaning of חטא is relational, rather than action-oriented. He argues that חטאת should really be translated as ‘hide oneself’ and is thus a relational term rather than a ‘conduct-oriented’ term (Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 91). Watts also contends for the rendering of ‘sin offering’ for the sake of the word-play between חטאת and חטאת. Nihan, The Templization of Israel, p. 101, also suggests, ‘the basic function of the offering is to eliminate the guilt implied by that transgression, and הatta’t, as a technical term for a type of
second phase of the ritual process in v4a continues the forward motion with the priest bringing the bull to the entrance of the tent of meeting 'before YHWH' (לפני יהוה). The priest is then to press his hand upon the bull's head (v4b; third movement) and slaughter it, again, 'before YHWH' (לפני יהוה; fourth movement).\(^{54}\) Once the priest has brought the offering, pressed his hand upon its head, and slaughtered it, all before YHWH, the following five actions in the ritual process revolve around the blood of the bull. The priest is to take the blood (v5a), bring it to the tent of meeting (v5b), dip his finger into the blood (v6a), and sprinkle the blood seven times 'before YHWH' (לפני יהוה). Once the priest has finished the seven repetitions, he is then to put the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, again, 'before YHWH' (לפני יהוה; v7a). While the description of the hand-pressing and slaughtering of the animal are concise, the instructions communicating what is to be done with the blood of the bull are lengthy. The blood, in this instance, acts as a purifier. The sprinkling of the blood seven times at the holy veil has a symbolic dimension in terms of seven signifying completeness, a known syntagm,\(^ {55}\) and the front of the veil being towards the place where YHWH's presence dwells. The putting of blood on the horns of the altar of incense purifies the whole altar, as per the *pars pro toto* principle, and thus the holy place is purified from the impurity of the anointed priest's offence.\(^ {56}\)

---

sacrifice, should be rendered by ‘sin offering’ or ‘expiation offering’. Since this debate will not impact my argument about the logic of the text, this thesis will leave מסתננות untranslatable.

\(^ {54}\) Some have suggested that during the hand-pressing rite the priest would confess his sin or recite a so-called ‘psalm of penitence’ (see Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 60). Yet there is no concern with any verbal confession in this text and thus our focus is on the logic of the text's arrangement rather than ritual reconstruction, we will not be considering what might be assumed as part of the text’s logic.

\(^ {55}\) See also Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 60; Sklar, *Leviticus*, pp. 111-112. Contrary to Watts, *Leviticus* 1–10, p. 335, who maintains that the number seven appears frequently in the HB as a round number and here probably signifies little more than a thorough performance of the action.’

\(^ {56}\) I acknowledge that the meaning of the blood manipulation process is contentious and that Milgrom’s argument is problematic on a number of points as highlighted by Nihan, ‘The Templization of Israel’, pp. 125-111. However, the space of this thesis does not allow for an evaluation of Milgrom’s arguments that have substantially influenced current scholarship. I have followed, more or less, arguments put forward by Gane, *Cult and Character*, p. 62; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 1–16, p. 236; Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 112. I recognise the alternative view of Gilders, *Blood Ritual*, p. 139, who argues that the blood manipulation process distinguishes the priest's activity from the laity. There are two movements to the blood manipulation process according to Gilders; the sprinkling part of the blood manipulation is 'used to mark the divine presence' and so 'marks the inner limit
The apodosis so far progresses through a sequence of Px clauses in vv3b-7a; however, v7b is an Xp clause where the fronting of הפָּרָה interrupts the information flow to highlight that all the blood of the bull, i.e. left over from the blood manipulation in vv6-7a, is to be poured out at the foundation of the altar (v7b). Moreover, a second sequential Xp clause follows in v8a which draws attention to all the fat being removed, after which vv8αγ-9 then digresses to identify all the fat parts.\(^5\) The progression of the digression from vv8-9 to v10a suggests the choice to emphasise the particular fat parts instead of, for instance, letting v8αβ progress immediately to v10a. Also, the recollection of the בֵּית הַמִּזְבחָה in v10a reactivates the memory of 3:16-17, which highlights that both the blood and the fat belong to YHWH. Thus, the prominence of v7b and v8a by use of the Xp clauses, as well as the digression in vv8αγ-10a with the recalling of the בֵּית הַמִּזְבחָה, suggests that what is occurring is the giving of both the blood and the fat to YHWH.\(^\text{6}\) After this digression, v10b resumes the ritual process where the fat is caused to smoke on the altar and so given finally to YHWH.\(^\text{7}\) However, unlike the gift offerings in 1:3–3:17, the ritual process is not yet complete for the סָכַּם; rather, vv11-12 continues the process. Unusually though, v11 is a chain of indirect objects and cumulative prepositional clauses while the main verb in v12a is a weqatal (הוֹסֵר). Furthermore, its direct object אֲדָמֵי חַלְבִּים encompasses all the parts from v11. This prominent sequence in vv11-12a

of access', whilst the pouring of the blood marks the 'withdrawal from the encounter' (Gilders, Blood Ritual, p.117). A more persuasive view is put forward by Nihan, 'The Templization of Israel', pp. 120-127, which is that the blood rites represent contact between Israel and the divine. Nihan's argument is compelling and warrants further exploration and evaluation. If Nihan is accurate, then this would change the emphasis of the ritual process, but not the overall goal of reconciliation.

\(^{5}\) NB. This argument about the disjunctive syntax in vv7-10 does not agree with Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 336-337, who suggests that the absence of a subject conveys that there is a change in participant. The text is not concerned with who is participating at this point, but rather draws attention to what is being manipulated and removed. B. K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1993), 39.2.3, allows for the use of the disjunctive to indicate a 'shift in scene' as an alternative or even to offer a parenthesis; the latter is the case in vv7-10.

\(^{6}\) My argument presupposes that the pouring out of the blood is part of the ritual process. See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 336-337. Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, p. 61, and Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 238-239, who argue that the pouring out of the blood is a means of disposal of the rest.

\(^{7}\) Gane, Cult and Character, p. 66, stresses that the fat being caused to smoke is not as a gift, but rather as 'a mandatory payment of an obligation or “debt” to YHWH, whose order has been violated.'
highlights the whole bull that is to be taken outside the camp to a pure place. The choice of the text to repeat the verbal idea שָׁרַף suggests that the destroying of the whole bull is significant.\textsuperscript{63} As Moshavi observes, v12 could be expressed without the repetition of שָׁרַף and more concisely;\textsuperscript{64} the choice, according to Moshavi, to include the clause עלָ֣שֶׁנָּ֗ם הדַּשָּׁן is 'to stress that it is here and nowhere else that the offering is to be burnt.'\textsuperscript{65}

The second minor protasis in v13 begins with an XP clause shifting the topic to a situation where the whole Israelite community commits an offence.\textsuperscript{66} The protasis, however, is much more complex than v3. The yiqtol שָׁרַף indicates a future situation where the congregation has actively and corporately wandered. The niphal הזהל, which is subordinate to the initial yiqtol, suggests that instruction (דָּרֶךְ) has been concealed from 'from the eyes of the assembly' after they have wandered. The following waqatal וַעֲשָׂה then conveys that the consequence of having wandered and instruction being concealed from the community is

\textsuperscript{63} Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, p. 61. As Wenham, Leviticus, p. 91 fn. 9, observes, שָׁרַף has the connotation of burning to destroy, while שָׁרַף is used in the context of causing an offering to smoke for a soothing aroma for YHWH.


\textsuperscript{65} Moshavi, Word Order, p. 142.

\textsuperscript{66} I acknowledge that הַדַּשָּׁן could mean a 'community', 'assembly', 'congregation', 'gathering', or even 'elders', and more negatively can be used as a derogative for a gang of people. The term הַדַּשָּׁן can be used to refer to a community made up of various social levels such as in the context of the census in Numbers 12. Drawing on this example as well as Judges 20–21, 1 Kings 2:23, and Numbers 14:1-4. Levy and Milgrom note, 'the הַדַּשָּׁן is the 'general assembly, congregation,' of all freed adult men and is empowered with making decisions affecting the entire nation' (D. J. Levy and J. Milgrom, הַדַּשָּׁן, TDOT, ed. G. J Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H. J. Fabry, vol. X, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999, p. 470). Moreover, the הַדַּשָּׁן can gather for a number of purposes, such as for cultic worship, war, or for a legal proceeding. There is also a question as to whether the community refers more to a national entity or a worshipping entity. See E. Carpenter, הַדַּשָּׁן, NIDOTTE, ed. W. A. VanGemeren (vol. 3, Carlisle, UK: Paternoster, 1995), pp. 326-328, or Levy and Milgrom, הַדַּשָּׁן, pp. 468-480, for an overview of the uses of הַדַּשָּׁן. I note though that Ringgren makes the point after Levy and Milgrom's contribution that their understanding of הַדַּשָּׁן is influenced by an early dating for P and highlights that for a later dating for P, 'in this view P presents not a realistic portrayal of circumstances obtaining during the oldest period but rather an agenda and an ideal program for the postexilic congregation' (H. Ringgren, הַדַּשָּׁן, TDOT, ed. G. J Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H. J. Fabry, vol. X, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999, p. 482). However, at this point, whether P is early or late does not affect the understanding of הַדַּשָּׁן as referring to a community. I have taken the construct הַדַּשָּׁן וַעֲשָׂה in Leviticus 4:13 to mean the community of Israel, which is a broader reference than to the elders, and also with the understanding that the nature of Israel is that the nation is purposed to be a worshipping nation as a covenant people whose king is their God and thus the הַדַּשָּׁן refers to the community both as a cultic community and as a community part of a nation.
that they did what they should not have done from YHWH's commands. The third וָשָׁכַל is then the cumulative consequence, which is that the community bears their own guilt. There is contention as to whether the congregation is aware of their guilt or whether they are in this state unconsciously. Yet the final וָשָׁכַל in v14a completes the protasis and the juxtaposing verbal sequence suggests that the community is in a state of guilt and only after is the 'sin that they have sinned' made known to the congregation.

The situation described in the protasis is complex; the whole Israelite community is active in the first instance of wandering and yet the unintentional nature of the sin is due to the fact that they have been acted upon, having instruction concealed from them, which leads to the congregation actively doing what is prohibited. Whilst they bear their own guilt, they do so unknowingly having wandered, and so the apodosis in vv14b-21 then hinges upon the offence being made known to the community.

The apodosis beginning in v14b shares a similar logic to the schema of vv3-12, including the digressions with the blood (vv17-18; cf. vv6-7), although the detail about the fat (v19a; cf. vv8-10a) and the bull being destroyed by fire outside the camp is more concise (v21; cf. vv11-12). There are some notable differences, however. First, since the community

---

64 For arguments for the consciousness of guilt before knowledge of their offence, see Hartley, Leviticus, p. 62; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 243; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 113. Levine, Leviticus, p. 22, observes though in contrast, 'guilt exists whether or not the offender is aware of it at the time [...] Guilt may "begin" even before the offender realizes what he has done.' However, we would perhaps be wise to hear the caution of Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 342, when he notes that there is ambiguity in the use of חטאת in v13 and that 'Translations would do well to reproduce the word plays and associations as literally as possible so that readers can tease out the possible implications for themselves.'

65 The text does not say how the community is brought to a knowledge of their offence, only that they are made aware, which then provides impetus for the elders to bring the נָפַש offering. However, commentators have offered varied suggestions. Hartley, Leviticus, p. 62, for instance, recognises that the text does not explicitly explain how the community are made aware of their sin, but assumes that guilt leads to collective knowledge. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 243, states that the second verb precedes the first and thus, for Milgrom, the feeling of guilt is a consequence of the offence being made known to the community. In contrast to Milgrom, Levine, Leviticus, p. 22 keeps the verbal order between v13 and v14 and observes, 'A state of guilt exists because of the fact of the misdeed. If and when the offense becomes known, expiation must be undertaken.' Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 342, just simply states that the passive is used 'because the whole community's sin can only come to light internally'. I have suggested, in line with Levine's argument, that the verbal order be retained and that the offender is in a state of guilt before the offence is made known.
collectively is culpable, the assembly is responsible for bringing a bull, which is חטאת, and once presented, the elders as representative of the community become the active participants in the ritual process from v15a. The elders of the congregation press their hands upon the head of the bull ‘before YHWH’ (לפני יהוה) and slaughter the animal, again, ‘before YHWH’ (לפני יהוה). However, once the animal has been transferred to YHWH’s possession through the slaughter, the anointed priest then undertakes the blood manipulation process (vv16-18). Second, v20a stresses the need for compliance by the repetition of עש in the wqatal + qatal + yiqtol verbal sequence and so can be translated, ‘He [the priest] shall do with the bull as he did with the bull of the חטאת offering, thus, he shall do with it’. This suggests that the success of making כפר (v20b) and so restoring the relationship (v20c) is conditional upon the priest adhering to command. This then leads to the third observation that v20b and v20c explicitly state that the priest makes כפר ‘upon them’ (עלהם), which leads to the restoration of relationship (ונסלח). The use of the niphal ונסלח is significant since the wqatal sequence suggests a juxtaposing sequence where being forgiven is subordinate to the first verb כפר. The use of the niphal leads Milgrom to argue that the implied identity of the one who is forgiving is YHWH and thus the act of forgiving belongs to YHWH’s domain alone. Watts adds further to Milgrom, ‘The passive verb distinguishes the priest’s atoning action from its effects’. Both Milgrom and Watts draw attention to the richer meaning of סלח to encompass the relational aspect of reconciliation, not just the idea of forgiveness. In the instance of the חטאת 스לח

---

66. Worth noting is Nihan, ‘The Templization of Israel’, pp. 110-111, argues that the ones for whom כפר is effected are the offenders, that is, the Israelites, rather than the sanctuary. See also Jenson, Graded Holiness, p. 157, who notes that the purification is for the people as well as the sanctuary.

67. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 245, views the text wishing to avoid ‘anthropopathic notions’. See also Gane, Cult and Character, p. 51; Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 62-63; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 96.

68. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 346-347. See also Cranz, Atonement and Purification, p. 121. Cranz, Atonement and Purification, p. 122, takes Watts’ argument a step further, however, to note that ‘divine forgiveness tends to be directed toward the collective and often relates to the covenantal relationship between God and his people’. She then concludes, ‘Consequently, it appears that the Hebrew verb סלח does not relate to the relationship between God and his people. In other words, sinners are not necessarily forgiven for their transgressions, but rather for endangering the divine presence at the sanctuary.’ Cranz’s argument is certainly worthy of assessment.

69. Contrary to Levine, Leviticus, p. 24, who takes the view of סלח referring to a mechanical notion of
congregation, the offence caused by doing what is prohibited because they have wandered causes a breakdown in relationship between YHWH and the community, thus the חטאת offering is given so that there is restoration of relationship. This state of reconciliation is the goal of the חטאת process, after which the rest of the bull is destroyed by fire outside the camp (v21).

Thus, Leviticus 4 is made up of one major overarching case in v2 that introduces the general context of when someone sins unintentionally and is guilty. This major case is then followed by five minor situations (vv3-12, vv13-21, vv22-26, vv27-31, vv32-35), which clarify the nature of the offence and the ritual process according to who the offenders are. Each case narrates a similar ritual process for the חטאת. While the kind of animal may differ, the one constant factor is that the animal must be תמים and slaughtered by those who are culpable. The blood is then used to purify the place where the guilt of offence has caused impurity. In the first two cases involving corporate guilt and responsibility, the anointed priest purifies the holy place with blood, whereas in the two cases involving individual guilt and responsibility, the priest purifies the place where the עלה offering is given to the YHWH as a soothing offering. The impurity of individual offence could hinder the acceptability of the עלה offering. In all situations though, when purification is made, both the blood and the fat of the animal is given to YHWH. The goal of the ritual process of the חטאת is for כפר to be made and for reconciliation (סלח) to be achieved between the offerer(s) and YHWH. Hearing the repetition in the ritual processes, the Israelite community would know that reconciliation must be accomplished through the shedding of blood for the purification of the place that represents God’s presence among his people and so for the relationship to be restored. This may explain the reason for the sense of ‘urgency’ Watts observes. When guilt of an offence is known, the

---

70 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 245; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 346. Contrary to Gane, Cult and Character, p. 52, who acknowledges the idea of forgiveness, but who then states that the idea of reconciliation and restoration is only present ‘in an extended sense’.

71 Watts, Ritual and Rhetoric, p. 91.
individual or community must seek reconciliation, otherwise they would persist in the
guilt of their offence. Thus, the argument of Leviticus 4 can be summarised as follows:

*When an unintentional sin has been committed leading to corporate or individual guilt, and
their sin has been shown to them, they must present to YHWH an animal without blemish as a חטאת and slaughter the animal in the presence of the YHWH. The priest will act to purify the place where YHWH dwells for corporate guilt or the place where gifts of whole relationship are offered to the YHWH for individual guilt. After purification is accomplished, both the blood and the fat are given to YHWH. By doing as he is instructed, the priest makes חファー on behalf of the culpable and the offence is forgiven. The intent of Leviticus 4 is to motivate the Israelite community to seek restoration of relationship with YHWH by submitting to the process of the חטאת when they sin unintentionally and know their offence.*

The second major case within the חטאת instructions begins in 5:1 and is distinctive from 4:2-35. Its lengthy protasis in vv1-5 describes four specific situations where the offender is culpable. The pithy apodosis in v6 summarises the חטאת process with the same goal of making חファー and relational restoration. A further two minor cases in vv7-10 and vv11-13

---

72 Contrary to Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, p. 91, that the urgency is merely to 'convince their hearers and readers of the urgent necessity of fulfilling their ritual stipulations' because there is an expectation that the instructions will meet resistance. Watts leaves the connection between this urgency and then the urgency of sin and its consequences left unaddressed (see Watts, *Ritual and Rhetoric*, p. 95).

73 There are various views about how the second major case of the חטאת in 5:1-13 is distinctive from the first major case of the חטאת in 4:2-35. Noth, *Leviticus*, pp. 43-45, suggests that 5:1-13 is an appendix to Leviticus 4 and while the focus of the major case is 'the failure to divulge a known offence', he insinuates that because the minor cases progresses from a female offering to the offering of two doves, and then to a cereal alternative, that these cases are for those belonging to a lower socio-economic threshold. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 310, argues against the notion that the חטאת cases in 5:1-13 are the 'poor man's purification offering', but agrees that the major case acts as an appendix to the חטאת in Leviticus 4. However, Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, pp. 307-313, calls 5:1-13 'the graduated purification offering' where the minor cases are arranged according to the economic means of the offerer, as opposed to the status of the offender in 4:2-35. While Watts, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 336, agrees with Nihan, *From Priestly Torah*, pp. 244-245, that the nature of offence in 5:6 is that of omission, he then concedes to Milgrom that the arrangement of 5:7-13 is 'read best as a continuation of the scale already begun in chapter 4. Thus, the prevailing understanding so far is that the חטאת in 5:1-13 is an extension of the חטאת in Leviticus 4 with 5:1-13 serving the purpose of giving alternatives for different socio-economic means.

74 Contrary to Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 301, who views the apodosis beginning in v5b with חטא והתרודה ארבע חטאתים instead of חטאת.
then represent minor topic shifts where first, in the situation where a sheep cannot be attained, the offerer may approach with two male doves or pigeons (vv7-10) or second, where a מנחה is offered in the stead of the two birds (vv11-13). The logic though of this section can be summarised as follows: When a person sins, the offence being hidden from him initially, but then he knows, realises his guilt, and confesses, he is to bring his penalty to make כפר so that he can be forgiven for his offence. If the offender cannot afford a female lamb or goat as his penalty, he is able to bring two male doves or pigeons or a semolina flour as his sin offering.

The XP clause beginning 5:15 shifts the theme of the episodic schema to address the situation where someone (נפש being the clause-initial constituent) breaks faith (yiqtol תמעל מוטל) with YHWH and so sins (wqatal מקרש יהוה) unintentionally against YHWH's holy 'things' (יהוה מקדשי). The brief apodosis in vv15c-16 clarifies first that the offender brings his אשם to YHWH (ליהוה), which is a ram that is תמים and also in equal in the valuation of silver shekels for an אשם. The Xp clause beginning v16a then highlights that restitution (ישלם) needs to be made for the offence. After the offerer hands the ram and the monetary reparation to the priest (v16b), the priest makes כפר for the offerer and is forgiven (ונסלח לו; v16c). As Watts notes, 'Sacrilege must be compensated as well as mitigated.'

A minor case in 5:17-19 follows a similar ritual process in v18, but the situation again is quite distinctive and a matter of some contention. The situation is where an individual breaks a prohibition, does not know he has done so, but suspects by the realisation of

---

75 Levine, Leviticus, p. 33, acknowledges that the origin of מעלה is unclear. He observes that the study of מעלה reveals its use in two contexts; the first to 'sacrilege and impurity; as such, it is an appropriate term for misappropriation of sanctuary property' and second, to a breach of a covenant, whether the context is the relationship between God and his people or in marriage. Scholars tend to take one of the two positions. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 320, prefers 'committing a sacrilege' (see also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 367), while Hartley, Leviticus, p. 80, keeps with 'breach of faith' (see also Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 112).

76 Contrary to Noth, Leviticus, p. 47, who argues that the purpose of valuation is so that the monetary valuation of the ram without blemish is offered, rather than the animal itself.

77 Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 369.

78 There is some discussion about the level of 'not knowing' (ולא-ידע) in 5:17b; does the offender not know of the act of sacrilege that he has committed, or is he 'not knowing' that his action is an act of sacrilege? Watts,
guilt that he has broken a command, and so bears the penalty. The need for valuation in v18 suggests that the offence is a matter of property. Also, the description of the offence that is dealt with by the act of כפר in v18b-18c is unparalleled so far in the episodic schema: יָלַע שָנַה יֵשָׁר שָנָה והוא ולא יָדיע. The use of שָנַה + the qatal שָנַה + the Xp clause לַא יָדיע suggests that the offence was done unintentionally. Thus, the logic for the arrangement of the major case in 5:17-19 can be expressed in the following way, When someone sins unknowingly against the property of the YHWH, realises guilt, and bears his penalty, he is to make reparation by financial restitution and with a guilt offering for כפר and forgiveness for his unintentional and unknowing offence.

The theme shifts in 5:21-26 to address a situation where someone will break faith with YHWH by committing an offence against a neighbour’s property. The protasis in vv21-24a, beginning with an initiating XP clause, describes the situation of offence against YHWH; he has deceived his neighbour with property entrusted to him. However, the protasis continues to describe a further four situations of offence coordinated by a series of או conjunctions: stealing (v21b), extortion (v21c), lying when finding property that a neighbour had lost (v22a), and swearing falsely about any of these situations (v22b). The temporal frame in v23a then summarises the protasis with the יִקְטָל, תחטא, after which the two sequential ושבת verbs והשיב ואשם progress the information flow of the paragraph schema by adding that the offender, having recognised his state of guilt, then returns the property according to each situation described in vv21-22. After the description of what the offender is to restore in vv23-24a, v24b then progresses the ritual process by a ושבת

---

Leviticus 1–10, p. 370, understands the phrase to convey that the offender is unaware that he has committed an act of sacrilege. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 82. However, Levine, Leviticus, p. 32, thinks there are problems with the reasoning leading to this conclusion and contends that ולא ידיע contains the idea of ‘ultimate knowledge’ where a person knows something for certain. In the instance of 5:17, Levine understands ולא ידיע to convey that the person has an inkling of the knowledge of the offence, but does not know for sure that what he has done is an act of sacrilege.

There is a question of whether והשיב refers to the status of the individual as guilty (see Levine, Leviticus, p. 32), or whether the person realises his guilt at this point and thus moves from unconsciousness of the offence to being conscious of the sacrilege he has caused (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 332-333).
prescribing that the offender is then to make good by adding a fifth of what has been restored, which is to happen on the day of reparation.\textsuperscript{80} The Xp clause beginning v25a then breaks the information flow of the schema to highlight what the offerer is to bring, namely אשם, to YHWH. This אשם is to be a ram without blemish (תמים) according to the valuation of an אשם and so be brought to the priest, who then makes כפר before YHWH (לפני יהוה). Once more, the goal is for restoration of relationship between God and the offender (v26). The logic, therefore, of this final case of the אשם could be summarised as, *An individual, who breaks faith with YHWH by sinning against his neighbour’s property, recognises his guilt and returns the property to his neighbour; after restoring the property, he seeks to make peace with his neighbour by offering financial restitution and then offers a guilt offering in the presence of YHWH for כפר and forgiveness for what he has done.*

1.3 *The Argument and Rhetorical Strategy of 1:2b–3:17 and 4:1–5:26*

The emphasis in Leviticus 4–5 upon the need for reconciliation when offence threatens the wholeness of relationship is a logical progression from Leviticus 1–3. The gift instructions in Leviticus 1–3 remind the Israelite community that acceptance in the presence of YHWH is conditional upon integrity, actively remembering their covenant God, and giving to YHWH what belongs to him. What then happens if offence threatens the wholeness of relationship between the Israelite community and YHWH? Leviticus 4–5 at the most basic level, as case after case is recited, establishes the order of reconciliation beginning with the realisation of guilt, leading to the need for כפר, and the divine prerogative of forgiveness. If the offence is against YHWH’s property (and thus the holy) or a neighbour’s property, then restoration must include seeking peace by restitution materially and by a gift effecting כפר. The repetition of the key beliefs embodied in the worldview of each ritual process is part of the rhetorical strategy of each episodic schema,

\textsuperscript{80} This is a subtle difference to Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, p. 374, who understands אשם biopsy to mean, ‘when their guilt becomes apparent in the act of restitution’.
so that by hearing the recital of the instructions, the Israelites too embody the worldview of the ritual processes so that relational order with YHWH is sustained and maintained.

1.4 The Arrangement and Argument of Leviticus 6:1–7:21

The hearer is familiar with the narrative introduction in 6:1 recalling YHWH speaking to Moses; how the speech then proceeds in 6:2α breaks the ordered familiarity. No longer is Moses commanded to speak to the sons of Israel, he is now to command Aaron and his sons. This escalation from ראה תורה עליה might reflect who is being addressed, there is an escalation of responsibility between the sons of Israel and the priesthood. Perhaps the use of זה accentuates the seriousness of what is to be commanded. The speech begins in 6:2β with the first XP topicalising clause אמרות תורה עליה. The paragraph schema then coheres around the עליה as the referent. The Xp clause in v2bγ fronts the pleonastic pronoun הוא followed by the subject עליה with the sense of ‘the עליה only’ or ‘the עליה itself’. The effect is to highlight the עליה as the only offering upon the hearth all night until morning, which is the reason why v2c unambiguously states that the fire is to be kept burning (זוקרא) upon the altar. The repetition of the verbal root לבש in v3 emphasises the necessity for the priest to cover his flesh as is commanded in Exodus 28:42–43. The consequence if he does not is that he will be in a state of guilt and so die. Verses 3–4 then progress slowly by recalling each act of dressing (v3a), removing the ashes (v3b), setting the ashes near the altar (v3c), then stripping his linen garments (v4a), clothing himself in

---

83 See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 390, who notes, ‘ו imperative “command” appears here in the place where יא “say” is used in the previous regulations addressed to all Israel (12: 41). Perhaps the stronger term appears here because the recipients are priests.’

84 See Waltke and O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 16.3.3. See also 8.1.4b.

85 There is a textual problem with the prepositional phrase על המוקד. The Samaritan Pentateuch adds the definite article the המוקד. This causes Elliger, Leviticus, p. 81 (with Hartley, Leviticus, p. 89, following his lead) to suppose that the preposition על is an example of dittrography and thus emends יחידי המוקד to יחידי המוקד. The LXX adds the genitive (thus possessive) pronoun to the prepositional phrase, επ’ αυτής καύσεως γιατί (see also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 383; Rendtorff, Leviticus 1:1–10, pp. 229, 234). Since the text as it stands does not need emending and makes sense, with the LXX addition only making a slightest of difference, we have chosen to maintain the rendering, ‘It is the עליה only upon the hearth, [which is] upon the altar, all night until morning.’ The function of an identifying clause, according to Waltke and O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 16.3.3, is to draw attention to the uniqueness of something, which in this instance is the עליה.
other clothes (v4b), before going outside the camp to the place of purity with the ashes (v4c). This laborious detail heightens the danger and priestly responsibility where there is no ambiguity about his task. The relative clause in v3bα conveys why such care must be taken; the fire has consumed the העלה עליה המזבח upon the altar. An Xp clause beginning v5αξ pauses the information flow by placing והאש עליה המזבח in the clause-initial position to highlight what must be kept burning continually, namely the fire upon the altar. The asyndetic Px clause in v5αβ then pauses the information flow to accentuate the prohibition against letting the fire be quenched, thus highlighting priestly responsibility once more. This leads logically to the instruction for the priest to burn wood upon the altar morning after morning and for the העלה עליה המזבח to be arranged upon it so as to cause the fat of the בזח שלמים to smoke upon it. An asyndetic Xp clause beginning v6αξ repeats the instruction for the fire to burn continuously on the altar, as well as the prohibition from v5αβ. Again, there is no ambiguity; the fire must not be quenched.

The second XP thematic refrain והכה תורה המזבח shifts the topic to the המזבח in 6:7αξ, beginning the paragraph schema in vv7-11. Initially, in v7, the sons of Aaron draw near with the לאפיים יהוה (לפני יהוה).84 The use of two sequential directional phrases in v7, לאפיים יהוה אלפיים המזבח, suggests the priest must draw near before YHWH and more

---

84 Contrary to Hartley, Leviticus, p. 96, the setting aside of the ashes after their removal is not necessarily concerned with ‘the priest lay[ing] aside a small amount of ashes for the next day to insure continuity in the sacrifices’, but is a practical provision for the priest to change out of his sacred clothing (Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 385). The question remains as to why the text deems the inclusion of this detail necessary. A reasonable suggestion is that the text is purposefully slowing down the pace of the narrative by the use of incremental actions, which in turn moves the ritual process at an incremental pace. The effect is to increase the tension of the ritual and conveys the danger of the priestly task.

85 The infinitive absolute המקרב המזבח begins the instructions, rather than the finite verb we might expect. The Samaritan Pentateuch emends המקרב המזבח to המקרב, while the LXX attempts to render the Hebrew יְהַבַּשׁ המזבח of the speech. Watts, Leviticus 1–16, p. 396, understands the infinitive absolute to be acting temporally and subordinate to the next major verb in v8. Waltke and O’Connor, Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 35:5:1, suggest that an infinitive absolute beginning its clause can be ‘used as a word of command’. This is most likely since the context is command and treats the infinitive absolute as a finite verb with the force, ‘The sons of Aaron must offer’. Similarly, Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 391, suggests that the infinitive absolute ‘has the force of an imperative’. While Rendtorff, Leviticus 1,1–10,20, p. 249, acknowledges the various options, he concludes that it is not easy to say how the infinitive functions.
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specifically to the front of the altar.\textsuperscript{86} The sequence of Px clauses with \textit{\textit{w}aqatal} verbs resembles 2:1-3 where the priest removes a handful of semolina flour, oil, and all the incense (v8a), and then causes the handful to smoke upon the altar as a soothing aroma (v8b). The place of אזכורת preceding ‘for YHWH’ (ליהוה) draws attention to the purpose of the offering, it is a remembrance for God, which is a distinctive emphasis from 2:1-3 where the offerer remembers.\textsuperscript{87} Thus, the function of the מנחה is for both the offerer and YHWH to remember the covenant.

The paragraph schema continues in vv9-11 with a number of asyndetic clauses and also with prominent CFS. Each clause within v9 is an Xp structure where each predicate is a \textit{yiqtol} of אכל. The first Xp clause fronts what is to be eaten, namely the leftovers from the מנחה (v9α), while the second fronts מצות highlighting how it is to be eaten i.e. unleavened (v9β). The modifying prepositional phrase קדש במקום then prescribes the ritual state of the place where it is to be eaten - holy. The third Xp clause places the particular location, הבט Zombies in the clause-initial position (v9γ), and so the logic of v9 accentuates how and where the priests are to eat their share of the gift. This emphasis will become increasingly significant in the חטאת and אשם instructions in 6:19, 6:22, and 7:6-7.

While v9 gives permission for the priests to eat the leftovers from the מנחה, v10 restricts how the priestly share can be eaten. Every clause in v10 is asyndetic. The prohibition in v10a, לא תמאם תמי, states clearly that the flour is not to be baked with yeast after which the Xp clause in v10b highlights that the portion is given from the food offering. The final clause though, whilst there is no conjunction suggesting so, is the rationale for the

\textsuperscript{86} Watts, \textit{Leviticus} i–10, p. 396, notes that the two directional phrases in v7 reflect the transfer between the offerer and the priest occurring when the offerer approaches before YHWH at the entrance of the tent. After the offerer approaches, the priest then takes the offering to the front of the altar. However, the verb הקרב encompasses both prepositional phrases with בני אהרן as the probable subject of the one who is drawing near with the מנחה.

\textsuperscript{87} There is a question as to who is remembering. Is God meant to be remembering and so the function of the soothing aroma is to motivate him to remember or is אזכורת referring to the function of the offering as a whole where the offerer is also remembering? The different emphasis in 6:8 in comparison with 2:3 suggests that both the offerer and YHWH are remembering.
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unambiguous and prominent instruction in vv9-10. The pragmatic XP structure declares the priestly share to be most holy as per the (v10γ). Verse 11 then suggests why. Verse 11a, an asyndetic Xp clause, reiterates permission for all the Aaronic priests to eat freely from YHWH's food offerings, while the final relative Px clause introduces, for the first time in the global schema, the idea that the state of holiness is contagious.

The third XP thematic refrain in v13, departing from the usual formula, shifts the theme of the paragraph schema to focus upon the gift that Aaron and his sons are to offer to YHWH on the day of their consecration. Worth noting is the high occurrence of asyndetic clauses within vv13-14. The gift is to be a tenth of an ephah of semolina flour as a מנחה מנה and is to be in perpetuity, half in the morning and half in the evening. Verse 14 then describes how this מנחה is to be prepared. The use of asyndeton with the syntactic and pragmatic structures in v14 produces intricate and complex logic that also changes the cooking process from the תכורת מנה, instructing with a pause existing between the two phrases, which suggests that the oil is not for the griddle but for the making of the mixture. Leaving the participle悬念 for the moment, the yiqtol הביאנה + the construct chain תכורת מנה can be rendered roughly as, 'you shall bring the broken pieces of the mixture.' The participle is then modifying悬念 being brought. The third Px

86 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 397–399, reasons that the daily מנה of the high priest is being referred to in v13 (see also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 423). Levine, Leviticus, pp. 38–39 notes that could be rendered 'from the day' as well as 'on the day' and thus understands this to be instructing a daily offering 'from the day Moses anoints him' (see also Hartley, Leviticus, pp. 97–98; Kiuchi, Leviticus, p. 125; Marx, 'Theology of the Sacrifice', p. 129). While this is plausible, we would normally understand בימים to mean 'on the day'. Furthermore, the logic of v13 makes sense even with retaining the meaning 'on the day'; the gift is to be offered 'on the day' of Aaron's anointing as the beginning of a daily offering of a מנה的食物 sacrifices (see also Wenham, Leviticus, p. 122).

The object of悬念 is the construct chain תכורת מנה, but the problem is that this is the only occurrence of悬念 in the Old Testament and its origin and meaning is not known with any certainty. The hazy provenance of悬念 causes Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 402, to leave the word untranslated. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 404, opts for making an emendation to悬念 'you must crumble it', which then means emending the verb מנה into the noun תכורת悬念 ('produce'). However,悬念 is a verbal form that is not problematic, except for the awkwardness of the second person. Thus, I have chosen translating悬念 as 'broken pieces' and also keeping the verbal idea悬念.
conveys its intent, which is to offer a soothing aroma for YHWH. If this understanding is accurate, then two observations need to be made.

The first observation, as hinted at earlier, is that the verbal sequence in v14 does not follow the process of making a מנה. The linear process in v14 would be to soak the flour in water to create an active agent, mixing in the oil, which, when brought together can form a crumb-like mixture, after which the mixture is then baked on a griddle. What this suggests is that the text is not concerned with the re-enactment of the ritual process. Why does the beginning of v14 mention how the מנה is to be baked, while the end of the verbal sequence stresses how the מנה is to be brought? A plausible explanation, especially considering the emphasis of v15, is that the text desires the 'you' (the second person) to bring the crumbed mixture and that this mixture is then griddle baked before it is caused to smoke. This will ensure that the 'whole' in v15 is caused to smoke and no crumb is left behind. The second observation then concerns why the participle מרבכת is included. The act of 'soaking' in a bread-making process is for an active agent to leaven bread. What will be caused to smoke in v15 is leavened bread. The fact that the bread is leavened is implied in the text by the use of the participle and accentuates the uniqueness of this particular מנה. Usually, a מנה is to be unleavened for it to be a soothing aroma for YHWH (2:11). However, the abrupt syntax of v14 ensures that the whole מנה is to be offered as a soothing aroma to YHWH, which is made explicit in v15. Verse 16 concludes the paragraph with an XP clause declaring that the whole מנה is to be burnt up in its entirety and finishes with a prohibition for this gift not to be eaten.\(^9\)

Finally, given the oddity of 6:12-16, asking why the instruction for the ordination מנה occurs at this particular point of the text’s arrangement is worth exploring. Although the

\(^9\) Verse 16 suddenly broadens the instruction from the high priest to now addressing ‘every priest’. Furthermore, rendering 6:23 (Eng.; 6:16 Heb.) in the NIV ‘Every grain offering of a priest shall be burned completely’ is to read the meaning of the previous verbal clause at the end of 6:22 (Eng.) into the Hebrew text. The Hebrew clause תeràה יכלה לַחֵנַיִם in 6:16 (Heb.) is purposefully drawing attention to the responsibility of the priest to ensure his gift is whole. Thus, the NIV at 6:23 is not an accurate reflection of the Hebrew or the text's logic at this point.
instructions in 6:12-16 are dependent upon the situation of the high priest being
anointed, the kind of gift is still a מנחה and thus follows the instructions in 6:7-11
quite naturally. Moreover, the proximity of the ordination offering to the אלה is quite fitting
since they both involve the giving of the whole offering to YHWH by causing the gift to
smoke as a soothing aroma. Also, v9 and v11 give permission for the priesthood to eat
their share of the מנחה, so vv12-16 logically follow by giving the one exception to this
freedom, which is the ordination מנחה where the whole must be given to YHWH.

The fourth XP thematic refrain in v18 shifts the topic of the next paragraph schema to the
חטאת where, again, asyndeton is prevalent. An asyndetic Xp clause places הבכום in the
clause-initial position after which a relative clause uses syntactic equivalence, העלה וה >/הבכום, to highlight where the החטאת is to be slaughtered, namely where the העלה is
also slaughtered before YHWH. The Px refrain הוא קדשים declares the החטאת to be
most holy. Verse 19, an asyndetic Xp clause placing אתה החטאת הכהן in the clause-initial
position, emphasises who is to eat before a second asyndetic Xp clause. In this second Xp
clause, קדשים בمكان is in the clause-initial position to accentuate that the priestly portions
of the החטאת are to be eaten in a holy place, namely in the court of the tent of meeting.91 So
far, the logic accentuates both where the החטאת is to be sacrificed, where it can be eaten,
and by whom - in a place and by a person in a state of holiness. Verses 20-21 then refocus
upon the contagious nature of holiness and the implications for anything used in the ritual
process, whether it be clothes worn in the blood rite (v20b) or vessels used to cook the
meat (v21). In v20, the asyndetic initial XP clause emphasises through the prominence of

91 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 402, seems to have a problem with the repeated verbal root אכל in its literal sense
in v9 and prefers 'enjoy' since 'it is clearly impossible for a single priest to consume the entire animal in a
single day'. As Watts, Leviticus 1–16, p. 406, points out, 'No biblical text requires that priestly prebends from
the most holy offerings be eaten on the same day except in the case of the filling offering (Exod. 29:32-34).'
Moreover, Hartley, Leviticus, p. 98, clarifies what is being claimed in v9. The claim is for the priest who
offered the החטאת to eat from it, but this does not exclude other priests. Hartley notes, 'Perhaps it is saying
that the officiating priest needs to eat a portion of each purification offering he has offered up on the altar.'
What is for certain, to change the meaning of אכל at this point would be to miss the repetition and argument
of the text.
Cranz helpfully articulates the basis of vv 20-21, 'Thus, it becomes apparent that objects, once they had been introduced into the sphere of holiness, had to remain there or had to be destroyed by misappropriation.' Clearly, what is holy must be kept within the holy. The sequential Xp + pragmatic XP refrain in v 22 highlights this principle ensuring there is no ambiguity while also giving freedom at the same time; any male from the priesthood may eat the חטאת because it is most holy. However, the paragraph schema then concludes in v 23 with a restriction, which is that any of the חטאת gifts whose blood is brought into the Holy Place for the purpose of making כפר must not be eaten. The final Xp clause places באש in the clause-initial position for the pragmatic function of highlighting the agency by which the blood must be destroyed.

The repetition of the thematic refrain in 7:1 shifts the focus to the אשם gift, which the immediate asyndetic Px clause declares as most holy (see also 6:10, 18, 22). Again, no ambiguity exists in the text about the status of the אשם and the schema seems to proceed as per the חטאת gift. The initial Xp clause in v 2 begins with אשר במקום highlighting where the אשם must be slaughtered. Once more, there is syntactical equivalence between the two yiqtol phrases, אשר במקום ישחטו אשר במקום ישחטו. There is only one place where the אשם can be slaughtered, which is where the שלח העלה is slaughtered. However, v 2b shifts the focus to 'its blood' by fronting דמי in a Xp clause to emphasise what is sprinkled, rather than the act of sprinkling upon the altar itself. Similarly, the Xp clause in v 3a fronts מלחולני אשם. To highlight this

---

92 There are questions as to why the pottery must be broken. Levine, Leviticus, p. 49, and Sklar, Leviticus, p. 131, suggest that the material is porous and thus is impossible to remove all the sacrifice from it. Thus, in case the same pot is used for a different kind of sacrifice or for a common purpose, care is taken to break it so that it cannot be used again.  
93 Cranz, Atonement and Purification, p. 115.
principle from v3a further, vv3b-4 then digress by specifying the fat parts that are to be offered and then caused to smoke (v5a).

There are two possible reasons for the digression in 7:3b-4. First, the hearer is familiar with the same emphases of blood sprinkling, the fat being removed, and caused to smoke from the narrated ritual processes in the הָעֶשֶׂתָה and חֲטָאת instructions (3:1-17; 4:1-35). However, the אָשֶׂם instructions were much more concise focusing upon the nature of the offence and how reparation is to be made materially before offering a gift for כְּפֶר and מַלָע. Thus, the text shows a concern for the instructions for slaughtering, the blood rites, and for the offering of all the fat, so that any ambiguity is removed about the אָשֶׂם process (cf. 5:14-26). Second, each set of offering instructions tend to be arranged to focus first on the part that is given to YHWH before turning to the issue of eating. The focus on the blood and the fat in vv2b-5 adheres to this principle since the blood rite and the offering of the fat is all about giving to God what belongs to him. There is order and hierarchy. The gift is given to God first.

The paragraph schema continues in 7:6a by repeating the logic from 6:22 nearly verbatim; the asyndetic Xp clause gives permission for every priest from the priesthood to eat the חֲטָאת, which is most holy. Verse 6b then shares pragmatic equivalence with v6a although now restricting the act of eating to a holy place. Again, the text stresses who and where the gift is to be eaten because the gift is to be declared most holy. The similarity with 6:19

94 See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 498. The explanation above is contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 498, who views the absence of the ritual process in 5:14-26 to be because the livestock offering was 'convertible into payment in silver'. Thus, the offerer brings the monetary payment to the priest to purchase an animal after which the priest then enacts the procedure. Thus, for Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 499, it is logical that the instructions for the laity focus on the monetary payment, while the instructions for the priest then narrate what is to happen with the purchased sacrificial animal.

95 There is enough similarity in syntax between 6:22 and 7:6 that points to equivalence. Both use the third person singular form יָאכֵל; however, where 6:22 uses the direct object + pronominal suffix את, an object suffix modifying אתה is used in 7:6a. We also note the difference in gender between the suffixes, but this is easily explained by the fact that there is a difference in the kind of offering being focused upon, the חֲטָאת being feminine and אָשֶׂם masculine. See also Rendtorff, Leviticus 1:1–10,10, p. 247, who notes similarly that 'v6 corresponds to 6:22' (my translation) and includes instruction about the eating of the prebend in a holy place from 6:19.
continues in 7:7 where the text affirms that what is true for the תִּשׁאֵת is also to be applied to the אָסְפָּה, which is that the priest who offers the gift is the one who eats. Although 7:7 does not mention the verb אָסְפָּה explicitly and refers more specifically to the priest who makes כָּפֵר, the concept is the same in that the offering is ‘for him’; that is, the offering belongs to the priest who makes כָּפֵר and thus is his to eat.\textsuperscript{*} Verse 8 and vv9-10 address the same issue but for the מֶנֶחָה and the עליה.\textsuperscript{**} So how the paragraph schema in 7:1-10 begins and ends focuses upon giving the right portions to those to whom the share belongs, while also accentuating that a gift declared holy can only be eaten by a people and in a place that is set apart by YHWH as holy.

The final thematic refrain in 7:11 begins a new paragraph schema focusing upon the מבא שלמים. The schema is shaped by three minor cases in vv12-15, vv16-17, and vv18-21, where each case is a step within the paragraph schema. The first protasis is an XP clause fronting鹩והו and so highlights the motivation of thanksgiving that prompts the offerer to bring, along with a thanksgiving sacrifice, loaves of unleavened bread mixed with oil (v12b), unleavened flatbread spread with oil (v12c), and semolina flour, well-soaked, mixed into loaves with oil (v12d).\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{*}} Verse 14 quickly narrates what the offerer is to do with the bread gifts described in vv12-13; he is to bring one from each gift as a contribution ‘to YHWH’ (זֹאת לְיִהוּד), which in turn is given to the priest who sprinkles the blood of

\textsuperscript{*} Please note that a contradiction is not present between v6a and v7. Verse 6a intends to give permission as a principle for the priesthood to eat from the אספה, while v7 identifies more specifically which priest a particular אספה belongs to for food. See also Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 401; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 411.

\textsuperscript{**} Again, vv9-10 is not inconsistent with 23:10, contrary to Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 411-412. Leviticus 23:10 is instruction to the sons of Israel to give the left-over ingredients to the priesthood, while 79:10 is more specific about who from Aaron and his sons receive the priestly share. See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 412. Levine, Leviticus, p. 41, views v9 and v10 as being two merisms where both verses are equivalent in meaning. Thus, for Levine, Leviticus, p. 41, the meaning is ‘that all types of grain offerings, part of which went to the priests, belonged to the various groups of officiants at these rites’.

\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{*}} NB. The rendering of v12d, סְמִילָה מַרְבַּכְתָה חַלֶּה בָּלָהּ בָּשׂפֶּן, is uncertain amongst scholars. Noth, Leviticus, p. 61, takes the general understanding ‘dough mixed into cake-form, but unbaked’, while Hartley, Leviticus, p. 99, offers the understanding, ‘bread of fine flour well-mixed with oil’. Yet v12d employs מַרְבַּכְתָה, which implies not unleavened, but rather leavened bread. Levine, Leviticus, p. 42, is probably more accurate rendering v12d as ‘cakes of choice flour with oil mixed in, well-soaked.’ Levine, Leviticus, p. 42, notes that the leavened loaves were not offered upon the altar.
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The Xp clause at the end of v14 highlights that the gift belongs to the priest who was active in the ritual process. Verse 15, however, shifts the focus to the eating of the meat by the familial community. There is no ambiguity. The initial Xp clause places הבשר יבש perishable meat before the yiqtol אוכל to gives prominence not only to the flesh of the sacrifice that must be eaten, but also that the flesh is to be consumed on the day of the gift. The following asyndetic clause then prohibits leftovers the next morning. The second minor protasis in v16 is a Px structure focusing upon a gift being either a vow or a voluntary sacrifice and is a contrast with v15. Verse 16 gives permission to eat the leftovers of a gift on the day it is offered after which v17 clarifies that the leftovers must be burned on the third day.

The third minor case in vv18-21 addresses the problem of eating the sacrifice's flesh against command. In v18, the emphatic הנסיך in the protasis accentuates the act of eating after which the apodosis conveys two prohibitions describing the consequence of breaking the command from v17. The first prohibits the one who offers the sacrifice from being accepted (ירצה), whilst the second states that the sacrifice will not be accredited to him. The consequence of leaving the meat unconsumed, whether by eating or by fire, is ritual failure. The asyndetic XP clause מוכתר declares why the sacrifice is unacceptable; the leftovers of the flesh are now offensive. While the offering fails to be accepted, the

---

99 The term התרמה is often translated as 'portion, contribution' as per Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 415. However, Levine, Leviticus, p. 43, notes that the term is more accurately understood 'levy, what is raised'. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 415, agrees with Levine's idea of the levy being akin to withholding taxes and thus translates התרמה as 'a withholding'. I have kept with the traditional translation 'contribution' to this point recognising that it is a gift that is offered to God, thus belonging to him, which in turn is for the provision of the priesthood (see also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 103; Sklar, Leviticus, p. 134).

100 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 418, notes that v15 must also include the bread given to the priests as well as the meat of the sacrifice. This might be true, but to conflate the bread gifts into the meat sacrifice, which is very careful not to do, is to miss the emphasis of the text's arrangement.

101 Levine, Leviticus, p. 45, notes that the thanksgiving offering symbolises the 'pure expression of gratitude to God'. The command to eat on the day of the sacrifice and not to leave any for the following day is significantly stricter than other cases of the שלמים. To defile what is given to YHWH as a 'pure expression of gratitude' would be the opposite of what the gift was intended for. Similarly, Sklar, Leviticus, pp. 134-135, notes, 'This stricter requirement implies that defiling this meat would be an even greater offence, suggesting again that praise fellowship offerings were the most sacred of the three.'
one who ate, and so offended against the prohibition, bears the iniquity of the act.\textsuperscript{103} However, v19a continues the paragraph schema with another prohibition against eating 'the flesh' that has touched something impure; it must be destroyed by fire. Verse 19b, however, is an atypical construction and Levine understands this to be an instance of 'anacoluthon, wherein the sentence starts out to say one thing and then abruptly switches to another.'\textsuperscript{104} On this basis, he recommends the rendering, 'and the flesh – any pure person may eat flesh.'\textsuperscript{105} This transitions the logic of the schema to vv20-21, which addresses two situations where the penalty is the consequence for profaning what is given to YHWH.\textsuperscript{106} The first situation in v20 is when someone who is impure eats from the flesh of the sacrifice 'for YHWH' (יהוה), whilst the second is where a person has been in contact

\begin{itemize}
\item Rendtorff, Leviticus 1,1–10,20, p. 252, notes that the 'exact meaning of the rare word cannot be ascertained' (my translation). However, examining both Isaiah 65:4 and Ezekiel 44:14, he observes that the concern is for the 'ritually forbidden or unclean', so at the very least the one who eats invites blame. Similarly, Levine, Leviticus, p. 44, observes that קָרֵת in Ezekiel 44:14 is 'in a more general sense as something forbidden', while the plural in Isaiah 65:4 'seems to designate flesh offered in idolatrous worship, regarded as abominable.' Using similar logic, Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 422, highlights that the use of קָרֵת in Leviticus 19:7-8 is in a context where meat is desecrated. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 417, argues against the rendering 'desecration' since the meat was in danger of desecration for two days and so prefers the understanding 'putrid'. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 100, who argues that יַעֲקֹב refers to meat that is spoiling and is rancid. In my translation above, I have chosen to accentuate the aspect of offensiveness rather than rancidness of meat spoiling.
\item The absence of detail about what specifically is the penalty leads Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 423, to suggest that when the phrase קָרֵת appears 'wherein man and not God is the subject, the crime is against God and is punishable only by God – lying outside the jurisdiction of the human court'. See also Hartley, Leviticus, p. 100. Levine, Leviticus, p. 44, notes that the penalty for the same offence in 19:5-8 is exile from the community.
\item Levine, Leviticus, p. 44.
\item Levine, Leviticus, p. 44.
\item There is contention as to whether the clause 'בָּא תָּכֹסֶר, הָמֵה הַכָּלָה הָדוֹר מִעָלָיו' implies exile physically, whether the penalty is to be enforced, and who the agents of justice are to be, divine or human? Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 418, makes the point that 'Legal interpretation requires resolving these questions, but rhetorical analysis does not. The threat is clearly dire and its ambiguous nature and enforcement makes it even more threatening.' Noth, Leviticus, p. 63, saw the meaning to be clear in that the penalty is to 'be excluded from the cultic community and punished by death.' Yet if death were part of the penalty, then the verbal root מָתַת would be used. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 424, takes the view 'that the person’s line will be terminated by God and, possibly, that he will be denied life in the hereafter'. The use of the niphal could be suggesting divine agency (as per Hartley, Leviticus, p. 100), but as Sklar, Leviticus, p. 136, notes, 'The karet penalty could be carried out by the Israelite community (Exod. 31:4; Num. 15:30-35) or directly by the Lord (Lev. 20:4-5).' I would suggest that at the very least the penalty accentuates the seriousness of the offence since it implies permanent exclusion from the covenant community and YHWH, irrespective of whether the penalty is death or exile. For this reason, heeding Watts’ argument, I have decided to leave מָתַת untranslated since it makes no difference to the conceptual basis of the penalty – permanent exclusion from YHWH’s presence in the midst of his covenant people.
\end{itemize}
with the impure and eats from the בזילם. The בזילם celebrates right relationship with God and so being in a state of impurity, ritual or otherwise, represents the opposite – disordered relationship. The penalty for deliberately profaning a celebration of right relationship is relational exile from the covenant community.

Viewing the paragraph schema for the בזילם instructions as a whole, there seems to be a progression in logic from eating in ordered relationship (vv12-17) to eating in various degrees of disorder and the consequences therein (vv18-21). Verses 12-15 and vv16-17 instruct and prohibit without giving penalty for offence, and moreover, the text expects obedience to command. The premise of v18 though is the possibility for the instruction particularly in vv16-17 to be broken. The fact that the offerer is not accepted as a consequence of the offence suggests the potential, at least, for disorder to enter the relationship between the offerer and YHWH, although the offerer may not be the offender. Furthermore, the offender who eats the meat bears his iniquity. Thus, the language of offence and penalty is explicit within vv18-21 whereas it is entirely absence in vv12-17. Verse 19 and v20 has a greater degree of disorder since the offence is a wilful partaking of the fellowship meal in a condition of impurity with the consequence of the כרת penalty. This progression from order to pre-empting greater degrees of disorder is fitting within the instruction for a fellowship offering expressing wholeness of relationship with YHWH.

1.5 The Argument and Rhetorical Strategy of 6:1–7:21

As the text progresses through each kind of gift in 6:1–7:21, the argument of each ritual instruction focuses upon what is given to YHWH and, if there is a priestly portion, that the holy must be confined to the holy. The exception is the בזילם instructions in 7:11-21, which first addresses the giving of the priestly share (vv12-15) before how the community is to eat the fellowship sacrifice (vv16-21). Also, there is a general movement within each kind of offering from bringing to YHWH what belongs to him to how the priests are to eat what is holy.
There are two further points of progression within the argument of 6:1–7:21 that is part of the text's rhetorical strategy. First, there is a movement from the whole gift being given to YHWH (6:2-6, 6:12-16), to a part of it being given to the priests to eat (6:9-11, 6:17-23, 7:1-10), to then the inclusion of the community in the eating of the gift (7:11-21). Second, there is a progression from command and prohibition reflecting relational wholeness to acknowledging the potential for ritual failure where the consequences are non-acceptance and the כרת penalty. The repetition of similar schematic movements within each gift cycle, as well as the general movement of the whole, contribute to the rhetorical strategy of the text. The argument within 6:1–7:21 suggests that the intent is both to persuade and dissuade. Once more the text has two audiences, one direct (the priesthood) and the other indirect (Israel). For the active audience, the intent is to motivate the priesthood to offer to YHWH what wholly belongs to him, while constraining the holy to the holy by eating what is given to them in a place that is holy. For the indirect audience, the effect in the Israelite community is to know that what is holy is distinctive and is sacred. Thus, by first hearing that ritual order confines the holy to the holy and then second how ritual disorder is caused by impurity profaning what is offered to YHWH, the Israelite community is dissuaded from allowing impurity to profane what is offered to YHWH, otherwise non-acceptance will ensue.

1.6 The Arrangement and Argument of Leviticus 7:22-36

As observed above, the concluding emphasis in 6:1–7:21 is the penalty for ritual failure when the impure comes into contact with the שלמים שלםו offered to YHWH. There is no ambiguity. This uncompromising stance continues into 7:22-36 where the divine speech is addressed directly to the sons of Israel. There are four paragraphs within the episodic schema, 7:23α-25, 7:26-27, 7:28-34, and 7:35-36.

See also Marx, 'Theology of the Sacrifice', p. 197.
The first paragraph schema in vv23α-25 begins with an XP clause fronting כל חלב (v23αβ) in the clause-initial position and so topicalises the paragraph. The prominence of כל חלב at the beginning also accentuates what specifically is prohibited from being eaten, namely all the fat from the ox, sheep, and goat. The next clause in the schema, however, is an XP clause fronting של חלבแปลח שרשמה to highlight what can be used for any other purpose, but which shall not be eaten. The prohibition in v24c is an unusual construction, לא אוכל תאכלה, where at the very least the repetition of אוכל intensifies the prohibition against eating what the Israelites have been given for any other use, which is the fat of carcasses found dead or torn apart by wild animals. The paragraph schema then concludes in v25 with the justification for why generally no one should eat the fat. Verse 25a, another XP clause, highlights מהגלל חלב לפני הבנים before the relative clause clarifies that the fat, which was eaten, is from an animal that should be offered (yiqtol) as a food offering to YHWH. The second clause (Px) begins with the וכרתה suggesting that, in the succession of events, the כרת penalty is the consequence of a person having eaten the fat, which should have been offered to YHWH.

The second paragraph in vv26-27 also begins with an XP clause topicalising the schema to focus upon כל דם, reflecting both the syntactic and pragmatic structures in v23αβ. Once more, this first clause prohibits eating what belongs to YHWH, namely 'all the blood'. However, the additional prepositional phrase clarifies that this prohibition applies to all Israelite dwelling-places and also encompasses the blood of both birds and livestock. Thus, there is no part of the Israelite community where blood can be consumed. The progression of the paragraph schema is paused however by an initial asyndetic XP clause highlighting כל נפש who eats any blood and so who then bears the כרת penalty. The reason perhaps for the clause-initial prominence in v27a is to highlight that the penalty

---

108 See also Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 420.
109 Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, pp. 428-429 makes the distinction between sacrificial and non-sacrificial meat in vv23-27 and, in making this distinction, he misses the intensification of the text. Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 420, notes, 'This verse, however, intensifies the rhetoric by expanding the geographic scope of its provision with a phrase that echoes the prohibition at the end of chap. 3, "all your residences"'.
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encompasses ‘anyone’, that is, both the Israelite and the resident foreigner. Thus, the first two paragraphs in the episodic schema prohibit fat and blood, the two parts of the ritual process that belong wholly to YHWH, from being eaten.

There is, however, a topic shift in v29αβ to anyone who offers a בות שלמים to YHWH and so initiating the paragraph schema in vv29αβ-34. This first XP asyndetic clause is followed by a second asyndetic clause (Px) where the offerer brings his gift ‘to YHWH’ from his בות שלמים. Both asyndetic clauses in v29 repeat the motion of bringing a בות שלמים (ליהוה). A third asyndetic clause in v30αα places ידיו in the clause-initial position before repeating the verbal ideaבוא. This accentuates the agency of the offerer by attributing the act of bringing the food offering ‘for YHWH’ (איש יהוה) to ‘his hands’, which heightens the offerer’s responsibility. The fourth asyndetic clause (v30αβ), also an Xp structure, then separates the two direct objects with the main verb,アイירהו על החזה את החלב, to give an Xpx structure. By doing so, the text separates the fat upon the breast from the breast itself. The reason for this distinction is that only the breast is brought for the purpose of waving (inf. const. להניף) as a wave offering ‘before YHWH’ (לפני יהוה). Thus, the four asyndetic clauses in vv29-30 stress the movement towards YHWH with a gift from השלמים with the goal of bringing the wave offering also before YHWH.

After the four asyndetic clauses in vv29-30, the text returns briefly in v31 to two consecutive Px clauses, each beginning with a waqatal. The first narrates the priestly action of causing the fat from v30αβ to smoke, while the second states that the breast belongs to Aaron and his sons (לאפרים ולבני אהרן). Verse 32 continues the logic, although an Xp clause, placing יאדו שמי יהי in the clause-initial position to highlight the responsibility of the

110. Contrary to Watts, Leviticus 1–10, pp. 421-422, who seems to think that the repetition of החזה is confusing and a result of redaction. Yet if we see that the text is purposefully making a distinction between the fat and the חזה, then the logic focuses upon what is raised up before YHWH. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 431, seems to make the distinction between the fat of the breast and the breast part itself that is to be elevated before God.

111. Please note that I have chosen to use the traditional rendering ‘wave’ and ‘wave offering’. Milgrom, followed by Watts, suggests ‘elevate’ and ‘raise’ to render the verbal root נוף. See Levine, Leviticus, p. 46; Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, p. 431; Watts, Leviticus 1–10, p. 423.
offerer to give the right thigh as a contribution to the priest who offered the פלטスキים. The paragraph schema then concludes in vv33-34 by expounding upon, and thus clarifying, the instruction from v32. The participle phrase in the clause-initial position in v33 leaves no ambiguity about who among the sons of Aaron can claim the contribution of the right thigh; namely, the one who offers the blood and the fat, the parts that belong to YHWH. Verse 34 then summarises the logic of 7:29a-33 by giving the reason for why the breast and the right thigh of the wave offerings (v30, v32) are to be given to the priests. What is striking is the sudden use of first person verbs that reminds the Israelites that the words Moses is mediating have their origin in YHWH. Moreover, the sudden use of the first person heightens the necessity for obedience since it is YHWH who has taken from the sons of Israel the breast and right thigh from the שלמים and, in taking from the sons of Israel, it is YHWH who has given the two parts to Aaron and his sons for an everlasting statute. The repetition of מאת בני ישראל (v33, v34) together with the lamed prefixed to Aaron and his sons in לאהרן בניו stresses that God has intended to take from the sons of Israel and give to Aaron and his sons.

The final paragraph, vv35-36, consolidates the episodic schema in 7:22-36, whilst also introducing the point of sequential connection to Leviticus 8. The initial cataphoric demonstrative in v35 refers back to the priestly contributions that are from the food offerings of YHWH and so consolidates the logic from the previous paragraph at least. The relative clause in v36 then modifies v35 explaining that this instruction is as YHWH commanded on the day the priests were anointed, which is a deliberate preview of the theme in Leviticus 8.

---

112. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, p. 432, observes that the use of the first person in לאהרן בניו הם שלמים מאת מאת את בני ישראל is an example of an ancient Near Eastern practice where the ‘king assigns a prebend to a loyal servant.’ Thus, the use of the first person is not unexpected if we know what is germane to the ancient Near East. The only question might be why the first person is not used more often throughout Leviticus 6–7 if this is the case. See also Watts, *Leviticus 1–10*, p. 424.
1.7 The Rhetorical Strategy of 7:22-36

There are two particular characteristics of the episodic schema in 7:22-36 that seem to be part of the text’s rhetorical strategy. The first is the distinct use of asyndetic clauses particularly where the text is trying to avoid ambiguity, such as in v27 and vv29-30. The second characteristic is the schematic progression from what the Israelites are prohibited from eating (i.e. the fat and blood belonging to YHWH) to a focus upon what God has given as a contribution belonging to the priesthood. This is a significant part of the rhetorical strategy of the episode since it deliberately moves from what is prohibited, and so also the consequence of doing what is prohibited, to a positive emphasis at the conclusion to instructing about the priestly contribution from YHWH’s food gift. This is evident by the first two paragraphs in vv23-27 introducing the penalty, whereas this language is missing entirely in vv28-36. This positive and yet unambiguous ending of the schema allows for the conclusion summary in vv35-36 to consolidate the whole while also providing a preview, and thus the sequential connection, to the priestly ordination event in Leviticus 8. The effect of this rhetorical strategy is explored in the next section below.

1.8 The Rhetorical Strategy and Persuasive Intent of Leviticus 1–7

From the beginning of Leviticus 1–7, the hearer becomes involved in the ritual world of the Israelite community, witnessing the instruction for how Israel is to approach and the priests are to serve YHWH in ordered relationship. Conversely, the hearer also witnesses YHWH’s instructions concerning the ritual consequences in situations of relational disorder between YHWH and his covenant community. Until the final episode, there is a progression from relational order to disorder. The first embedded episode describes a series of three offerings where the offerer simply draws near to YHWH with a food offering for him (Lev. 1–3); the fact that the offerer approaches with a gift and the text moves towards acceptance of the gift without a hint of ritual failure suggests that the offering of these three gifts exemplifies relational order between the offerer and YHWH. Each of the
three gifts of the עלם, מנחה, ושלמים is a reminder to the Israelite community that acceptance in the presence of YHWH requires a life of integrity (Lev. 1), covenant allegiance (Lev. 2), and where what belongs to God is given to him (Lev. 3). What happens though when offence endangers relational order? Leviticus 4–5, the second embedded episode, then addresses the responsibility of the Israelite community, whether it be an individual or the collective, to overcome offence so that relational order is restored by the culpable bringing the penalty of the offence so that כפר can be made on the offender's behalf. Each case within Leviticus 4–5 begins with disorder and ends with restoration where the offender has been forgiven.

The third embedded episode in Leviticus 6:1–7:21 does not allow for ambiguity and also moves from relational order to the potential for disorder. This instruction addressed to the priesthood has a concern for the Aaronic priesthood who serve the holy to then consume the holy in a holy place. The belief being communicated is that the holy must be constrained to the holy. As the logic progresses from the kinds of gifts where the whole is given to YHWH, the priests (and indirectly the Israelite community) are to ensure that what wholly belongs to God is offered to him, while what has been given to the priesthood is to be consumed in a holy place. Since there is no hint of relational disorder, the instructions in 6:1–7:17 exemplify relational order between the priesthood and YHWH. However, the final offering instruction for השלמים in 7:18-21 is distinctive not only for the reason that the community shares the food offering, but the logic of the instruction entertains the possibility that an Israelite may allow impurity to profane what has been offered to YHWH. The fact that there is a penalty for the offences described suggests the text is pre-empting future instances of relational disorder. In each instance of offence, there is no opportunity given for the offender to offer to YHWH a penalty; the offender who profanes what is holy bears the consequence of non-acceptance or the כפר penalty. Thus, the movement in 6:1–7:21 is once more from relational order to situations of relational disorder.
This progression, however, is inverted in the final embedded episode in 7:22-36. The first part in 7:22-27 begins with the prohibition against eating what belongs to YHWH with the penalty of exile for an offender who eats of the fat or the blood. The act of eating what belongs to YHWH is a cause of relational disorder where the offender once more bears the penalty. However, the arrangement of Leviticus 1–7 does not conclude with relational disorder, but how Israel is to relate in ordered relationship with both YHWH and the priesthood who serves him. Ordered relationship is through offering to YHWH the priestly share that God has given from Israel's sacrifice. The reason for the inverted order is so that the concluding note of the rhetorical unit previews the event to be narrated in the next unit within the book's arrangement, the setting apart of the priesthood by YHWH in Leviticus 8.

The progression of the argument within Leviticus 1–7 from relational order in approaching Israel's covenant God to how relational disorder is to be overcome so that order is restored is part of the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 1–7 as a whole. The fact that the episode ends in relational order also reminds the hearer of the goal of the book. If YHWH is to dwell among the people and not abhor them, then their acceptance is conditional upon relational order, while disorder will lead to their death and to national exile. Thus, the persuasive intent of Leviticus 1–7 in the Israel at Sinai situation is to shape the Israelite community into a people that are accepted in the presence of YHWH by giving to him what belongs to him and by confining the holy to what is holy. It is by this means that Israel learns to sanctify the God who is in her midst and for God to be glorified before his people (10:3, 22:33b).

2. The Rhetorical Strategy and Persuasive Intent of Leviticus 27

Leviticus 27 as the final episode within Leviticus' global schema is consistent with the beginning of the book. Both the beginning and end focus upon giving to YHWH what belongs to him. However, an analysis of the arrangement, argument, strategy, and intent of Leviticus 27 suggests a significant development of this idea, which is reflective of the
thematic development of the whole book. This progression makes Leviticus 27 a fitting conclusion to the global schema.

2.1 Four Observations of the Arrangement and Argument of Leviticus 27

As observed briefly in Chapters Two and Four, the episodic schema has five paragraphs (vv2b-13, vv14-25, vv26-27, vv28-29, vv30-33) and each paragraph focuses either upon an act of giving to YHWH (vv2b-25) or honouring what belongs to him (vv26-33). This can be established by exploring four major observations about the speech's argument within its arrangement.

The first observation is that the first two paragraph schemas in vv2b-13 and vv14-25 are initiated by two XP structures, which both initiate and topicalise each paragraph. The first XP(x) clause in v2b(x), introduces the topic where a man makes an extraordinary vow, after which the prepositional phrase Lýוהנפשתבערךך clarifies that the vow is made in the valuation of persons to YHWH. Thus, a financial equivalent, rather than the persons, is given to YHWH. The rest of the schema unfolds through a series of Px clauses, which are either initiated by a היה temporal clause (v3) or are minor cases (v4, v5, v6, v7, v8), which modify the major case in v2b(x). The first Px clause in v3 presents the situation where the valuation is for a male between 20-60 years, while the second Px clause defines the valuation as fifty shekels of silver in the 'shekel of the holy'. The paragraph schema then progresses through a series of minor cases in vv4-8 where the valuation of persons depends upon whether they are female (v4), the age of the person

---

10 Please note the lengthy debate about how to understand the phrase נפשתлибоיחם. Albertz observes that the piel of פלא appears to be the normal expression for the fulfilment of a vow in the Holiness Code and the Priestly Code, such as in Leviticus 22:21 and Numbers 15:3 (R. Albertz, 'ᾠδε ρήμα' ni. to be wondrous' in TLOT, ed. E. Jenni and C. Westermann, vol. 2, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997, p. 981). Furthermore, as Conrad highlights, the hiphil of פלא is mostly used in contexts either pleading for or describing God's delivering activity (Pss. 17:7, 31:22; Joel 2:26), which does not fit the semantic context of פלא in the instance of Leviticus 27:2β (J. Conrad, 'ᾠδε ρήμα', TDOT, ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H. J. Fabry, vol. XI, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2001, pp. 538-539). Thus, rendering נפשתлибоיחם as 'fulfil a vow' is sensible, especially since the rest of the protasis conveys the notion that the vow is honoured in the valuation of persons to YHWH (בצערדדופשת).
(vv5-7), or if the person who makes the vow is poor (v8)." Although v9 also begins with the minor case marker אָשָׁה, the XP structure pauses the information flow and shifts the topic to livestock. Although this may suggest a new paragraph schema, there is still continuity with this minor case still modifying the major case in v2b. Thus, while there is a change in object from persons (vv2aβ-8) to livestock (vv9-13), the internal coherence of the first major case, and thus the paragraph schema, rests upon the topic of the extraordinary vow, rather than the object of the vow i.e. whether it is persons or livestock.

The second XP clause with a major case marker in v14a אֲשֶׁר כִּי קְדַשֶׁת יִשְׂרָאֵל topicalises the second paragraph schema to focus upon situations where a man consecrates objects of his possession to YHWH. While vv14-15 focus specifically on the situation of a house being the object of the act of consecration, the XP structure with the minor case marker beginning v16 shifts the object that is consecrated to a field of a man's possession. Again, although there is a change in the object of קְדַשֶׁת at v16a, the overarching case כיִשָּׁה יִשְׂרָאֵל lends coherence to vv14-25 as a whole. Furthermore, each minor case, whether it involves a house (v15) or a field (v16, v17, v18, v19, v20, v21, v22), explains how to redeem what is consecrated or focuses upon an act of setting apart to YHWH. In each instance, with the exception of v15, which is dependent upon the major case in v14, the minor cases use the verb קְדַשׁ and thus sustain the focus within the entire paragraph upon what a man consecrates to YHWH.

The second observation is that the first paragraph, vv2aβ-13, emphasises what is willingly given to YHWH's possession. The logic in the first major case in vv2aβ-13 focuses initially upon fulfilling a vow where the object is a human and the vow is fulfilled in the form of financial compensation (vv2aβ-8). The list of minor cases in vv3-8 is simply a list of valuations that vary according to age, gender, and social status, but the purpose of the

---

Please refer to Milgrom, *Leviticus 23–27*, pp. 2370-2373, for an overview of the different arguments and for his own view that the prices are set according to the value of productivity. For an alternate view, refer to G. J. Wenham, 'Leviticus 27:2-8 and the Price of Slaves', *ZAW* 90 (1978), pp. 254-265.
valuations is not explicitly expressed. The only phrase explaining the purpose of the valuations defined in vv3-8 is the protasis in v2aβ. The last phrase of the protasis in v2aβ conveys that the vow is honoured in the valuation of persons ‘to YHWH’. When the case changes object from humans to livestock in v9, every part accentuates the notion that what is vowed belongs to YHWH. First, the use of with the phrase וַיִּקְרֵב־לִיהוָה כָּרֶב recalls the ‘forward moving prescriptiveness’ of the sacrificing. Second, מִמָּה is qualified with וַיִּקְרֵב לִיהוָה כָּרֶב conveying that the purpose of drawing near with one from the livestock is to offer the animal as a gift to YHWH. Thus, the very intent of the one who makes the vow is to surrender the livestock from his possession to YHWH. Third, the phrase וַיִּקְרֵב לִיהוָה כָּרֶב then acts to qualify accentuating that all, which is given from the offering (מסנה) to YHWH, is holy. The repetition of לִיהוָה כָּרֶב with the phrase כָּרֶב יִהְיֶה כָּדֶשֶׁש stresses that the whole belongs to YHWH once given as a gift. If the person who fulfils the vow attempts to make an exchange, then v10 instructs that both the original animal and its substitute is כָּדֶש. Once given to YHWH, it belongs to YHWH. For this reason, there is no provision for redeeming or offering financial restitution for the livestock that have been surrendered to YHWH’s ownership.\(^9\)

The third observation is that the use of the restrictive adverb וי, together with the XP structures beginning v26 and v28, function in a similar way to previously in v2aβ and v14. Past approaches tend to acknowledge the structuring function of the first restrictive adverb in v26, but do not attach the same value to v28.\(^10\) We have also

---

\(^9\) Knierim, *Text and Concept*, pp. 36, 52.

\(^10\) See also Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, p. 442. This point is inferred by Kiuchi, *Leviticus*, p. 497, but he emphasises ‘that the point is that the Lord is not concerned about the offerer’s decision rather than the quality of the animal; once it is offered to the Lord, it must not be tampered with by the human will’. Yet, the concern of vv9-11 seems to be less about whether the animal is pure, impure, good or bad, but rather that whatever kind of animal it is, the offerer then honours the vow made by either surrendering the animal to YHWH or, in the case of an impure animal, redeeming the livestock by financial reparation.

\(^11\) For example, Hartley, *Leviticus*, p. 480, subsumes vv28-33 under the same heading as per vv26-27, ‘Restriction on objects that may be vowed’, which suggests that he does not view the second וי as having a text-structuring function except to introduce a new case aimed to restrict what is devoted to God. Similarly, Sklar, *Leviticus*, p. 339, folds vv28-33 into the same heading as vv26-27 for thematic reasons, which is that ‘Verses 26-33 deal with involuntary offerings that cannot be dedicated to the Lord because they are already
established that the internal coherence of the first two sections in vv2aβ-13 and vv14-24 rests upon a particular act of giving to YHWH where what is given belongs to him. It is, therefore, worth exploring whether each paragraph beginning with אך + an XP structure in v26 and v28 also sustains a focus on a particular act of giving to YHWH.

The first restrictive adverb אך in v26 assumes a logical relationship to the previous section. While vv14-24 focuses upon the act of setting apart (קדש) to YHWH, v26aα is an X[Px]P structure topicalising the paragraph schema and which prohibits the firstborn being consecrated (לא-יקדיש). The relative clause (Px) interrupting the XP structure clarifies that the firstborn (בנו) is dedicated to YHWH from the livestock. The reason then for the relative clause separating the XP structure is to highlight that the firstborn is dedicated to YHWH and so supplies the reason for the prohibition; what has been dedicated as a firstborn to YHWH is YHWH’s possession and so cannot be set apart to him. The following asyndetic Px clause in 26aβ affirms that if it is an ox or a sheep then it belongs to YHWH (ליהוה הוא). The minor case in v27a, an Xp structure placing the prepositional phrase בבהמה in the clause-initial position, modifies v26 to focus upon the situation where the livestock is impure.118 Verse 27b clarifies that only in this instance is there a provision for ransoming the dedicated livestock (or redemption; פדה and גאל).

The second restrictive adverb אך in v28a introduces a similar construction to v26. Verse 28a is also an X[Px]P structure where the relative clause clarifies the fronted constituent כל-חרם; a man has devoted (יחרד) to YHWH from all that belongs to him from אדם, livestock, and from the fields of his possession. The following two prohibitions, ולא ימכר ולא יgal, then restrict the selling and redeeming of what a man has devoted to YHWH. Verse 28 then concludes with two asyndetic XP clauses. The first declares the reason for the

his (firstborn, tithes), and with people or objects that are dedicated to him but cannot be redeemed (all devoted objects). Alternatively, Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, p. 2393, recognises that the ‘particle of exclusion clearly refers to the prior case of the impure firstling’, but does not assign a structural function to the adverb. 118 The restrictive adverb in v26aβ introduces the governing principle for vv26-27 after which אך then prefaces two minor cases in vv26aβ-27. The אך marker is, therefore, acting identically in vv26aβ-27 as per vv2aβ-25 where אך was used to introduce the minor cases that clarify the situation of the major cases (v2aβ, v14a).
prohibitions against selling and redeeming what is קרבן; all that is קרבן is most holy. The final XP clause then declares YHWH’s ownership of all that is devoted. Thus, v28 emphasises the point that all, which is devoted to YHWH, belongs to him. Although v29 is an asyndetic XP clause, using a similar syntactic structure to v28a, it has not broken the paragraph schema since the topic is being restated. However, the prohibition is only pertaining to humans (מן-האדם) and the predicate prohibits ransoming (יפדה) a human who has been devoted. The asyndetic Px execution formula יומת pauses the information flow to draw attention to what must happen - he shall surely die.” Thus, the argument in vv28-29 centres upon the idea that everything devoted to YHWH from a man’s possession belongs to God. Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that both paragraphs beginning with the restrictive adverb אך + an XP structure sustain a focus upon what belongs to YHWH and so is unable to be consecrated, ransomed, or redeemed. The implied intent is to motivate the honouring of what belongs to YHWH.

The fourth observation then is that the initial topicalising XP clause in v30a is sequentially connected to vv28-29, although there is no longer a focus upon an act of giving to YHWH. Verse 30a retains attention upon כל, as per כל-קרבן in v28a and v29a, but shifts the topic to הארץ. Moreover, it is a copulative XP clause that highlights all the tithes of the land belonging to YHWH. The final XP clause declares the status of the tithes as holy to YHWH. Thus, rather than the focus being centred upon a particular act of giving to YHWH, the last emphasis in the speech is upon all that belongs to YHWH. In contrast to the קרבן instructions, v31 makes provision for part of the tithe of the land to be redeemed, which is conditional upon a fifth being added to it. However, v31 is the only provision for redemption within vv28-33 and not the whole of the tithe can be redeemed. Verses 32-33 return to the notion that the tithe is holy to YHWH (יהיה-קדש). The prohibition against deciding whether the tithed animals are good or bad, as well as preventing the

---

farmer from exchanging what has been tithed, acts to accentuate that a tithe belongs solely to YHWH.

Therefore, the instruction about the tithes as the last concern of the speech makes explicit what has been implied from the beginning of the episodic schema, which is the imperative to give to YHWH all that belongs to him.

Thus, in light of the above reasoning, the divine speech in Leviticus 27 coheres around the theme of giving to YHWH what belongs to him, whether given willingly or is his possession naturally. In turn, YHWH makes provision for restoring property, which has been set apart to him. In a sense, Douglas rightly observes that God does submit himself to the Jubilee laws, but in doing so, God is exemplifying what he desires from his people, which is honouring all that belongs to him.

2.2 The Rhetorical Strategy and Persuasive Intent of Leviticus 27

There are three characteristics of the schema's arrangement that contribute to the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus 27. The first is the progression of the text through sequential-connectedness. The connection between the first paragraph and the second is that each coheres around a particular act of giving to YHWH, whether it be through an extraordinary vow (vv2b-13, vv14-25) or an act of setting apart (קדש). The third paragraph beginning in v26 connects with vv14-25 by restricting the dedicated firstborn from being consecrated (קדש). A second restrictive frame in v28 then mirrors both the pragmatic and syntactic structures of the first in v26, although shifting the topic from the dedicated firstborn to what has been devoted as חרב. This second restrictive frame, however, introduces a new element, which is the placing of כל in the clause-initial position and so highlighting the whole of what has been devoted as חרב. This focus is prominent with the repetition of the clause כל in v29a. The prominence of כל,

---

120 The implication of this argument is that vv28-33 finds conceptual unity within its arrangement, rather than being a loose collection of instructions. Contrary to Elliger, *Leviticus*, p. 385; Noth, *Leviticus*, p. 207. Also, Gerstenberger, *Leviticus*, p. 446, who assigns vv28-33 as an addendum since the central idea of vv2a-33 is ‘completely absent’.

121 Douglas, *Leviticus as Literature*, pp. 242, 244.
especially as the fronted constituent, is then the point of sequential connection between vv28-29 and vv30-33. This progression of the episodic schema allows for the thematic progression from what is willingly given to YHWH, to restrictions about what belongs to YHWH, and then to what, namely the tithes of the land, wholly belongs to him. This leads to the second characteristic, which is that the sequential connectedness allows for the placing of vv30-33 as the final phase of logic within the schema. Thus, the schema culminating in an emphasis upon that which wholly belongs to YHWH and which is holy to YHWH is part of the text’s rhetorical strategy.

The third characteristic is that each paragraph addresses how either what is vowed, set apart, dedicated, devoted, or which belongs to YHWH, must be completed without substitution, redemption, or ransom. For instance, in the first paragraph of the extraordinary vow of persons, the financial valuation is already exchanging what has been vowed with a financial contribution and so logically there is no provision for redemption in vv2bβ-8. However, there is a concern in v10 for the livestock, which is the object of the vow to be honoured without exchange or substitution. In the instance the livestock is impure, then the vow still must be completed in a financial contribution (v11). Also, there is provision in v15 for an owner who wishes to redeem even the pure livestock. Similarly, in the concluding paragraph, the logic of the schema addresses a provision for redemption (v31), how the tithe is to be completed (v32), and a concern that the tithe is not substituted (v33). Thus, the logic of Leviticus 27’s argument is consistent from beginning to end; what is given or belongs to YHWH must be honoured and respected.

If the argument of the whole accentuates that what is given or what belongs to YHWH must be honoured, then this too is the intent of the schema. However, the repeated concern that what is given or belongs to YHWH is honoured with integrity suggests a concern for actions representative of relational order. Thus, the intent is to motivate Israel at Sinai to give to YHWH what belongs to him in a manner representative of relational order. If the thematic referent in Leviticus 1–16 is that YHWH is to be sanctified by those
who are near him and glorified before the people (10:3), which is then extended in Leviticus 17–26 by demonstrating how YHWH is to be sanctified in the midst of the people of the land, then Leviticus 27 culminates this progression by accentuating how Israel, as a sanctified people, is to give YHWH what belongs to him. By honouring what is given to YHWH and all that belongs to him, they act to sanctify the God who is in their midst.

3. Conclusion

The aim of this chapter is to demonstrate how the rhetorical strategy of the text's arrangement and persuasive intent can be derived at every level of the text's macrostructure and in this case focusing particularly on Leviticus 1–7 and Leviticus 27. The reason why these chapters were selected is that they represent the two episodes beginning and culminating Leviticus' global schema. The analysis demonstrates a similar emphasis at the beginning and end of Leviticus, although each episode is also distinctive. Leviticus 1–7 accentuates giving to YHWH what belongs to him and does so in the context of what it means to approach YHWH in relational order or when relational order needs to be restored. However, since Leviticus 27 is the final episode, it is also to be understood in light of the whole. Leviticus 27 accentuates that how YHWH’s sanctified nation can ensure that YHWH is sanctified in their midst is by giving to YHWH what belongs to him. Thus, by exploring the shaping of the Leviticus’ arrangement at both the episodic and paragraph levels, it is possible to access the rhetorical strategy and the persuasive intent within both ritual and legal texts, and thus demonstrating the plausibility that both kinds of texts within Leviticus have a persuasive intent.
As YHWH's glory fills the tabernacle at the conclusion of the book of Exodus, an already existing tension intensifies; how will YHWH live in the midst of his covenant people who have displayed a propensity to break faith with him and for YHWH not to consume them? The separation between Moses and YHWH, as Moses is left standing outside of the tabernacle unable to enter, heightens this tension. If Moses cannot approach, how will Israel, and there be life and not death? As YHWH calls to Moses from the tent of meeting at the beginning of the book of Leviticus, the following communication events address the problem of this exigency and thus the book of Leviticus functions between Exodus and Numbers to enable YHWH to dwell among his covenant people whilst not abhorring them (Lev. 26:11-12). This study explored the persuasive intent and rhetorical strategy of Leviticus with the goal of identifying how the book of Leviticus addresses this exigency of the persuasive situation described above. This goal is the fourth step in this study's rhetorical-critical framework and will be attended to below. So far, by working through steps 1-3 of the rhetorical-critical framework, I have argued that the persuasive intent within the Israel at Sinai context is to form and shape Israel into a covenant community who ensures that YHWH is sanctified and glorified in their midst (10:3, 22:32b). How the text achieves this intent is the means by which Leviticus meets the exigency of the situation.

By addressing the second step of the rhetorical-critical framework, which is a delimitation of Leviticus' arrangement, this study argued that the global schema of Leviticus' arrangement is made up of fifteen episodes (Lev. 1–7, 8–10, 11, 12, 13–14, 15, 16, 17–21, 22:1-16, 22:17-33, 23:1-44, 24:1-9, 24:10-23, 25–26, 27). Each episode represents a 'part' in Leviticus' arrangement and each part is arranged in relation to the other by being sequentially connected; that is, each represents a step in instructing both Israel and the
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priesthood about how YHWH is to be sanctified by those who approach him and glorified among the people. Chapters Three and Four applied the third step of the adopted rhetorical-critical framework, which focused upon examining the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus' arrangement. As noted above, the goal of this study is not only to suggest the persuasive intent of Leviticus, but to determine how that intent addresses the exigency of the persuasive situation, which is the fourth and final step of the rhetorical-critical framework. In the following, I will synthesise how each part of Leviticus' arrangement relates to the whole and, in doing so, attend to this final step of how the persuasive intent of each part of the sequentially connected arrangements meets the exigency of the persuasive situation.

Leviticus 1–7 establishes how the Israelite community is to approach him in relational order and, when that order is threatened by offence, to approach so that כָּפֵר can be made for restoration of that relationship (Lev. 1–5, 7:22-36). The priesthood is also instructed about the need to confine the holy to the holy as the means by which the priesthood serve YHWH in relational order as they offer Israel's food gifts to YHWH (6:1-7:21). The episode concludes with a preview of the priestly ordination (7:35-36), which is the event beginning the next schema in Leviticus 8–10. Whilst Leviticus 1–7 instructs about how the Israelites and the priesthood can approach YHWH in relational order, and thus immediately addressing one consequence of the exigence of the persuasive situation, Leviticus 8–10 inaugurates YHWH's cultic provision for his presence to reside amongst his people. In doing so, Leviticus 8–10 juxtaposes YHWH being sanctified by the priesthood by their obedience with YHWH ensuring that he is both sanctified and glorified when there is priestly failure. The consequence when YHWH is sanctified by the priesthood is that the people's lives are preserved with a visible display of YHWH's glory; the gifts are consumed and the people live. The consequence though when YHWH sanctifies himself is death. The articulation of the principle in 10:3, 'By those who approach me I will be sanctified and before all the people I will be glorified' functions as an explanation of Leviticus 8–10 and
also encompasses the instructions in Leviticus 1–7. This juxtaposition leading to 10:3 prompts a further clarification of the priestly role, which is to distinguish between the holy and common and between the impure and pure, as well as teaching the Israelites all that YHWH has commanded. By this two-fold role, the priesthood ensures YHWH is sanctified in their midst.

Following from Leviticus 8–10, Leviticus 11 then teaches the distinction between the pure and the impure in the domain of food. What is permissible to eat is declared pure and has the association with being complete and whole. What Israel is not to eat and thus is to be declared either impure or detestable has associations with incompleteness and rebellion. The episode culminates with exhortation that Israel is to be set apart by being in a condition of purity (i.e. wholeness) and by disassociating themselves from rebellion. In teaching this distinction and how it relates to the state of being holy, Israel also learns the consequence of impurity, which is exclusion from God's presence. Leviticus 13–14 extends this notion of impurity from Leviticus 11 to encompass the association with corruption and so accentuates the nature of impurity as being contagious. Once more, the intent is to motivate Israel to separate themselves from contagion. Leviticus 12 and 15 each follow Leviticus 11 and 13–14 to reinforce the nature of impurity as being contagious and its consequences. Whilst in the domain of childbirth, Leviticus 12 accentuates that the consequence of being in an impure condition is exclusion from the holy and thus from approaching YHWH's presence. Yet this exclusion is not permanent since there is opportunity to seek restoration to the holy by כפר being made on her behalf. Leviticus 15 extends this further to warn Israel and the priesthood about failing to separate Israel from the nation's impurity, which is permanent exclusion from YHWH's presence. The reason for this consequence is established in the conceptual basis of Leviticus 1–16, which is that Israel's covenant God is present in his sanctuary in their midst; if the priesthood fails to remove Israel's impurities then it will cause YHWH's sanctuary to be desecrated. Thus, each episode in Leviticus 11, 12, 13–14, and 15, also exemplifies the principle in 10:3. By Israel...
separating herself from impurity, from that which represents incompleteness, rebellion, and corruption, both people and priesthood act to sanctify YHWH in their midst. If the priesthood allows Israel to persist in their impurities, then YHWH will act to sanctify himself – the nation will die.

The problem concluding Leviticus 15 reflects the exigency Leviticus is addressing in the persuasive situation. Leviticus 16 resolves this problem for the first generation at Sinai (vv1-28) and then for future generations (vv29-34). Although Aaron is prohibited from entering the Most Holy Place, YHWH gives permission for an exception so that he can remove the impurities, rebellions, and sins of Israel from the tabernacle and from the nation. By future generations undertaking the Day of Atonement instructions in obedience to command, as per the example of Aaron, both the tabernacle and nation are restored to a condition of order and purity and so act to sanctify YHWH in their midst.

So far, the episodes within Leviticus 1–16 have focused upon how YHWH is to be sanctified and glorified by priests and people within the ritual domain of YHWH's tabernacle in the midst of the camp. Leviticus 17–21 then extends this concern to the ethical and ritual domains within the land. Leviticus 17 follows sequentially from Leviticus 16 by continuing the theme of sacrifice whilst ensuring that Israel brings her gifts to YHWH, not participating in idolatry, and thus gives to YHWH at his dwelling what belongs to him, namely blood that he has given to Israel for making כְּפָר. Leviticus 18–20 then seeks to form Israel's character and behaviour to be reflective of their covenant God; namely, a holy nation set apart in purity. That is, Israel can embody her holy status by maintaining relational order within the YHWH–Israel relationship and by separating themselves from the impure practices of both Egypt and Canaan. While the priesthood is not precluded from the instructions addressed to the sons of Israel in Leviticus 18–20, 21:1-15 and 21:16-23 address the priesthood directly to motivate them to embody their holy status and so dissuade them from profaning YHWH's sanctuary. Relating to this topic, 22:1-16 continues to address the priesthood and seeks to dissuade them from profaning the food
gifts set apart to YHWH. This is the intent too of the following episode in 22:17-33, but this
time directed to the Israelite community who are to offer gifts that are acceptable before
YHWH and so not profane his name. In this context, the paraenesis in 22:32 extends the
principle of 10:3 to the people; YHWH is to be sanctified in the midst of the sons of Israel.
This then forms the basis of Leviticus 23 where the Israelites are instructed to declare
YHWH's holy festal days.

The conceptual basis underlying the global schema so far has been the YHWH's presence in
the midst of his covenant nation first within the camp and then within the land, which is
the reason why both priesthood and people are to ensure that YHWH is sanctified and
glorified in their midst (10:3, 22:32b). After a sequence of episodes emphasising the need
to ensure what belongs to YHWH is not treated with contempt i.e. gifts (22:1-16, 17-33)
and festal days (23:1-43), 24:1-9 then makes explicit was has been implied since Leviticus
17; Israel is to acknowledge YHWH's permanent presence amongst his people (vv1-4). In
response, they are to present their supplication in the form of twelve loaves before YHWH
to remember the twelve tribes (vv5-9). The juxtaposition between narrative and
instruction that follows in 24:10-23 then exemplifies how Israel is to ensure that YHWH is
sanctified when offence profanes YHWH's name (10:3, 22:32b). They are to ensure that the
cause of impurity, irrespective of whether the offender is Israelite or resident foreigner, is
removed from the nation. Through Israel's obedience, Israel ensures that YHWH is
sanctified and glorified.

If 24:1-9 expiclates the permanent presence of YHWH amongst his covenant nation, then
Leviticus 25–26 evinces the conceptual basis of how the paradigm of the camp extends to
Israel in the land. Both land and people belong to YHWH their covenant God and thus the
consequence is that if YHWH is to dwell in the midst of his people and not abhor them,
then Israel is to walk in his statutes in obedience. The warning if they do not act to sanctify
YHWH in their midst is that YHWH will act to sanctify himself through enacting the
covenant curses. Leviticus 27 then brings the arrangement to a fitting conclusion; Israel is
to give to YHWH all that belongs to him and an implied consequence after Leviticus 25–26 is that this includes the whole nation as YHWH's servants who belong to him.

Therefore, through the sequential connectedness of the text's global schema, YHWH instructs both priesthood and nation about how he is to be sanctified by those who approach him and glorified in their midst (10:3, 22:32b). In summary, this is by approaching in relational order, seeking restoration when offence threatens, by embodying the distinction between the impure and pure so that they can be set apart to YHWH their God in a condition of purity, by removing impurity from the tabernacle and the nation, and by respecting all that belongs to YHWH. Thus, to conclude the fourth and final step in this study's rhetorical-critical framework, each episode in Leviticus' arrangement instructs about one or more of the dimensions listed above about how people and priesthood are to ensure YHWH is both sanctified and glorified in Israel's midst. This meets the exigency of the persuasive situation since it is by these means that Israel's life will be preserved with YHWH dwelling in their midst both in their camp and in the future as they reside in the land as YHWH's servants.

However, from the beginning of the study, I have acknowledged how Leviticus does not hide that it recalls past events relative to the real editor and the real audience within the text's rhetorical situation. I have also affirmed that the rhetorical situation is where Israel is in the land. At the conclusion of this study, it is worth observing the intent of Leviticus' rhetorical strategy within the rhetorical situation as far as can be known. I have suggested from the beginning that the sustaining of the future orientation evinces a deliberative disposition of Leviticus in the persuasive situation. More specifically, the disposition of the text is to form the character and behaviour of the new covenant nation at Sinai to reflect the character and works of YHWH their covenant God. It is feasible that the rhetorical situation reflects a similar exigence to the persuasive situation. The exigence is the danger to Israel with YHWH dwelling in their midst and this characterises a Solomonic situation, an Ahaz-Hezekian context, and also a post-exilic community rebuilding in the land under
Persian rule. Irrespective of the particular historical situation, the disposition of the text would be consistent. The future orientation of the recalled speeches would function to reform and re-shape the worldview of the covenant community in the land. The intent of the rhetorical strategy is then to re-align the character and behaviour of YHWH’s covenant nation with the past self-revelatory events of Israel’s beginnings at Sinai. By this means, the threat of YHWH’s presence amongst his covenant nation would be assuaged and Israel’s life preserved.

Although this study has focused upon exploring the persuasive intent of Leviticus’ rhetorical strategy, supporting arguments have been proposed attending to our primary task. These arguments encompass the embedding of discourse analysis in a rhetorical-critical framework, the coherence of Leviticus’ global schema, and also that a persuasive intent exists in ritual and legal texts. By employing discourse analysis, particularly clause focus structures, I have demonstrated the possibility that the linguistic and conceptual structures of Leviticus’ text align. This in turn has led to the coherence of Leviticus’ global schema being established with the refrain אלהיכם יהוה אני (‘I am YHWH your God’) emerging as the primary thematic referent. Furthermore, while I have briefly drawn upon ritual anthropology to establish an argument for the presupposition that ritual and legal texts persuade, the analysis in Chapters Three, Four, and Five, demonstrates that ritual and legal texts do exemplify an intent to shape the worldview of YHWH’s covenant community and so establishes order, sustains order, and restores order when broken. These supporting arguments are where future areas of research still lie. This study only demonstrates the usefulness of information structure analysis for understanding global and episodic schemas of Leviticus and so further work should be undertaken analysing the type of focus particularly at the paragraph level. Also, given the plausibility that ritual texts demonstrate a persuasive intent, a further area of research is the integration of ritual anthropology with Levitical studies. This has been undertaken to an extent by, for example, Bibb, Gane,
Gorman, Jenson, and Klingbeil, but not in a way that substantially demonstrates how Levitical priestly texts are persuasive and display a rhetorical strategy.122

However, the primary task of this study, which is to determine the persuasive intent of Leviticus, also opens further avenues of research. Further research could be undertaken demonstrating how the conceptual framework of Leviticus 1–16 and 17–27 align, and how this relates to the text’s rhetorical strategy. Furthermore, an implication of this study is that the arrangement of Leviticus may not display an alternating pattern between ‘story, list, and sanction’.123 Thus, an in-depth assessment of Watts’ argument for the rhetorical strategy of the Pentateuch is a needed next step in Levitical research. Also, future studies could explore how the rhetorical devices at the micro-level of the text’s arrangement, such as the use of ‘gradation’, personification of the land, binary pairs, and intertextuality, that may contribute to Leviticus’ rhetorical strategy. Thus, this study represents a beginning exploration of the persuasive intent of Leviticus and how this is then achieved by the rhetorical strategy of Leviticus’ arrangement.

APPENDIX A

Onset and Closure Markers for Leviticus’ Global Schema

Key
B  Background
CFS  Clause Focus Structure
E-Episode  Embedded Episode (first level)
EE-Episode  Embedded Episode (second level)
EEE-Episode  Embedded Episode (third level)
NF-B  Narrative Frame - Background
Px  Predicate focus structure
QF-B  Quotative Frame - Background
QF-R  Quotative Frame - Redundant
TF-B  Temporal Frame - Background
XP  Clause-focus structure
XP*  A pragmatic clause-focus structure (grammatical Px clause)
Xp  Argument-focus structure

1. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 1–7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>입כר לאמר׃</td>
<td>NF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידבר יהוה אלהי עם משה:</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עכל אשא ידיניווהו לווה:</td>
<td>NF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עמך פריסיא קרבן ו所所בבש א מיינתו עכלה</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אמס פריסיא קרבן ו所所בבש א מיינתו עכלה</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP*</td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עכל ומתא והיות קרבן</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>[XP]</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עכל ואשא רוית נחת לווה:</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP*</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עכל מתא והיות קרבן</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP*</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עכל מתא והיות קרבן</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עכל מתא והיות קרבן</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP*</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכש קריב פריסיא AUTHOR NAMELESS</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכש קריב פריסיא AUTHOR NAMELESS</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>[XP]</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכש קריב פריסיא AUTHOR NAMELESS</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכש קריב פריסיא AUTHOR NAMELESS</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכש קריב פריסיא AUTHOR NAMELESS</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP*</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יכש קריב פריסיא AUTHOR NAMELESS</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
כדרש קדישması מסייעו: כדרש קדיש()].

וכן אסףเกมן נחית בהוים של יהוה.

 filmer/marshall 2:11

 filmer/marshall 2:14α

 filmer/marshall 2:15β

 filmer/marshall 3:1αβ

 filmer/marshall 3:3a

 filmer/marshall 3:7α

 filmer/marshall 3:11αβ

 filmer/marshall 3:1αβ

 filmer/marshall 3:16αβ

 filmer/marshall 3:16αγ

 filmer/marshall 3:17αβ

 filmer/marshall 4:1

 filmer/marshall 4:2αα

 filmer/marshall 4:2αβ

 filmer/marshall 4:3α

 filmer/marshall 4:13α

 filmer/marshall 4:22α

 filmer/marshall 4:27α

 filmer/marshall 4:32α

 filmer/marshall 5:1α

 filmer/marshall 5:7α

 filmer/marshall 5:11α

 filmer/marshall 5:14

 filmer/marshall 5:15α

 filmer/marshall 5:17α

 filmer/marshall 5:20

 filmer/marshall 5:22α

 filmer/marshall 6:1

 filmer/marshall 6:2αα

 filmer/marshall 6:2αβ

 filmer/marshall 6:7αα

 filmer/marshall 6:12

 filmer/marshall 6:13α

 filmer/marshall 6:17
2. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 8–10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יצורו זה אלمشا אלמר</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph + Paragraph</td>
<td>8:2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>הק אדארלחויא ואمثال יאש והן בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>TF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>9:1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זה אתלבית</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>9:1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ואימר אלחד</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>9:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חקיל שהיה לביקוקטיבו וליהל להשלמה</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>9:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידירו זה אלمشا אלמר</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>10:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וייסר הלאשלשה אדיבとにתחב אתאלחל</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וייסר הלאשלשה אדיבとにתחב אתאלחל</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>10:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידירו זה אלمشا אלמר</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>10:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וייסר הלאשלשה אדיבとにתחב אתאלחל</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>10:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>10:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>יצורו זה אלمشا אלמר</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידירו זה אלمشا אלמר</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>11:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>11:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>11:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>11:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ובו והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>11:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והן ואمثال בניו והן בניו</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>11:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>12:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>12:2az</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>12:2αβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>12:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:5a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>12:7cβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>12:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 13–14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>13:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>13:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>13:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:38</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:47</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:59</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:1</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:2</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:21</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:32</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:33</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:34</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:43</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:48</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:54</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:55</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text is in Hebrew.
### 6. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-B + TF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>PX</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 17–21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td>QF– Onset</td>
<td>XP[Px]</td>
<td>Episode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>E-Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>E-Paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Xp</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 321 -
איש איש מבית ישראל ומרקרר אחר מבית בּוֹךְ.

איש איש מבית ישראל ומרקרר אחר מבית בּוֹךְ.

איש איש מבית ישראל ומרקרר אחר מבית בּוֹךְ.

מיishi את אלהים ש獴ית לאמר:

דוע את עשת אביך ואשת אביך ובקש ממך אל המלך. אם עשת הכהנים את דבריהם, אל תצא לחצרו.

ואמרת אלהים: "אני אלהיכם. לא ת اللبن דרכה או תאכל טרפה בבית אשר גור מבית איש ומן הגר בתוכם איש.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. לכל זכר יש מכנה קדשים ושבעת שנים לא תışıוה.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. בכל־בהמה לא תתן אל כל־עדת בני ישראל.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. פּרְעֹה, חרב תמי וקרישה והכּוֹר עשת אביך ואשת אביך.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. זבח או־זבח אשר יעלה אל כל־עדת בני ישראל. כל זכר יש מכנה קדשים ושבעת שנים לא תışıוה.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. כל זכר יש מכנה קדשים ושבעת שנים לא תışıוה.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. כל זכר יש מכנה קדשים ושבעת שנים לא תışıוה.

וכך תנקת את כל הגרים ב换届א nuclei ותרפה בּוֹךְ. כל זכר יש מכנה קדשים ושבעת שנים לא תisburyי משכים אשת: "אני אלהים ש獴ית לאמר:

דוע את עשת אביך ואשת אביך ובקש ממך אל המלך. אם עשת הכהנים את דבריהם, אל תצא לחצרו.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22:1</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:2</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:3aα</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:3aα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:3aβ</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:3aβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:4a</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:4a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:6a</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:6a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:7aβ</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:7aβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:8a</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:8a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:9β</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:9β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:10</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Onset and closure markers are used throughout the text to indicate the beginning and end of discourse units.
### 10. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 22:17-33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>22:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>22:18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>22:18bξ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode +</td>
<td>22:18bβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:27a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>22:33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 11. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>23:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>23:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>23:2bξ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>23:2bβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topicalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>[XP]</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:14c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:15αz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>[XP]</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Px</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>23:24αz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Function</strong></td>
<td><strong>CFS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td><strong>Verse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ידבר היה אליהם לאמור:</td>
<td>QF-R</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>24:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>זכר לאברהם נא:</td>
<td>QF</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>24:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יקח את אמרו שמה ישים ויביא:</td>
<td>Thematisation</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>24:2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כלחת שלח:</td>
<td>Thematisation</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>24:5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 13. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 24:10-23 |
|---|---|---|---|
| מצא אנשי בני ישראל: | Thematisation | Episode | 24:10 |
| ידבר היה אליהם לאמור: | QF-B | Paragraph | 24:13 |
| ואילו בני ישראל מלאו: | QF | Paragraph | 24:15aα-
| עניינו יicare על ח kém אשר: | Identification | Paragraph | 24:15aβ |
| ואיש כי ברות אנס: | Topicalisation | Paragraph | 24:17 |
| ואיש כי ברות אנס: | Topicalisation | Paragraph | 24:19 |
| ידבר משה אשר בני ישראל: | QF-B | Paragraph | 24:23 |
| בסיוע רמא לשבע באש שנào מהזון: | Closure | Episode | 24:23 |

| 14. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 25–26 |
|---|---|---|---|
| ידבר היה אליהם בחר עני לאמור: | QF-B | Episode | 25:1 |
| ידבר אליהם ירשו את ישראל: | QF-B | Episode | 25:2a |
| אמרו אלהים: | QF-B | Episode | 25:2bα |
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‫‪25:2bβ‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪25:8‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪Xp‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬

‫‪25:13‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪XP‬‬

‫‪25:25‬‬
‫‪25:35‬‬
‫‪25:39‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬
‫‪Paragraph‬‬
‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬

‫‪25:44‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪XP‬‬

‫‪25:47‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Px‬‬

‫‪26:1‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Px‬‬

‫‪26:2‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Xp‬‬

‫‪26:3‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪26:13‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Xp‬‬
‫‪Xp‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪XP‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬

‫‪26:14a‬‬
‫‪26:14b‬‬
‫‪26:15a‬‬
‫‪26:15b‬‬
‫‪26:15bα‬‬
‫‪26:15bβ‬‬
‫‪26:16a‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Initiating‬‬
‫כי תבאו אל־הארץ‬
‫‪ Identification‬אשר אני נתן לכם‬
‫‪ Topicalisation‬ושבתה הארץ שבת ליהוה׃‬
‫‪Onset‬‬
‫וספרת לך שבע שבתת שנים שׁבע שנים שבע‬
‫‪ Topic shift‬פעמים‬
‫‪Onset‬‬
‫בשנת היובל הזאת תשבו איש אל־אחזתו‬
‫‪Topic shift‬‬
‫‪ Thematisation‬כי־ימוך אחיך‬
‫‪ Thematisation‬וכי־ימוך אחיך‬
‫‪ Thematisation‬וכי־ימוך אחיך עמך ונמכר־לך‬
‫‪Topic shift‬‬

‫ועבדך ואמתך אשר יהיו־לך מאת הגוים‬

‫‪ Thematisation‬וכי תשיג יד גר‬
‫‪Topic shift‬‬
‫‪ Thematisation‬ל ֹא־תַעֲש ׂו ּ לָכֶם אֱלִילִם‬
‫)‪(asyndeton‬‬
‫‪ Identification‬את־שבתתי תשמרו‬
‫‪Topic Shift‬‬
‫)‪(asyndeton‬‬
‫‪ Topic shift‬אם־בחקתי תלכו‬
‫‪ Identification‬ואת־מצותי תשמרו‬
‫ועשיתם אתם׃‬
‫‪Closure‬‬
‫אני יהוה אלהיכם‬
‫אשר הוצאתי אתכם מארץ מצרים מהית להם עבדים‬

‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪XP‬‬
‫‪XP‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪Px‬‬
‫‪XP‬‬

‫‪Initiating‬‬

‫‪Initiating‬‬

‫ואם־לא תשמעו לי‬
‫ולא תעשו את כל־המצות האלה׃‬
‫ואם־בחקתי תמאסו‬
‫ואם את־משפּטי תגעל נפשכם‬
‫לבלתי עשות את־כל־מצותי‬
‫להפרכם את־בריתי׃‬
‫אף־אני אעשה־זאת לכם‬

‫‪26:18a‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪XP‬‬

‫‪Initiating‬‬

‫ואם־עד־אלה לא תשמעו לי‬

‫‪26:21a‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬

‫‪Px‬‬

‫‪Initiating‬‬

‫ואם־תלכו עמי קרי‬

‫‪26:23a‬‬
‫‪26:27a‬‬
‫‪26:46‬‬

‫‪Paragraph‬‬
‫‪Paragraph‬‬
‫‪Episode‬‬

‫‪XP‬‬
‫‪XP‬‬
‫‪Xp‬‬
‫‪Xp‬‬

‫‪Initiating‬‬
‫‪Initiating‬‬
‫‪Closure‬‬

‫ואם־באלה לא תוסרו לי‬
‫ואם־בזאת לא תשמעו לי‬
‫אלה החקים והמשפטים והתורת‬
‫אשר נתן יהוה בינו ובין בני ישראל בהר סיני‬
‫ביד־משה׃‬
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### 15. Onset and Closure Markers in Leviticus 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Verse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initialisation</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>27:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>りょびちょのアリュミサプリ</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>27:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>27:2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>QF-B</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>27:2bα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>Initialisation, XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>27:2bβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>Initialisation, XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>27:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>Initialisation, XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>27:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>Initialisation, XP</td>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td>27:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>イザブレアリハスポアプリ</td>
<td>Closure</td>
<td>Episode</td>
<td>27:34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- "CFS" stands for Coherence Features System.
- "Episode" indicates a higher level of coherence, while "Paragraph" indicates a lower level.
- "Closure" marks the end of a segment or chapter.

---

面部的語法和篇章結構：
- "Face" indicates the structural and syntactical properties of the text.
- "Level" indicates the coherence level of the text:
  - "Episode" indicates a higher level of coherence, while "Paragraph" indicates a lower level.
- "Closure" marks the end of a segment or chapter.
APPENDIX B

The Macrostructure of Leviticus' Arrangement

Arrangement Hierarchy

Global and Episode (G + or E)
  Embedded-Episode (EE)
    Embedded-Embedded Episode (EEE)
      Embedded-Embedded-Embedded Episode (EEEE)
      Paragraph (Pa)

1. The Arrangement of Leviticus 1–7

1:1–7:38  YHWH spoke to Moses from the tent of meeting (G+E)
1:2bγ-1:2βγ  When an Israelite offers a gift for YHWH from livestock (E)

1:3-17  If an עלאה is his gift (EE)
  1:3-9  If the עלאה is from the cattle (Pa)
  1:10-13  If the עלאה is from the flock (Pa)
  1:14-17  If the עלאה is from the bird (Pa)
2:1-16  If an offerer brings a מנחה gift for YHWH (EE)
  2:1-3  If the מנחה is presented as raw ingredients (Pa)
  2-4  If the מנחה is baked in an oven (Pa)
  2:5-6  If the מנחה is prepared on a griddle (Pa)
  2:7-10  If the>Name missing: ].
  2:11-13  Every מנחה for YHWH must be made without yeast and honey (Pa)
  2:14-16  If the מנחה is a first fruits gift to YHWH (Pa)

3:1-17  If the שלמים זבח is his gift (EE)
  3:1b-5  If the שלמים זבח is from the cattle (Pa)
  3:6  If the שלמים זבח is from the flock (Pa)
  3:7-11  If the שלמים זבח is a lamb (Pa)
  3:12-16  If the שלמים זבח is a goat (Pa)
  3:17  A statute for all your generations and dwelling places (Pa)

4:1-35  When an Israelite sins unintentionally (EE)
  4:1-13  If the high priest sins and incurs guilt for the people (Pa)
  4:14-21  If all the congregation of Israelite wanders and instruction is concealed from the community and they break YHWH's commands (Pa)
  4:22-26  When a leader sins and breaks a command of YHWH his God (Pa)
4:27-31 If a person sins unintentionally from the people of the land (Pa)
4:32-35 If a lamb is presented as a חטאת (Pa)
5:1-13 When an Israelite hears a testimony and is a witness (EEE)
5:1-6 When a person sins and hears a testimony (Pa)
5:7-10 If he cannot afford a sheep (Pa)
5:11-14 If he cannot afford a pair of doves (Pa)
5:14-19 When an Israelite breaks faith and sins unintentionally against the holy things of YHWH (EEE)
5:15-16 When an Israelite breaks faith against the holy things of YHWH (Pa)
5:17-19 When an Israelite sins and does one from all the commands of YHWH (Pa)
5:20-26 When an Israelite sins and breaks faith with his neighbour (EEE)

6:1-7 Command Aaron and his sons (EE)
6:2αβ-6 These are the instructions of the עלה (Pa)
6:7-11 These are the instructions of the מנחה (Pa)
6:12-16 The מנחה gift for the day Aaron and his sons are anointed (Pa)
6:17-23 These are the instructions of the חטאת (Pa)
7:1-10 These are the instructions of the אשם (Pa)
7:11-21 These are the instructions of the בז שלמים (Pa)

7:22-36 Speak to the sons of Israel (EE)
7:23αβ-25 All the fat is not to be eaten (Pa)
7:26-27 All the blood is not to be eaten (Pa)
7:28-34 When he offers his בז שלמים to YHWH (Pa)
7:35-36 Summary: These are the prebends for the priests (Pa)

7:37-38 Summary: These are the instructions for the עלה offering, מנחה offering, חטאת offering, אשם offering, שלמים offering, and בז sacrifice, which YHWH commanded Moses on Mt Sinai on the day he commanded the sons of Israel to bring their gifts before YHWH in the Sinai wilderness (E)

2. The Arrangement of Leviticus 8–10

8:1–10:20 I, YHWH, shall be sanctified and glorified
8:1-36 The anointing of the Aaronic priesthood (Pa)
9:1-10:7 YHWH is sanctified and glorified (Pa)
10:8-11 The holy and common and the impure and pure (Pa)
10:12-20 When acting contrary to command is justified (Pa)
3. The Arrangement of Leviticus 11

11:1-47 Learning the distinction between the impure and pure (E)
   11:2-8 These are the living things that can be eaten from the animals upon the earth (Pa)
   11:9-12 All that can be eaten from the waters (Pa)
   11:13-19 These birds are to be declared impure (Pa)
   11:20-23 All flying insects that walk on the earth are to be declared impure (Pa)
   11:24-28 These will make you impure (Pa)
   11:29-40 These are to be declared impure from the swarming things upon the ground (Pa)
   11:41-45 All swarming things upon the earth are to be declared impure (Pa)

11:46-47 Summary and Purpose Statement: These are the instructions for the animal, the bird, all the living things that move in the waters, and all the swarming creatures upon the earth to distinguish between the impure and the pure and between the living creature that can be eaten and the living creature that can be eaten (Pa/E)

4. The Arrangement of Leviticus 12

12:1-8 Instructions for a Woman After the Birth of a Son of a Daughter (E)
   12:2αβ-4 When a woman gives birth to a son (Pa)
   12:5-7 If she gives birth to a daughter (Pa)
   12:7cδ Summary: This are the instructions for the woman who gives birth to a male or a female (Pa)
   12:8 Provision if she cannot afford a lamb (Pa)

5. The Arrangement of Leviticus 13–14

13:1–14:57 Instructions for the צараית of Skin, Clothing, and a House (E)
   13:1-8 When a mark of skin disease (Pa)
   13:9-17 When there is a mark of skin disease (Pa)
   13:18-23 When the flesh has an inflamed spot on its skin and it heals (Pa)
   13:24-28 When the flesh has a burn and there is a reddish-white or white spot (Pa)
   13:29-37 When a person has a mark on the head or chin (Pa)
   13:38-39 When a person has bright spots of white on his or her skin (Pa)
   13:40-44 When a man becomes bald (Pa)
   13:45-46 Anyone who has a skin disease is impure and must live outside of the camp (Pa)
13:47-59 When clothing has a mark of mould (EE)
  13:47-58 When clothing has a mark of mould (Pa)
  13:59 Summary: These are the instructions for a mark of mould on clothing

14:1-32 These are the instructions for the one who is skin diseased on the day of his purification (EE)
  14:2-20 Instructions for the skin-diseased on the day of purification and comes to the priest (Pa)
  14:21-32 If the skin-diseased person is poor (Pa)

14:33-53 When you enter the land, which I give you as a possession, and I give you a plague of mould in the house of your possession (EE+Pa)

14:54-57 Summary: These are the instructions for all marks of disease on skin, for mould on clothing and for houses (E)

6. The Arrangement of Leviticus 15

15:1-33 When for When a Man or a Woman has a Discharge (E)
  15:2-15 When a man has a discharge from his flesh (Pa)
  15:16-18 When a man has an emission of semen (Pa)
  15:19-24 When a woman has a discharge of blood (Pa)
  15:25-31 When a woman has a discharge of blood for many days (Pa)

15:32-33 These are the instructions for when a man or a woman has a discharge (E)

7. The Arrangement of Leviticus 16

16:1-34 The Day of Atonement as a Permanent Statute (E)
  16:1-2 YHWH's warning to Aaron after his two sons died (Pa)
  16:3-28 The instructions to Aaron to effect כפר for the tabernacle and for the people of Israel (Pa)
  16:29-34a The Day of Atonement for an everlasting statute (Pa)
  16:34b Aaron did as YHWH commanded Moses (E/Pa)

8. The Arrangement of Leviticus 17–21

17:1–21:24 This is YHWH's command (E)
  17:3-7 When a man from the house of Israel slaughters livestock inside or outside the camp and does not bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting (Pa)
  17:8-9 When a man from the house of Israel or a resident foreigner does not bring his gift to YHWH (Pa)
  17:10-12 When a man from the house of Israel and from the resident foreigner eats blood (Pa)
  17:13-14 When a man from the house of Israel and from the foreigner who hunts pure animals and birds (Pa)
  17:15-16 When anyone eats a carcass torn by animals (Pa)

18:1-30 I am YHWH your God (EE)
18:2-5 I am YHWH your God; you shall not do the works of the land of Egypt or of the land of Canaan (Pa)
18:6 A man shall not approach to uncover the nakedness of his flesh of his flesh (Pa)
18:7 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your father and of your mother (Pa)
18:8 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your father’s wife (Pa)
18:9 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your sister, the daughter of your father or the daughter of your mother (Pa)
18:10 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your son’s daughter or your daughter’s daughter (Pa)
18:11 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your father’s wife’s daughter who is born to your father (Pa)
18:12 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your father’s sister (Pa)
18:13 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your mother’s sister (Pa)
18:14 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your father’s brother (Pa)
18:15 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your daughter-in-law (Pa)
18:16 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your brother’s wife (Pa)
18:17 You shall not uncover the nakedness of a woman and daughter (Pa)
18:18-20 And with a woman who is... you shall not uncover her nakedness (Pa)
18:21 And you shall not give your seed to Molech (Pa)
18:22 And you shall not lie with a male as with a woman (Pa)
18:23 And with any animal you shall not lie down to defile yourself with it (Pa)
18:24-30 Summary: He shall not defile himself by any of this (Pa)

19:1-37 You are to be holy for I YHWH your God am holy (EE)
19:2 Be holy for I YHWH your God am holy (Pa)
19:3-19 A Decalogue for the land (Pa)
19:20-22 When a man lies sexually with a woman and she is a slave (Pa)
19:23-32 When you come into the land (Pa)
19:33-37 When a foreigner sojourns with you in your land (Pa)

20:1-27 A people set apart from the nations to belong to YHWH (EE)
20:2-8 When a man from the sons of Israel or from the foreigner who gives his seed to Molech (Pa)
20:9-26 Penalties for particular relational offence (Pa)
20:27 When a man or a woman is a medium or a spiritist (Pa)

21:1-15 The priests are to be holy to their God (EE)
21:1-6 You are not to make yourself impure for a person among your people (Pa)
21:7-9 The priesthood shall not marry a prostitute or a defiled woman (Pa)
21:10-15 Higher responsibility for the high priest (Pa)

21:16-23 A man from the priestly generations who has a blemish shall not approach to offer the bread of his God (EE)

21:24 Summary: Moses spoke to Aaron and his sons and to all the sons (E)


22:1-16 Instructions for the priesthood about the 'holy things' given to YHWH (E)
22:1-2 Let the priests separate themselves from the holy things of the sons of Israel (Pa)
22:3 If any priest approaches the holy things, which the sons of Israel have set apart to YHWH, and impurity is upon him (Pa)
22:4-9 A man from the seed of Aaron who has a skin disease or a discharge shall not eat from the holy things (Pa)
22:10-16 Any foreigner shall not eat a holy thing (Pa)

10. The Arrangement of Leviticus 22:17-33

22:17-33 When a gift is and is not acceptable (E)
22:17-20 When a man from the house of Israel and from the resident foreigner presents his gift as a vow (Pa) or voluntary offering, and who offers an עלה (Pa)
22:21-25 What is and is not acceptable for a שלמים (Pa)
22:26-30 When an ox, lamb, or goat is born (Pa)
22:31-33 You shall keep my commandments: I am YHWH (Pa)

11. The Arrangement of Leviticus 23:1-44

23:1-44 YHWH's appointed times (E)
23:1-2 These are my appointed times (Pa)
23:3 Six days you shall do work (Pa)
23:4 These are YHWH's appointed times from the festal days (Pa)
23:5-8 The Passover of YHWH (Pa)
23:9-14 When you come into the land which I am giving to you and you reap its harvest (Pa)
23:15-22 You shall present a new מנחה gift to YHWH (Pa)
In the seventh month, on the first of the month, there will be a rest for you (Pa)

On the tenth of the seventh month, this is the Day of Atonement (Pa)

On the fifteenth day of the seventh month, this is the feast of booths for seven days to YHWH (Pa)

But on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when you have gathered the harvest of the land, you shall celebrate a feast for YHWH (Pa)

Moses spoke the appointed times of YHWH to the sons of Israel (E)

12. The Arrangement of Leviticus 24:1-9

The light of the lamp and the twelve loaves of bread (E)

Command the people to bring pure olive oil for light for the lamp to be burning always (Pa)

The twelve loaves to be set before YHWH (Pa)

13. The Arrangement of Leviticus 24:10-23

The Israelites adhere to command (E)

An Israelite woman's son curses God's name (Pa)

YHWH speaks to Moses and instructs him to put to death anyone who curses the name of YHWH (Pa)

Anyone who curses his God shall bear his own sin (Pa)

Anyone who takes any life of a human shall be put to death (Pa)

Anyone who injures another, the same will be done to him (Pa)

The Israelites do as YHWH commanded Moses (E/Pa)


The statutes that YHWH set between himself and Israel (E)

When you come into the land that I am giving to you, the land shall rest a sabbath to YHWH (Pa)

The fiftieth year shall be a jubilee to you (Pa)

In the jubilee year, every man shall return to his property (Pa)

When your brother becomes poor and sells his property (Pa)

When your brother becomes poor and his hand 'slips' (Pa)

When your brother becomes poor with you and he sells himself to you (Pa)

Your male and female slaves from the nations (Pa)
25:47-55 When a resident foreigner can ‘afford a hand’ and he sojourns with you, and your brother grows poor and sells himself to the foreigner (Pa)
26:1 You shall not make for yourself idols (Pa)
26:2 You shall keep my Sabbaths (Pa)
26:3-13 If you walk by my statutes (Pa)
26:14-17 If you do not hear me and do not do any of these commands, then I will do this to you (Pa)
26:18-20 If after this you do not listen to me (Pa)
26:21-22 If you walk with me in hostility (Pa)
26:23-26 If by this you are not disciplined and walk in hostility against me (Pa)
26:27-45 If by this you do not listen to me and walk with me in hostility (Pa)

26:46 Summary: These are the statutes, the ordinances, and the instructions, which YHWH set between him and the sons of Israel on Mt Sinai by the hand of Moses (E)

15. The Arrangement of Leviticus 27:1-34

27:1-34 Giving to YHWH what belongs to him (E)
27:1-13 When a man makes an extraordinary vow in the valuation of persons to YHWH (Pa)
27:14-25 When a man sets apart his house as holy to YHWH (Pa)
27:26-27 A dedicated firstborn cannot be set apart to YHWH (Pa)
27:28-29 All that is סֵפֶל must be devoted to YHWH (Pa)
27:30-33 All the tithe of the land belongs to YHWH (Pa)
27:34 These are the commands that YHWH commanded Moses for the sons of Israel on Mt Sinai (Pa/E)
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