Form of priestly blessings cursing and toroth in ancient Israel

Rudman, S.

FORMS OF PRIESTLY BLESSINGS, CURSINGS AND TOROTH IN ANCIENT ISRAEL.

S.Rudman.

M.Litt. Thesis,

1967.

CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.

AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures
Ac.Or.	Acta Orientalia
ANET	Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BA	The Biblical Archaeologist
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BH	Biblia Hebraica
Bib	Biblica
BZ	Biblische Zeitschrift
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
ET	Expository Times (or: English Translation)
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
Ges.Stud.	Gesammelte Studien
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HK	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HUCA	Hebrew Union College Annual
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, N.York, 1962
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JLH	Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies

Kleine Schriften	Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Massoretic Text
MVAG	Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft
NTT	Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift
OT	Old Testament
OTMS	The Old Testament and Modern Study, ed. H.H. Rowley
OTS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PAAJR	Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
RB	Revue Biblique
RE	Realencyklopädie für prot. Theologie und Kirche
RGG	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
RHPhR	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses
RHR	Revue de l'Histoire des Religions
SBU	Symbolae Biblicae Uppsaliensis
TGUOS	Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung
ThR	Theologische Rundschau
ThWBNT	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament
ThZ	Theologische Zeitschrift
UUÅ	Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift
VT	Vetus Testamentum
VTS	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZThK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

FOOTNOTES

Titles of books and periodicals are underlined; articles are indicated by single quotation-marks.

Normally full bibliographical details have not been quoted in the footnotes. Only authors and pages references have been given. But full bibliographical details can be ascertained from the Bibliography.

HEBREW WORDS

Hebrew words have been transliterated according to OTMS (ed.Rowley).

FORMS OF PRIESTLY BLESSINGS AND CURSINGS AND TOROTH IN ANCIENT ISRAEL

INTRODUCTION

In recent studies of the OT. there has been frequent discussion of topics related to the priestly office in ancient Israel,[1] but there has been little overall investigation of the Israelite priestly office as such.[2] This is all the more surprising since nearly all recent work has been influenced by the increased interest in the cultic significance of the various parts of the OT. and Israelite institutions.[3] Most of the emphasis, however, has been

---

1. Cf. the numerous articles listed in the bibliography.

2. Apart from the dictionary articles of W.R. Smith, G. Hölscher, N. Snaith, A. Lefèvre, K. Koch, G. Fohrer, D.R. Jones, E. Nielsen (cf. bibliog.), the last full-scale treatment was in 1889, namely W.von Baudissin, Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestertums untersucht, W. Eichrodt, Theology of the OT., Vol. I, pp.392-433, although sound and balanced in its treatment, does not pretend to discuss the problems of priesthood in ancient Israel fully. The comprehensive and up-to-date treatment of priesthood in De Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp.345-406, is unfortunately lacking in footnotes or references, other than scriptural. It is in the nature of a considered opinion; a fuller discussion is still needed. E.O. James, The Nature and Function of Priesthood, is concerned with priesthood as a whole from an anthropological point of view and devotes only a few pages to ancient Israel. The recently published Habilitationsschrift of A.H.J. Gunneweg, Leviten und Priester, is an interesting exception to this comparative neglect; cf. p.3, n.2 below.

3. Cf. the seminal work of Mowinckel, esp. Psalmenstudien I - VI; cf. also S.H. Hooke (ed.), Myth and Ritual; The Labyrinth. On cult and law-giving see the bibliog. under A. Alt, G.v.Rad, M. Noth, W. Zimmerli, K. Baltzer, W. Beyerlin and the development of the theme of cult and covenant in R. Catholic exegetes such as N.Lohfink, D. McCarthy, J.L'Hour, etc.; cf. pp.184f. below. On cult and kingship see Mowinckel, Engnell, Widengren, Johnson, etc.; criticism of these views can be found in Alt, Noth and especially Bernhardt. On cultic prophecy see Jepsen, Mowinckel, Johnson, Engnell, v. Rad, Zimmerli, v. Reventlow. On the cultic use of the Psalms see Mowinckel, Bentzen, Johnson, Weiser.

placed on the cult itself, particularly the festivals,[1] the place of the king[2] and the cultic language and status of the prophets.[3] In all this discussion the priest has not been brought into the new perspective. The unquestioned acceptance of the priestly office in Israel's religious observances has probably contributed to this comparative neglect. Dogmatic grounds have also played their part; priesthood has been regarded simply as man's way to God, and therefore relatively unimportant in comparison with God's way to man.[4]

A new discussion of the priestly office as a whole is called for, dealing with the work of the priest in dispensing torah and with the place of the priest in the sacrificial cultus. Aspects of these two functions of priesthood have been the subject of numerous articles in recent years,

---

1. Scandinavian and English scholars have emphasised the royal enthronement festival (cf. Mowinckel, Engnell, Johnson, Segal); German scholars have tended to deny this in favour of a festival of covenant-renewal or amphictyonic festival (cf. v. Rad, Noth, Beyerlin) or Zion-festival (Kraus). Cf. the critical discussion of N.Snaith, Jewish New Year Festival.
2. Cf. the works cited in the previous note. K-H Bernhardt, Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im AT., gives a good list of the innumerable articles devoted to this problem. His criteria for a distinctively Israelite non-sacral kingship - namely, the rejection of the identity of God and king, refusal to worship the king, and denial of the king's power over the forces of nature - are insufficient, however.
3. Cf. S. Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien III; G. Widengren, Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets; A. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel; I. Engnell, 'The Call of Isaiah'; W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel.
4. Cf. L. Köhler, Old Testament Theology, pp.181. Cf. P. Volz, Prophetengestalten des AT., p.56. The absence of reference to a separate priesthood within the primitive church of the NT. has - in the hands of dogmatic and systematic theology - also tended to make the place of the priests of less importance than the subject deserves. The Wellhausenian view of the primacy of the prophets in O.T. religion has been a further contributory factor. From the Jewish side, the destruction of the Temple in AD.70 meant not only an end of sacrificing priests but also a lessening of interest in the priesthood of ancient Israel. (This did not apply to Samaritans, of course). Cf. R.Jeremiah, c.AD.300, Sifra 86b on II Sam.vii.19, 'This is Torah for man, O Lord God. And it is not written; this is the Torah for priests, Levites and Israelites'.

but there are still large areas of obscurity and uncertain hypothesis.[1] The present limited study, concentrating on the verbal activity of the priest, is to be seen as part of such a wider undertaking.[2] A traditio-historical examination of the forms of priestly toroth, blessings and cursings, will, it is hoped, shed some slight on certain important aspects of priestly activity and on certain controversial hypotheses regarding the nature of Israelite religion in the pre-exilic period. Although we are given more information

---

1. On torah - J.Begrich, 'Die priesterliche Tora'; G. Östborn, Tora in the OT.; M. Noth, 'Die Gesetze im Pentateuch'; W.Zimmerli, 'Das Gesetz im AT'; G.v.Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I, pp.190-203; 219-231; H-J Kraus, 'Freude an Gottes Gesetz'; E. Robertson, 'Temple and Torah'; H.W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the OT., pp.199-221; van der Ploeg, 'Studies in Biblical Law'; In his foreword to Begrich's Gesammelte Studien W. Zimmerli expresses regret that Begrich was not able to carry through his intended monograph on the concept of tora; 'die darin geplante Aufgabe ist bis heute trotz mehrfacher Bemühung um das Problem der Tora noch keineswegs gelöst'.
   On sacrifice - R.J. Thompson, Penitence and Sacrifice in Early Israel outside the Levitical law; R. de Vaux, Les Sacrifices de l'Ancien Testament; W.B. Stevenson, 'Hebrew 'Olah and Zebach Sacrifices'; L. Rost, 'Erwägungen zum israelitischen Brandopfer'; H.H. Rowley, 'The meaning of sacrifice in the OT.'; N. Snaith, 'Sacrifices in the OT.'; R. Rendtorff, Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im alten Israel (Maschinenschrift).

2. This is still required, despite A.H.J. Gunneweg's Leviten und Priester. He builds on recent studies of the Levites, which have emphasised that in the earliest traditions (Judg.17-18), as in some of the Deuteronomic traditions, the Levite is regarded primarily as a sojourner (ger) who had special connections with the Israelite amphictyony (Judg.19-20). He contrasts priests and Levites even in the pre-Josianic period, saying that the Levites were on the whole not priests, but possessed a special amphictyonic status. The priests, on the other hand, wanted to become Levites in order to obtain a privileged position within the amphictyony. This argument is a stimulating attempt to overcome the difficulties created by the views of Wellhausen; it questions the fundamental assumption that priests and Levites were not distinct in the earliest traditions, whilst accepting that P is a late composition. Unfortunately, such a radical solution, which is attractive in its simplicity (like that of Wellhausen), fails to do justice to the evidence. In particular, the alleged relation of amphictyonic and secular tribe (fundamental to the thesis that Levites were not priests) seems unsubstantiated.

about what the priests did than about what they said,[1] a traditio-historical study of their verbal activity reveals several useful pieces of information.

In view of the importance of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, often criticised[2] but still defended,[3] and in view of the major role of the priesthood in Wellhausen's reconstruction, we shall preface our introductory survey of the material and our approach to it with a closer reference to Wellhausen's views, particularly with regard to torah.

What Wellhausen says about priesthood cannot be separated from his approach to the documents of the OT. In the Introduction to his Prolegomena he refers to the obvious difference between prophetic and narrative portions of the OT. and its legal and cultic sections, and the impression which this made on him as a student.[4] Far from helping him, existing Histories of Israel (e.g. Ewald's History of Israel) only confused him. Then he saw the light. 'At last, in the course of a casual visit in Göttingen in the summer of 1867, I learned through Ritschl that Karl Heinrich Graf placed the Law later than the Prophets, and, almost without knowing his reasons for the hypothesis, I was prepared to accept it; I

---

1. This is especially true of the sacrificial activity of the priest (cf. the rubrics in Leviticus i-vii).

2. E.g. G. Hölscher, Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion, pp. 130-4; A.C. Welch, The Code of Deuteronomy, pp.18f., 165f.; E. Robertson, 'Temple and Torah', pp.34ff.; J. Pedersen, Israel III-IV, pp.725f.

3. E.g. R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the OT., p.141

4. Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel, pp.1-13

readily acknowledged to myself the possibility of understanding Hebrew antiquity without the book of the Torah'.[1] This impression leads to the formulation of the argument which dominates the introduction and which is used to determine the order of the various parts of the OT. - viz. the Law (priestly) is not referred to in the period of the Kings or earlier. In dealing with the place of worship[2] Wellhausen rightly points out that for the earliest period of the history of Israel, all that precedes the building of the Temple, not a trace can be found of any sanctuary of exclusive legitimacy. Even after the Temple was built it was not the only sanctuary. The prophets would have been saved a great deal of trouble if it had been. But his attempt to prove that, because D demands local unity of worship, whereas P presupposes it, only the order J E D P meets the chronological requirements of history, is less convincing, once it is admitted that J E D P are not static or uniform sources but embody oral traditions from different periods. Although he was not unaware of the importance of oral tradition in the formation of the OT., he worked with a rigid dichotomy of pre-exilic/post-exilic and equated P's origin with the date of P's literary fixation. Wellhausen's chronology is strictly applicable only to the final literary redaction. His discussion of the Levites[3] is chiefly concerned to note the discrepancy between P and pre-exilic facts rather than to describe their functions.

---

1. Ibid. p.3. For a rather different reconstruction of early Israelite history showing how the prophets are hardly to be understood except in the light of the Law cf. W. Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets.

2. Ibid. pp.17-52. For a rather different estimate of the relation of Temple and Ark cf. F. Cross, BA x, 3, 1947, pp.45-68; W. Beyerlin, Origin and History of the Earliest Sinai-traditions, pp.114f., 148f. Cf. the following note.

3. Ibid. pp. 121-153.

It is not surprising that Wellhausen maintains that we have very little evidence for the early history of priesthood in Israel. Nevertheless, he does make several interesting comments on Torah in this early period. 'Throughout the whole of the older period the Torah was no finished legislative code, but consisted entirely of the oral decisions and instructions of the priests[1]; as a whole it was potential only; what actually existed were the individual sentences given by the priesthood as they were asked for. Thus Moses was not regarded as the promulgator once for all of a national constitution, but rather as the first to call into activity the actual sense for law and justice, and to begin the series of oral decisions which were continued after him by the priest.'[2]

Since Wellhausen time has brought several considerable changes in the outlook and equipment of OT. scholars. In the first place, the modern

1. The rightness of this view, however, is called in question by W.Zimmerli, The Law and the Prophets, p.42. 'Admittedly the law in the form given to it by the Priestly Document is later than the prophets, but the prophets themselves belonged to a people who traced their origin to the proclamation of the law. Not only were they familiar with it in the form of oral instruction of torah, as Wellhausen accepted, but as a divine law, formulated in awesome statutes and recited at regular intervals in the name of Yahweh.'Examination of the forms of priestly toroth in the present study (pp.49f) confirms the tenacity of certain established forms, but does not determine how soon they were fixed in writing. Hos.viii.12 points to written torah in the 8th cent.B.C. W.Graf Baudissin, although he accepted the critical method and its sigla J E D P, was already seeking to refute some of Wellhausen's theories in 1889, but his greatest difference from Wellhausen lay in his pre-exilic dating for much of P and his inversion of the order of D and P rather than a different picture of priestly functions or a new understanding of priestly toroth.(cf.Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums untersucht, p.132). A.Kuenen, Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Biblischen Wissenschaft,pp.465-500, made a strong reply in the following year to Baudissin's departures from the Wellhausenian schema, but did not attempt to paint a different picture of priestly activity in respect of torah or sacrifice.
2. J. Wellhausen, art. 'Israel' (Encyc.Brit.), reprinted in the Meridian Library edition of the Prolegomena,p.438 and 468. A similar view of the relation of priest and torah is expressed by W.R. Smith, art.'Priest', Encyc.Bib. III, cols.3838f.,Sec.3-4, although he emphasises the connection of the earliest forms of Hebrew priesthood with the Arabian sadin (doorkeeper, guardian of the shrine) rather than the kahin (soothsayer).

student of the OT. is less likely to assume or accept without careful scrutiny certain methodological presuppositions which were common in the 19th cent. and whose application to the OT. was assumed rather than verified. In the late 19th cent. biological evolution and evolutionary method in other disciplines made a great impact on men's ways of thinking.[1] Theology was not immune,[2] and even if Wellhausen pursued a very different method from Vatke, there is no doubt that Wellhausen's methods reflect the assumptions of his period.[3] Hence, because he fails to do justice to the richness of variety in his sources, his history of Israel fails today to satisfy the historical consciousness which he sought to serve.[4] The fossil embedded in a later stratum is not unnoticed, but no serious attempt is made to come to grips with the interplay of different periods of history within the sources that he distinguishes. The picture of early Israel was not only framed and adopted by P; it was also painted by him according to Wellhausen.

---

1. Cf. B. Russell, History of W.Philosophy,p.750, commenting on Darwin's influence.

2. E.g. W. Vatke, Die Religion des AT I,. Cf. L. Perlitt, Vatke und Wellhausen, pp.58f, 159f, 178f, 206f., who seeks to emphasise the difference between Vatke and Wellhausen. Wellhausen stands with Niebuhr, Ranke and Mommsen rather than with Hegel and Schelling, he argues. He concedes that Wellhausen shared some of the 'romantic' presuppositions of his time; cf. J. Barr, Old and New in Interpretation p.180 n.1, p.260 additional note; Like Perlitt, Barr suggests that Wellhausen's work cannot be accounted for on the grounds of Hegelian or evolutionary presuppositions.

3. This does not mean that O.T. scholars today are without suppositions, of course; only that they are less liable to make the mistakes of Wellhausen, cf. the work of Barr cited in the previous note, dealing with, presuppositions of more recent Biblical scholars particularly in respect of the terms 'history' and 'revelation'.

4. Cf. R.J. Thompson, Penitence and Sacrifice in early Israel outside the Levitical Law, p.19 n.1, who questions whether the modern threefold time-scheme of desert, pre-monarchical period and monarchy is sufficiently rich and pliable to do justice to the pre-exilic period of 1,000 years.

The figure of P which emerges is somewhat of a caricature, in spite of certain illuminating insights on the part of Wellhausen. It seems most unlikely that all the contradictions and inaccuracies which Wellhausen discovers can be solved by a simple distinction of pre-exilic and post-exilic documents. This is particularly important in examining a document such as Deuteronomy, which embodies a great number of different traditions from different periods.

Connected with the reaction against over-strict evolutionary theories has beenthe growth of form-criticism and more latterly the traditio-historical viewpoint. One of the foremost pioneers of form-criticism was H. Gunkel in his researches into the Psalms and Genesis.[2] By stressing the power of custom and oral tradition in the shaping of later literary forms and by calling attention to the Sitz im Leben of such forms, which have a pre-literary history, Gunkel broke through - at least in principle - the documentary Wellhausenian scheme. The form-critical approach was developed further by Gressmann[3] and Alt[4], in their studies of Mosaic traditions and Pentateuchal legal material respectively. Alt's work will be discussed more fully in connection with our examination of Dt. xxvii. At this point we need only refer to the way in which he sought to penetrate behind the literary

---

1. Eg. Prolegomena, pp.171 & 182: '... the difference of spirit (between Kings and Chronicles) arises from the influence of the Priestly Code. ... See what Chronicles has made out of David! The founder of the kingdom has become the founder of the Temple and public worship, the king and hero at the head of his companions in arms has become the singer and master of ceremonies at the head of a swarm of priests and Levites; his clearly cut figure has become a feeble holy picture, seen through a cloud of incense.'
2. Genesis, HK 1/1, 1910; Die Psalmen HK, 1926.
3. Mose und seine Zeit.
4. Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts.

document to the original living tradition and show how the Pentateuch contains two very different types of legal material (short, urgent apodeictic prohibitions which were genuinely Israelite and connected with Israel's worship, and longer casuistic clauses which were very similar to what was found among Israel's neighbours and were administered by 'the men at the gate') which do not correspond fully to the literary documents in which they now stand. Alt's distinctions have been severely attacked recently, and, as we shall see, they must be modified; they do, however, contain an important element of truth (cf. p. 68 above). Begrich's form-critical essays on priestly torah and priestly 'Heilsorakel', which seek to exclude the priest, at least in the pre-exilic period, from a more than ritual competence, seem to illustrate the weaknesses, however, of a purely form-critical approach (cf. pp. 87 fabove); hypothetical forms are invented and false conclusions drawn.

Form-criticism in the hands of these and other scholars has been closely linked with two other equally important developments in the study of the OT., namely the growing amount of evidence (especially as a result of archaeological discovery) relating to neighbouring cultures[1] and a growing realisation of the cultic roots of life in the ancient Near-East generally and in ancient Israel also.[2] There is plenty of evidence on both these points within the OT. itself, but it is only in recent years that it has been more fully appreciated. Israel's geographical position between the fertile

---

1. The importance of the finds at Mari, Nuzi, Amarna and Ras Shamra is described in most modern histories of ancient Israel, cf. M. Noth, History of Israel; J. Bright, A History of Israel; G.E. Wright, Biblical Archaeology.

2. Cf. p.1 n.3 and p.2 nn.1-2, above.

Mesopotamian river-valleys, an area of successive great empires, and the two lands of the Nile, ruled over by various Egyptian dynasties, has always underlined the possibility of political and cultural influence from both these areas. But the extent of this influence on Israel's religion has never been discussed with any degree of unanimity. Some scholars have derived most of Israel's ideas and institutions from Babylon[1] or Egypt[2]; others have been equally emphatic about the uniqueness of Israelite religion[3]. Slowly but surely, however, archaeological discoveries and further research have been modifying the views of extremists and clarifying both the range of Israel's borrowing and the distinctiveness of Israel's faith. The discovery of material at Ras Shamra and the resultant picture of Ugaritic life and literature[4], although it is still controversial in detail, have been responsible for the most decisive re-orientation of OT. studies[5]. The Canaanite environment was undoubtedly the most immediate external influence on Israel and we are now in a better position than ever before to assess this. Unfortunately there are only infrequent references to ' priests '[6] in what has been discovered so

---

1. Eg. H. Winckler, Geschichte Israels; Religionsgeschichtler und geschichtlicher Orient.

2. Eg. some of the worksof Gressmann; E.H. Sugden, Israel's debt to Egypt.

3. Eg. B.D. Eerdmans.

4. Cf. Ugaritic Handbook, Manual, Grammar, Literature of C.H. Gordon; J. Nougayrol, Le palais royal d'Ugarit IVf; for a brief selection of the voluminous secondary literature cf. J. Gray, The Legacy of Canaan.

5. Cf. W.F. Albright in OTMS p.33 and in Peake's Commentary (1962) sec.49a

6. Ugaritic priests are most frequently mentioned in administrative texts and are not mentioned in connection with the sacrifices referred to in ritual and epic texts. Cf.D.Urie,'Officials of the cult at Ugarit',PEQ 80,1948,pp.42f.

far at Ras Shamra, but this is probably fortuitous in view of the great deal of material relating to sacrifice. There is, at any rate, sufficient material from other surrounding cultures to show that priests were often charged with pronouncing blessing, curse or law, as well as officiating at sacrifices.

The importance of the cult was stressed by Mowinckel in his Psalmenstudien and succeeding works[1], and although his arguments have not convinced all scholars the majority now concede the importance of the cult for a true understanding of the documents of the OT. and the life of Israel[2]. Mowinckel has consistently advocated the cultic interpretation of the Psalms and has applied what he himself calls a 'cult functional' method of approach. Cult is defined as 'the socially established and regulated holy acts and words in which the encounter and communion of the Deity with the congregation is established, developed and brought to its ultimate goal.'[3] A cult-functional approach means that content as well as form is interpreted from the point of view of its cultic Sitz im Leben. In the cult something happens. 'What the congregation wants to achieve through the cult, and what the "power" from God is to create, is life (and blessing). Blessing is to be created, increased and secured through the cult; the office of the priest is to "bless in Yahweh's name". Both life and blessing have their ultimate source in the Deity.'[4] All this has obvious reference to the theme of our study (cf. esp. pp.15-34).

These insights into the sway of methodological presuppositions, the pre-literary form and structure of our present texts, the influence of neighbouring

---

1. Religion und Kultus; He that Cometh; The Psalms in Israel's Worship.
2. Cf. I.P. Seierstad, Teologi og kirke, 1/34, 1963, pp.33f.
3. The Psalms in Israel's Worship I, p.15
4. Ibid. p.17

cultures on Israel and the significance of the cult have enabled successive scholars to build up a rather different picture of Israelite religion and the Biblical sources than that obtained by Wellhausen.[1]

Writing on the priestly office in 1931 Bentzen was already able to incorporate some of these advantages.[2] Starting from a suggestion of Mowinckel and Hall regarding the hypocoristic name of Zadok (and Nathan) in I. K.i.8 he uses Ps. cx. and Gen. xiv.18-20 to build up a picture of a native Canaanite (Jebusite) priesthood belonging to the defeated king of Jerusalem who were taken over by David as Temple-personnel.[3] David's reign becomes the history of various struggles for power. The period is characterised by struggles between the king and the priests of Jerusalem and between the priests of Jerusalem and the non-Jerusalemite priests. With Solomon the Zadokites begin to oust the Israelite priests who are banished to Anathoth. Deuteronomy is a programme of religious reform stemming from the non-Jerusalemite Levitical priests, who were influenced by early prophetic ideals prevalent in N.Israel as well as by a growing monotheism and by the idea that the shrine was the 'navel' of the earth'.[4] P., a party document sponsored by the Zadokites, claiming descent from Aaron and making biassed recommendations in favour of their own coterie, is also a programme of religious reform - to rebut those of D.[5] Bentzen

---

1. Cf. the works of Alt, Noth, v.Rad, Albright etc. Differences of interpretation, especially in detail, still remain, of course.

2. Det zadokidiske praesteskabs historie.

3. The objection of K.Budde, 'Die Herkunft Sadoks', ZAW 1934, pp.42-50, based on the view that Ps. cx is Maccabaean, is beside the mark. The reading [illegible] in II.Sam.Vi.3,4 is without support. On the other hand, Rowley's interpretation of Ps. cx ('Melchizedek and Zadok', Bertholet Festschrift 1950, pp.461-72) cannot be regarded as more than conjectural. Cf. the different suggestion of Ahlström, VT 13, 1963, pp.113f. Cf. also M.Noth, 'Gott, König, Volk im AT', Ges. Studien, pp. 188-230.

4. Ibid. p.28

5. Ibid, p.39

is well aware of the interplay and conflict of different traditions within our documentary sources and of the place of the cult and Jerusalem in Israel's history, but the role and functions of the pre-monarchical priesthood were not examined, and he later devoted his attention to other aspects of Hebrew religious history.[1]

Brief reference must also be made to the reconstructions of J. Morgenstern, who in a series of monographs has written what is virtually a history of Israel's priesthood.[2] But in so far as it is a development of the documentary views of Wellhausen and consigns the power of the priest to the post-exilic period, it requires no separate discussion here.[3]

It is clear, therefore, that in spite of great advances in our understanding of Hebrew history and religion, there is still much work to be done in connection with the priestly office in ancient Israel.[4] It is to this need that the present work is directed.

---

1. Eg. sacral kingship in King and Messiah.

2. 'The three calendars of ancient Israel', HUCA 1924; 'Supplementary studies in the calendars of ancient Israel', HUCA 1935; 'The Book of the Covenant', Pts. I - II, HUCA 1930-2; 'Amos Studies', HUCA 1936-8; 'The Ark, The Ephod and the Tent of Meeting', HUCA 1942-3.

3. Morgenstern distinguishes between an earlier and a later strand within the P. code. In the earlier, adapted by P from J, the name for the tabernacle in the wilderness is the 'tent of meeting'; in the later strand the tabernacle is called the 'dwelling place' (miškan) and the imagery is that of the temple restored in 404 BC., when a period of religious tolerance began with the accession of Artaxerxes II. Historical support for these conjectures is not strong, however, and there is little within the present text of the OT. to suggest these late dates.

4. Cf. G.v.Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol.I.p.71 n.5 "..Today we are further than ever from any knowledge of the life and activity of the pre-exilic Levites, and of their cultic functions and their history". Cf. also A.H.J. Gunneweg, Leviten und Priester, p.80, 'Schwieriger ist es, die Funktionen und Aufgaben des Levitentums zu ermitteln'; He does, however, rightly point to the Levites as 'guardians of legal traditions'. It should also be added that despite his pessimism about the Levites G.v.Rad has elucidated certain forms of priestly toroth (cf. pp. 98f. below).

The scope and plan of our examination is as follows. We shall first consider the meaning of blessing in general and examine certain priestly blessings invoked, a) upon the individual, b) upon the community gathered in worship. Discussion of priestly blessings at the end of an act of covenant-making will be deferred and treated in conjunction with priestly cursings. Examination of the meaning and function of curses in general and of priestly curses invoked upon the individual will be followed by a detailed study of Dt.xxvii.15f., where curses are pronounced by Levites on the gathered people. This will lead to a comparison of Dt.xxvii and 'apodeictic' laws in the law-codes of the OT., which will involve a discussion of the much contested judicial activity of the priest. We shall then turn to an examination of the forms of priestly ritual toroth. The alleged connection of Dt.xxvii with a festival of covenant renewal will lead to a fresh examination of the curses and blessings in Dt.xxviii. Finally we shall draw together what we have been able to glean about priesthood in ancient Israel through a study of the forms of priestly blessings, curses and toroth.

BLESSING

'Blessing' (b^{e}rākāh) in ancient Israel was related to every aspect of life and included everything that was valued in those days - long life, health, prosperity, children, flocks, herds, prowess in battle, wisdom and the ability to give good counsel. It signified both 'the inner strength of the soul' [1] and also God's presence. King David is a good example of a man whose soul is full of blessing, full of wisdom and good counsel, able to communicate blessing to others: this is because God is 'with him'.[1a] The blessing is never inappropriate, but always supplies what is needed and required (cf. Gen. xlix. 28). At the same time there are common traits, seen in the frequent connection of blessing and the charge to 'multiply and be fruitful' (cf. Gen.i.28; ix.1; xii.2; xvii.6; xxiv.60; xxvi.24; xxviii.3; xlviii.16; xlix.25; cf.xxx.30; I S.ii.20)[2]. For a woman to have children and for a man to get himself a house (i.e. to ensure the continued existence of name and family) was a great blessing.[3] The connection of blessing and fertility is quite pronounced (cf. Gen.xii.2; xxviii.3; xlviii.16; xlix.25; Job.xxi.8-13; xlii.12; cf. Ex.xxiii.25-6; Dt.vii.12-14; xi.14-5; xxviii.1-13; Lev.xxv.21).[4]

---

1. J. Pedersen, Israel I-II, p.182.

1a. David also typifies the man under the curse in II S.xii.14; xxiv.1f. Cf. A. Carlson, David the Chosen King, for a traditio-historical study of II Samuel, based on the theme of 'David under the Blessing/Curse'.

2. Cf. C. Westermann, Forschung am AT., p.33, 'In einer ausserordentlich reichen und vielfältigen Traditionsgeschichte haben die drei Grundelemente: Verheissung eines Sohnes - Verheissung des Landes - Segen und Mehrung --- das Werden und Wachsen der Vätergeschichte bestimmt'.

3. Cf. F. Horst, Gottes Recht, pp.194f.

4. Cf. also the Keret epic and the tale of Aqhat from Ras Shamra, ANET, p.146 A, 150B; cf. also the building inscription of Azitawadda of Adama (9-8th cent. BC.). ANET p.500A; and the Hittite prayer for the king, ANET, p.397B.

Other recurrent manifestations of blessing are wealth and prosperity (cf. Gen. xxvi.12; xxvii.27) and success in war (Gen. xxvii.29; Num.xxiv.17; Gen. xlix.8-12). Pedersen, who summarises these common traits as 'fertility, prosperity and victory' concludes that blessing is 'the kernel of life, the very life itself' (cf. Dt. xxx.19).[1] J.Hempel comes to a similar conclusion, although expressing it rather differently; 'If one seeks a comprehensive formula which includes everything that the ancient Oriental desired by "blessing" for himself, his family and his people, there is only one word possible: šālôm'[2], i.e. man's highest welfare.

It is significant, however, that the privilege of blessing is particularly linked with certain groups of people. He who blesses gives something of his own soul and the man who is not possessed of the blessing can create nothing in others,[3] although it must be added that 'the transferability of the blessing also depends on the receptivity of the one who is being blessed'.[4] Blessing is communicated by fathers to their children[5] (Gen. xxvii.4,7,10,19;23,25,27,33,38,41; xxviii.1,6; xxxii.1; xlviii.9,15,20; xlix.18; II S.vi.20; I Chron. xvi.43), by kings

---

1. Op. cit., p.210

2. J. Hempel, 'Die israelitische Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte altorientalischer Parallelen', Apoxysmata p.58, n.134.

3. J. Pedersen, op.cit., p.200.

4. S.Mowinckel. The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II, p.45

5. Gen.xxiv.60 seems to be an instance of mother and son blessing but is not clear. It may refer to the group as a whole (cf.Gen.xlviii.20). It should also be added that 'fathers' refers almost entirely to Abraham and the patriarchs; once to King David.

to their people (II S.vi.18; I K.viii.14,55; I Chron.xvi.2), by Moses[1] and Aaron (Ex.xxxix.43; Lev.ix.22; Dt.xxxiii.1), by Joshua[2] (Josh.xiv.13; xxii.7), and not least by the priests[3] (Num.vi.23; Dt.x.8; Judg.xviii.6; I S.i.17; ii.20; Ps.cxviii.26b; cxxix.8; cxxv.5; cxxii.8; II Chron.xxx.27; Mal.ii.2). There is no mention, however, of prophets[4] using a blessing formula, although their message may herald salvation and peace. Nor is there any instance of things or objects being blessed by men, although Yahweh may fill inanimate objects with blessing (cf. Ex.xxiii.25-6; Ps.lxv.10) and a gift may be a blessing (cf. II K.v.15). J. Hempel adduces II S.vi.11 to show how an inanimate object may in turn communicate its blessing to men[5], but it is instructive that the text states that the Lord (not the Ark) blessed Obededom, although the Ark was undoubtedly regarded as a sign of God's presence and, therefore, blessing.

---

1. Moses, Aaron and Joshua are linked together as 'Bundesmittler' by Scharbert, ~~op.cit.p.23~~ 'Segen und Fluch im AT.' ,Bib.39, 1958,p.23. This term, taken over by Scharbert from M. Noth and H-J. Kraus, does not solve any problems, however, until it is clear who performed the functions of 'Bundesmittler'. The figure of Moses is frequently regarded as royal (cf. J.R. Porter, Moses and Monarchy) as well as prophetic (cf. H-J Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel), but it may equally well be priestly (cf.G.B.Gray, Sacrifice in the OT.).

2. Joshua also displays both royal and priestly traits.

3. Cf. A.Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets among the ancient Semites, p.64 n.4. The pronouncement of imprecation and benediction formulae are typical features of priestly activity, cf. G. Widengren, Psalms p.299.

4. Cf. J. Scharbert op.cit p.23, Contra J. Hempel, op.cit., p.87, who says that the charisma of blessing is even stronger in the case of seers and prophets than in the case of the inherited priesthood. As typical prophets, however, he quotes Moses and Samuel (cf. Dt.xxxiii.1., Ex.xxxix.43., I S.ix.13 see below p.20) "In der prophetischen Fürbitte lebt dieser prophetische Segen weiter." He does not, however, quote any other instances than those referred to. "Prophetische Segen" must be considered an ill-chosen phrase and the conclusion fallacious.

5. Op.cit., p.55

Ultimately, blessing is always an act of God. This is rightly stressed by Scharbert[1]; in contrast to those (e.g. Hempel and Mowinckel) who link blessing more closely with a self-working magical power. It is doubtful, however, whether Scharbert's interpretation of I S.ix.13, where it is clearly stated that Samuel, who is elsewhere described as a Levite and who perfoms priestly tasks, 'used to bless the sacrifice', is correct.[2] Against Mowinckel[3] and Hempel, for instance, he urges that this is a misuse of blessing language by the maidens and is preserved as such by the author of the tradition. It attributes a far greater degree of sophistication to the tradentthan seems probable. At any rate, even Scharbert would have to admit that 'the blessing of a sacrifice' was not alien to popular thought. The suspicion that Scharbert does not do justice to the priestly blessing, however, is further strengthened by his interpreation of Num.vi.27. Desiring to stress that blessing is always an act of God he says that Num.vi.27 shows that the Aaronite blessing is 'nur ein Gebet um Segen, den Gott bewähren muss'.[4] But, in fact, Num.vi.27 says that by their words (vi.24-6) the priests 'put God's name on the people of Israel'. This is the equivalent of God's 'I bless'. There is no suggestion that God might separate his blessing from the priestly blessing, just as it would be equally mistaken to imagine that the priest could pronounce a blessing apart from Yahweh.

---

1. Op.cit., p.23f.
2. Op.cit.,p.24. There is of course, no dispute that priests 'consecrated' objects (qādaš).
3. The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II, p.47
4. Op.cit., p.23

Because Yahweh is the source of all blessing it is natural that 'the holy place where Yahweh "lives" is the home of all blessing' (cf. Ps. cxxxiii.3; Ezk.xlviii; Ps.xlvi.5).[1] Hence, too, the natural place of the blessing in the cult and its mediation by the priest. 'To procure, secure and increase "the blessing", that was the object of the temple services in Israel, put in a nutshell'.[2]

In view of the way that blessing was mediated it is also natural that other great assemblies, cultic or otherwise, should conclude with a blessing 'so that everyone may take away with him the strength of the community' (Josh. xxii.7; II S. vi.18; I K. viii.66).[3]

Sometimes the object of blessing is God himself. 'Blessed be God who ---' (I Chron. xxix.10; Ps.cxix.12, etc.). In these cases barak seems to mean 'to praise' or 'to speak well of' rather than 'bless'.[4] Man is acknowledging Yahweh as the source of all blessing. Similarly, the king may be blessed by his subjects; the great and the strong by the weaker.

Gifts and presents, greetings and leave-takings are described as 'blessings' because they represent and communicate the strength and value of the person or psyche of the giver or the traveller (cf. II K. iv.29; Josh. xiv.13; Gen.xxxiii.11; I S. xxv.18-27; II K. x.15; II S. xix.39).

---

1. Mowinckel, op.cit., p.46.
2. Ibid., p.46.
3. Pedersen, op.cit., p.203.
4. Scharbert, op.cit., p.18.

PRIESTLY BLESSINGS

In dealing with priestly blessings we shall consider first those which were pronounced upon an individual or group of individuals in a specific situation. One such instance is recorded in I Sam. ii.20, where Eli is stated to have blessed Samuel's parents, Elkanah and Hannah, each year when they came to Shiloh, with a present of clothing for their child, to offer sacrifice to Yahweh. The words of the blessing were as follows:

Yāśēm yhwh l^{e}ḵā zeraʿ
min-hā'iššāh hazzō't taḥaṯ haššʾ^{e}ʾēlāh
ʾ^{a}šer šā'al layhwh.

The blessing consists of a wish or prayer, of which God is the subject ('may he grant ---') concluded by a brief relative clause defining the preceding clause more fully.

There is a similar form of words in I Sam. i.17, where Eli tells Hannah, who has been praying in great distress, that she may 'go in peace':

l^{e}ḵî l^{e}šālôm
w'ēlōhê yiśrāēl yittēn ʾeṯ-šēlāṯēk
ʾ^{a}šer šā'alt mē'immô.

This last passage is described by Zimmerli[1] as one of the finest narrative examples of Begrich's priestly 'Heilsorakel' (= 'Erhörungsorakel').[2]

---

1. Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel', Ges.Stud., p.82

2. 'Das priesterliche Heilsorakel', Ges.Stud., pp.217-32. For the identification of 'Heilsorakel' and 'Erhörungsorakel' cf. Begrich, Stud.zu Dt-Is., p.14.

If this is true, it would seem to suggest that there is no essential difference (of form or content?) between priestly 'Heilsorakel' and priestly blessing in certain situations. Unfortunately, Begrich's article is limited to a collation of passages from the Psalms and Dt.-Is., so that even if his demonstration of the complementary nature of the individual lament and the promissory exhortations of Dt.-Is. is correct, we are given no solid evidence that the prophet was indeed using a form of speech specially borrowed from the priesthood.[1] Even if Begrich's analysis is correct[2], therefore, it is not possible to build on it as a complete description of the priestly 'Heilsorakel'.[3] One of the essential criteria of Begrich's priestly 'Heilsorakel', namely that it must be a direct word of Yahweh himself (in the first person singular)[4] is not found in I Sam.i.17.

---

1. It is difficult to denote the phrase 'fear not' as specifically priestly in view of the lexicographical evidence. The phrase occurs chiefly in the narrative literature of the Pentateuch, in Dt.-Is. and in Jer., and is completely absent in the Psalms (cf. S. Plath, Furcht Gottes, p.122). It is the natural response of the adviser or helper to the person in difficulty (e.g. the midwife to the woman in travail - Gen.xxxv.17, I Sam.iv.20; the leader to his people and fighting men - Num.xiv.9, Dt.i.21,29; the king to his subjects - I Sam.xxviii.13, II Sam.ix.7; and hence used of God's word of reassurance to those in distress or those whom he commissions - Num.xxi.34, Josh.viii.1, II K.i.15). It is not surprising, therefore, to find that the priest also uses the phrase - Dt.xx.3; but to regard it as specifically priestly is hardly justified.

2. Begrich has clearly established the formal connection of the individual lament and the affirmations of Dt.-Is.. But he is not entitled to infer from this that Dt.-Is. was coveting priestly respect and authority.

3. Account would also have to be taken of the change of mood in the Psalms, a fact to which Begrich (following Küchler and Gunkel) drew attention.

4. Ges, Stud., p.219.

Is, then, Zimmerli's classification of I Sam.i.17 as a priestly 'Erhörungsorakel' at fault?[1] The evidence of Judg. xviii.6 suggests not. A group of Danites scouting for a place in which their tribe might settle seek lodging with Micah, who has recently acquired a Levite as priest. The Danites ask the Levite priest to 'inquire' of God that we may know whether the journey on which we are setting out will succeed'. And the priest said to them:

l^e_kû l^eᵛšālôm
nōḵaḥ yhwh dark^e_kem
ʾaᵛšer tēl^e_kû-bāh.

The form is not exactly the same as Eli's reply to Hannah in I Sam.i.17, but it is very similar - a brief imperative ('go in peace'), followed by a statement (or promise?) in Judg.xviii.6 and by a wish or prayer in I S.i.17, concluded by a brief relative clause defining the preceding clause more fully. It seems clear, therefore, that Zimmerli is justified in describing I Sam.i.17 as a priestly oracle. On the other hand, there seems nothing specifically priestly about the vocabulary or form of the above statements; they might easily be regarded as general religious utterances,[2] and it might be expected that similar sentences would occur elsewhere in the OT. In fact, however, there are only three other instances of the phrase 'go in peace'[3] (using hālak and l^eᵛšālôm), namely Ex.iv.18, I Sam.xx.42; and

1. Zimmerli's example does not comply with the formal criteria proposed by Begrich.
2. As examples of wishes in which Yahweh is the subject of the active verb cf. Num.xi.29; Dt.i.11; II Sam.xxiv.3. Cf. too the blessings on p.25f. - Ps.xxix.11; cxv.14; cxxviii.5; cxxxiv.3; Gen.xxviii.3.
3. There are, of course, several other instances of 'go in peace' in the English versions (eg. Gen.xliv.17; I Sam.xxv.35; xxix.7; II Sam.iii.21-3; xv.9; I K.xx.18; xxii.17; Jer.xliii.12 and II Chron.xviii.27). But these sentences are construed with b^eᵛšālôm, which more often means 'peacably', or with ʾālāh. Nor are they followed by a succeeding prayer or wish. They are not, therefore, exactly parallel to the priestly blessings adduced above.

II K.v.19. In Ex.iv.18 the speaker is Jethro, the Midianite priest, in I Sam.xx.42 it is Jonathan, who has just entered into a solemn covenant with David, and in II K.v.19 the words are used by Elisha, the man of God. In Ex.iv.18 and II K.v.19, however, there is nothing beyond the words 'go in peace' In no case is there an exact parallel to the form we find in Judg.xviii.6 and I Sam.i.17. It may be accidental that no further parallels occur in which no priest is mentioned, but there is at least a strong suspicion that this may not be the case.

In I Sam.ii.20 the introductory imperative 'go in peace' is missing and the verb precedes the subject, but the sentence is otherwise closely parallel to I Sam.i.17. I Sam.ii.20, however, is introduced as a priestly 'blessing', a term which is not inappropriate to I Sam.i.17 and Judg.xviii.6. (although the word 'blessing' is not used). If this is true it would seem to suggest there was no essential difference between the priestly blessing given in specific situations and the priestly 'Heilsorakel'.[1]

It is difficult to assess the extent or importance of such individual priestly blessings in the total activity of a priest. They may represent quite a large part of the work of the local priest who was responsible for superintending the local shrine and delivering oracles.[2] On the other hand,

---

1. We are not, of course, referring here to the liturgical priestly blessing pronounced on the community at worship.

2. Whether the alleged 'oracles' in the Psalms were delivered by a priest or cultic prophet lies outside the scope of the present theme. The evidence is indecisive but points perhaps to the priest. Cf. N. Porteous, 'Prophet and Priest in Ancient Israel', ET lxii. 1950/1, pp.4f. "May we not suppose there was a cumulation of functions in the case of the priests, so that, to adopt Mowinckel's terminology, they were capable of carrying out both the sacrificial and sacramental parts of the cult?" There is no question, however, of a cultic prophet pronouncing the blessings to which we shall turn.

the blessing pronounced upon the community gathered in worship is more fully attested in the Psalms.

One of the tasks reserved exclusively for the priests at a later period in Jewish history was this liturgical blessing.[1] One of the oldest forms of this blessing that has come down to us is that preserved in Num. vi.24-6, which is generally regarded as embodying ancient material, even if its present form reflects later liturgical tradition.[2] In view of the tenacity of liturgical practice, however, even the form may be equally ancient.[3]

The text of Num.vi.24-6 is as follows:

y^{e}bārek^{e}kā yhwh w^{e}yišm^{e}rekā

yā'ēr yhwh pānāw 'ēl^{e}kā wiḥunnekā

yiśśā' yhwh pānāw 'ēl^{e}kā w^{e}yāśēm l^{e}kā šālôm.

The strong rhythm and parallelism of the blessing is immediately obvious. It is built up of a steadily mounting sequence 3/5/7, culminating with great force in the final word šālôm. Each of the three clauses consists of two

---

1. Cf. Mishnah, Tamid vii.2; cf.Sir.50.20f.
2. Cf. G.Gray, Numbers, p.71-4. 'The blessing is introduced by a formula characteristic of P (" -the Lord said to Moses, 'Say to Aaron and his sons -'"). But while it formed part of P, there neither has been nor can be much doubt felt that it was not composed by P, and that is is consequently of earlier origin than the date of its incorporation in P. The linguistic affinities (and indeed the general tenor and feeling) of the blessing, while they decisively distinguish it from P, relate it to the Psalms. -- It is probable then, that the blessing is pre-exilic in origin; -- a citation from an early Psalm, as Addis suggests, or more probably a blessing actually used in the Temple at Jerusalem before the exile.'
3. Cf. A.Bentzen, Introduction to the OT., I, p.186:

> Ea rejoice over thee
> Damkine, the queen of the ocean, illumine thee by her face,
> Marduk, the prince of the gods, raise up thy head.

It is possible to see here the origin of the threefold structure of Num.vi. 24-6? In this case an original polytheistic blessing has been transformed in the hands of the Israelite priests. There is,however, at least one other threefold blessing in the OT., namely Gen.xlviii.16-20(E), of which G.v.Rad, Genesis, p.412 says,"It begins solemnly with a wide-ranging, threefold invocation of God. Its style is that of a cultic hymn". It may be, therefore, that Num.vi.24-6 stems from the hymn tradition without having polytheistic roots. It is significant that this hymn tradition is well represented both in the patriarchal narratives and in the Psalms. In either case Jerusalem seems to be indicated as the sustainer of the tradition.

optative verbs, the subject each time being Yahweh. If this form of blessing were regularly used in the cult we should expect to find some trace of it, either in the colouring of language or in the influencing of form, elsewhere in the OT., even though the exact words of the blessing are only quoted in Num.vi.24-6. This is, in fact, what we find. Ps.lxvii, once used as a harvest-festival thanksgiving hymn with a refrain in vv.3 and 5, is perhaps the clearest example of the influence of the form and language of the Aaronite Blessing. Ps.lxxx, possibly a community lament recited at the central amphictyonic shrine as a result of losses of territory under Hoshea,[1] the last king of N.Israel, also reflects the same influence. Ps.iv.2 and 7 is another example.

It is not difficult to trace other shorter liturgical priestly blessings with the help of Num.vi.24-6. Whether these preceded or followed Numvi is impossible to say in view of the fact that most of them are found in Psalms which admit of no precise dating.[2] In their present form they show how Yahweh's blessing has become linked with Jerusalem.[3]

Both Ps.cxxviii.5, most probably a Wisdom psalm describing the blessings of family life, and cxxxiv.3 which concludes the Book of Pilgrim Songs and appeals to the priests or Levites(?) to 'bless' Yahweh by singing songs of praise, use identical words to link Yahweh's blessing with his dwelling on Zion (ie. in the Temple):

y^{e}bārek^{e}kā yhwh miṣṣiyyôn

1. Cf. A. Weiser, Psalms, p.547; O.Eissfeldt, Alt Festschrift, pp.65f.

2. Liebreich, 'The Song of Ascents and the Priestly Blessing', JBL 74, pp.33-6, simply assumes that Ps.120-135 are based on the Priestly Blessing. He then points out similarities of phraseology.

3. Cf. J.Schreiner, 'Segen für die Völker', BZ NF 6, 1962, pp.1-31. Cf. R.E. Clements, God and Temple, pp.50f. and 75-6.

The first two words correspond to the opening words of Num.vi., 24. Whether Num.vi. 24f. is an expansion and development of Ps.cxxviii.5, or Ps.cxxviii.5 an abbreviation of Num.vi.24, the connecting link in the tradition seems to be Jerusalem. Ps.cxxxiii.3 (another Wisdom psalm, relating the blessing of family life to the blessing that emanates from Yahweh's temple in Jerusalem) picks up the word Zion and concludes:

kî šām ṣiwwāh yhwh 'eṯ-habbᵉrāḵāh ḥayyîm 'aḏ-hā'ôlām.

The first two of these psalms close with a liturgical blessing spoken by the priest.[1] Another passage linking yᵉbārekᵉkā yhwh with Jerusalem is Jer.xxxi.23[2]:

yᵉbārekᵉkā yhwh nᵉwēh-ṣeḏeḳ har-haḳḳoḏeš

There seems little doubt that yᵉbārekᵉkā yhwh miṣṣîôn was a well-established form of priestly blessing.[3] So also bēraknûkem mibbēṯ yhwh (Ps.cxviii.26).

The third word of Num.vi.24-6 (wᵉyišmᵉrekā) also points to the existence of another priestly blessing. šāmar can refer to those who look after sheep,

---

1. Cf.p.25 n.2. There is no question of a cultic prophet here.

2. Weiser, Jeremiah, ATD, p.291 contests the view (e.g. Hyatt, IB 5, p.1034f.) that the verses must be secondary because of their message of restoration for Judah (cf.iii.16; vii.10; xvii.12). 'Die Heilsweissagung hat hier die Form eines „Segenswunsches", die uns aus der liturgischen Poesie bekannt ist (cf.Ps.125.5; 134.3) --Da Jeremia in v.23 einen liturgischen Segenswusch verwendet, ist es nicht sicher, ob die Predikate „Aue des Heils" (seḏeḳ) und „heiliger Berg" eigene Prägungen des Propheten oder aus der Kultsprache übernommene Wendungen sind.'

3. Ruth ii.4, where the people, in response to Boaz' greeting (yhwh 'immākem), say yᵉbarekᵉkā yhwh, uses the phrase purely as a greeting. Cf.II K.iv.29; x.15. A contrasting phenomenon is to be found in Ps.cxv.15, which belongs to the type 'bārûk 'attāh/ 'attem', used in I S.xv.13, xxiii.21, xxv.35, xxvi.25, II S.ii.5 & Ruth iii.10 of a greeting. Ps.cxv.15, however, is clearly not simply a greeting but a priestly blessing.

a garden, away, etc., and is used of God keeping Israel like a shepherd in Jer.xxxi.10. In Ps.cxxi šāmar is used six times within a brief compass, on each occasion referring to God's guardianship of Israel. The psalm was used as a pilgrim song, even if it was not originally composed as such. The interpretation of the dialogue is uncertain, but probably involved a priestly response in the form of a blessing,[1] delivered perhaps at the entrance to the shrine or in the context of the cult (cf. Ps.xxiv.5).

Num.vi.24-6 culminates in šālôm, which, as we have already indicated, sums up the whole content of blessing. It is not impossible, therefore, that the final words of Ps.cxxv and cxxviii (cf. Ps.cxxii.8), 'peace be in Israel' were spoken by a priest and represent a brief concluding priestly blessing.

So far we have used Num.vi.24-6 to trace the existence of other blessing formulas. We have noted their connection with Jerusalem. We shall now investigate the interaction of Num.vi.24-6 and traditions of blessing at Jerusalem more closely by means of Ps.lxvii.

---

1. Cf. Weiser, Psalms, p.746: 'We can think either of a conversation between a father and his son or of the comfort, intercession, promise and blessing which a priest gives in response to the question of a man who asks for his help; this latter view is supported by a certain liturgical and solemn ring about the answer.'

One of the significant features about the distribution of b^{e}rākāh in the O.T. is the predominance of Genesis and the Psalms.[1] At first sight the connection between the blessings of Genesis and the Psalter is far from obvious. The differences are more striking. In Genesis they are usually pronounced by God or the patriarchs and relate to fertility, prosperity and material success. In the Psalms their cultic context points to a priest having pronounced them and they are, as we have already seen from some examples, connected with Jerusalem. The specific content of the blessings is rarely stated so explicitly as in the Patriarchal narratives, where the theme of blessing is not only like a silver cord binding everything together,[2] but is also vividly described with a wealth of detail.

It has long been recognised that the blessing of Abraham in Gen.xii.2-3 represents a decisive point in the construction of Genesis.[3] It comes at the end of a mounting series of curses which have culminated in the confusion

---

1. 83 times in Genesis; 73 times in Psalms; 194 times elsewhere; the majority of these remainder are in Deuteronomy.

2. Cf. Gen.xxiv.35f.; xxvii.27f.; xxviii.3-4; xlix.1f.

3. Budde, Die biblische Urgeschichte, p.409; G.v.Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch (ĢGes,Stud.p.72)

of Babel; in Gen.v.29 and viii.21[1] the curse is partly stayed but it is only finally overcome at the point where 'Urgeschichte' is taken up into 'Heilsgeschichte', namely Gen.xii. Thereafter blessing predominates over curse.[2]

H.W. Wolff has recently sought to show how Gen.xii.3 represents the quintessence of the missionary 'kerygma' of the Yahwist ('Abraham-Israel is to be a blessing to the nations') and how this message is expounded in our present Tetrateuch.[3] In the course of this he draws attention to the way in which the Yahwist picks up and adapts older material.[4] The tradition of the promised land ('Landverheissung') must certainly have ranked among the traditions available for the Yahwist to draw upon, but it remains singularly undeveloped, compared with the tradition of the promised people ('Nachkommenverheissung'); 'Abraham is to become a great people'. This, says Wolff, was certainly not the invention of the Yahwist but refers back to older material (e.g. Gen.xxiv.34-6, 60; xxvi.24 (J); xxii.17 (Rje); xlviii.15(E); (xxviii.3(P)).[5] Beginning with the old family blessing in which the word itself was powerful and effective (cf. Gen.xxiv.34-6), Wolff traces the development of the Yahwist's message via the tradition of Gen.xxvii.29(=Num.xxiv.9)

---

1. Cf. R. Rendtorff, 'Gen.8.21 und die Urgeschichte des Yahwisten', KuD 7 (1961).
2. The proportion is roughly 30:2.
3. 'Das Kerygma des Yahwisten', Ges.Stud, pp.345-74.
4. Op.cit., p.354 'Hat sie (i.e. die Aussage des Yahwisten) Anhalt in der ihm vorgegebenen Tradition?'. Wie geht der Yahwist in seiner Interpretation mit den Tradenda um?'
5. Op.cit. pp.354-5.

'nach dem sich Segen und Fluch der Umwelt an ihrem Verhalten zu Israel entscheiden'.[1] Gen.xii.3,on the other hand, by its context and form has been given a far deeper meaning. Instead of a cultic pronouncement (*'ārûr/ bārûk* --) the Yahwist has given us a word of promise from God himself, 'I will bless/ curse '. Moreover, *'ārar* is changed to *kll* when the object is Israel ,and the one who curses Israel is set in the singular,as if such a person were an exception. Gen.xii.3,therefore,represents a distinct re-modelling of ancient tradition.[2] Wolff's exposition of the way in which the Yahwist's message of Gen.xii.3 is referred to and developed in the subsequent parts of the Tetrateuch is not relevant to our present purpose. But his suggestions about the way in which the Yahwist's 'kerygma' found echo in later writings[3] ,such as Ps.xlvii,Is.xix.23-5 and Jer.iv.3,seem to have a definite bearing on the tradition of Num.vi.24-6 and the problem of the priestly blessings. Ps.xlvii.2 reads:

> God reigns over the nations
>
> God sits on his holy throne.
>
> The princes of the people gather
>
> as the people of the God of Abraham[4] .

From this Wolff rightly infers that Gen.xii.3 has been taken up by the cult tradition.[5] Following Schreiner,he links this specifically with the theme of

---

1.*Op.cit.*, p.358

2.*Op.cit.*, p.359

3.*Op.cit.*, p.370

4.So RSV. Even if *'ām* ('people')is vocalised as *'im* ('with'),cf.A.Johnson, Sacral Kingship,p.68 n.1, the reference to the God of Abraham is sufficient of itself to suggest Gen.xii.3. It is more than likely,however, that *'im 'ām* ('with the people') should be read. Cf.B.H.,*loc.cit.*.

5.J.Schreiner,'Segen für die Völker in der Verheissung an die Väter', BZ NF 6,1962,pp.1-31.

Yahweh's kingship. But it is instructive to note that the motifs of 'blessing, curse' and 'other nations' appear together in the same psalm even when there is no mention of kingship (e.g. Ps.lix.13; lxvii.2,8). This is particularly clear in Ps.lxvii.1f.:

May God be gracious to us and bless us[1]
And make his face to shine upon us
That thy way may be known upon earth
Thy saving power among all nations.

There is no doubt that Jerusalem and blessing were closely connected because of the kingship ideology, however we interpret 'kingship ideology'. But was this the sole or chief reason? To what extent were other motives also at work? To what extent was blessing a priestly function of the king?

In fact,Ps.lxvii,taken in conjunction with other passages,seems to suggest a connection of priestly blessing and Jerusalem irrespective of the king. And this,even if it does not allow us to infer the origin of Num. vi.24-6,reinforces the likelihood of its connection with Jerusalem. Whether this particular form of priestly blessing was found elsewhere than at Jerusalem is uncertain because of lack of evidence.Ps.lxvii,at any rate,seems to combine the tradition of Num.vi.24-6 and Gen.xii.3f. It is not quite clear whether 'thy saving power among all nations' reflects more than a prayer that other nations might be converted by noting how God has blessed Israel (cf.Ps. xcviii.2-3;lxvi.8;xviii.43f.;xxii.27f.). Israel's missionary vocation is not expressed so unequivocally as in Gen.xii.3f. But there seems little doubt that the nations are to share in Israel's blessing if they submit to Yahweh.

1.It is one of the eight passages that contains the word bārak uttered as a prayer with God as subject; in addition,it contains three other words of the 'Aaronite Blessing'.

When we turn to other passages which speak of the nations submitting to Yahweh we are again confronted with the place occupied by Jerusalem (cf. Ps.cxlix; cx; xcix.2; lxxvi; xlvi-vii, xx; xiv.7; ii; lx.) There are indications, too, that some of these Jerusalem traditions were transmitted by circles that kept alive the tôrāh (i.e. priest and prophet):[1a]

> It shall come to pass in the latter days
> that the mountain of the house of the Lord
> shall be established as the highest of the mountains,
> and shall be raised above the hills;
> and all the nations shall flow to it,
> and many peoples shall come and say:
> 'Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord,
> to the house of the God of Jacob;
> that he may teach us his ways
> and that we may walk in his paths.'
> For out of Zion shall go forth the law,
> and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.
> He shall judge between the nations,
> and shall decide for many peoples ---.(Is.ii.2-4)

In Is.ii.2-4 (= Mic.iv.1-3), which also provides evidence of a possible 8th cent. date,[1] we have reference to the torah of Yahweh emanating from Jerusalem, the nations coming to Jerusalem, and Yahweh judging between the nations. The description of Yahweh as Judge of all the earth (cf. Gen.xviii.25; Is.xxxiii.22; Ps.xcviii.9; Am.i.3f.) is connected with the stylised descriptions of the divine-king in the ancient Near-East; but it should be remembered that these forms of address were probably mediated by Jerusalem and its cult personnel, if, as seems likely, many of its Jebusite traditions were taken over and re-interpreted in the light of the Ark traditions etc. when the city was captured by David.

The connection of priestly blessing and Jerusalem finds further support in Gen.xiv.19-20, where Melchizekek, king of Salem and priest of El Elyon, blesses Abraham in the following words:

1a. On question of priestly/prophetic oracle cf. p.[illegible] above.

1. The occurrence of the passage in both Is. and Mic. may have arisen because both are drawing on an already existing Temple tradition. Cf.H.Wildberger, 'Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion,Jes.2.1-5',VT 7,1957,pp.62-81. In that case an earlier date cannot be excluded.

bārûk ʾabrām lᵉʾēl ʿelyôn qōnēh šāmayîm wāʾāreṣ

ûbārûk ʾēl ʿelyôn ʾᵃšer miggēn ṣāreqā bᵉyādeqā

The interpretation of the passage in all its details is much disputed, but there is little doubt that the blessing embodies ancient priestly material which was linked with Jerusalem.[2] Further, it seems to illustrate how the nations, represented here by the Jebusites, find blessing in Yahweh through Abraham.

In short, Ps.lxvii, a harvest thanksgiving hymn in its present form, combines the original patriarchal emphasis upon victory and fertility with the Yahwist's stress on 'blessing for the nation' and with the priestly tradition of Num.vi.24-6. It is not impossible that the patriarchal blessings in general (e.g. Gen.xxiv.34-6; xxvi.24; xxvii.29; xlviii.15f.) reflect Canaanite priestly blessings[3] and were handed down in the pre-monarchical cult at Jerusalem. Certainly some of the Psalms reflect the unreformed spirit of Gen.xxvii.29 rather than the Yahwist's re-interpretation (Gen.xii.3f.). We cannot be sure of the origins of Num.vi.24-6 but there is little doubt that it was connected with Jerusalem at a later date. It clearly exerted an influence on Ps.lxvii, which, taken in conjunction with Gen.xii.3f. and Is.ii.2-4, suggests that the Jerusalem priesthood not only espoused and transmitted the patriarchal blessing

---

1. Although ʿōśēh and qōnēh are two very different words, their meaning is very similar and the frequency of this description of Yahweh in psalms from the Jerusalem Temple (cf. Ps.cxv.15; cxxi.2; cxxiv.8; cxxxiv.3; cxlvi.6·) suggests that there is a connection between the blessing of Melchizedek and Jerusalem Temple traditions. Cf. M. Pope, El in the Ugaritic Texts, pp.25,52; R.E. Clements, God and Temple, pp.46 f.

2. Cf. G.v.Rad, Genesis, ATD, p.151; Speiser, Genesis, p.104, 'Now that this chapter is amply attested as a source unto itself, it is not only unnecessary but fallacious to harmonise its contents with other portions of the OT. As a Canaanite priest, Melchizedek would invoke his deity or deities by name'.

3. Cf. Bentzen, Introduction to the O.T. Vol.I., p.187 n.5.

but also, under the influence of the Yahwist, gave support to a new interpretation of the patriarchal blessing that was one day to find fulfilment in the full-orbed missionary message of Deutero-Isaiah (cf. Is.xlix.5-6).

The final form of priestly blessing to be considered is that used in connection with the keeping of the law. The word b^{e}rākāh is not frequently linked with the law apart from Deut. (e.g. vii.13; xiv.29; xv.4; xvi.15; xxiii.20; xxiv.19; and especially xi.27 and xxx.16; cf. Josh.viii.33-4; Ps.xxiv.5). The three great legal sections of the OT., however, are all concluded with a reference to blessing (Ex.xxiii.23-33; Lev.xxvi.3-13; Dt. xxviii.1-14). There is notdirect reference to priesthood in these passages, but it will be necessary to consider these passages in connection with our study of priestly cursing to which we shall now turn.

CURSING

Like the blessing the curse played an important part in ancient life. There are frequent references in the Psalms to the destructive and divisive power of imprecations invoked by one man against another and which threaten the welfare of the whole community (cf. Ps.vii.13; xii.2; lii.4; lvii.4; lxii.5; lxiv.4; cxx.4; cxl.4). 'Through the Psalms we are acquainted with a community of strong discords, as it developed in towns like Jerusalem'.[1] The man who trusted in Yahweh also resorted to curses - at least he prayed that Yahweh would curse those who had cursed him (cf. Ps.lxix.; cix). To be cursed in this way was to experience want and degradation, and above all the pain and corruption of death; it was to be cut off from the source of life and blessing, from community and fellowship with man and God. In the words of Pedersen: 'the same features pervade all of these violent curses; the vitality of the soul is undermined, the ties which connect it with the organism from which it seeks strength and nourishment are gnawn asunder; peace, honour and blessing are lost'.[2]

The way in which curses are regarded in the Psalms makes it clear that they are 'words of power'.[3] It has been the contribution of Pedersen and Mowinckel particularly to draw attention to the importance of understanding

---

1. Pedersen, Israel, I-II, pp.441f.

2. Op.cit., p.451

3. Cf.J. Gray, Kings, p.206 commenting on I K.viii.31: 'The verb nāśā' implies a quasi-material conception of the curse which could be lifted up and imposed as a burden (maśśā'). He then compares the prophetic oracle and the patriarchal blessing and continues, 'In such instances, as in the invocation of the name of God (I K.viii.43) the Hebrew conception of the creative force of the word is well illustrated'.

Hebrew culture and psychology in order to interpret correctly such concepts as blessing and cursing. 'The curse acts within the soul and it acts thoroughly. The whole of the soul is made empty by it, and all its fundamental values are undermined, honour as well as blessing and peace. --- To be cursed is the same as to perish'.[1] This insight is also characteristic of the work of Mowinckel. 'Curse is the very opposite of blessing; it is blessing with a negative sign. --- the cursed one fails in everything, he is smitten by all sorts of disaster and suffers from want of all that makes life worth living; prematurely he meets with evil and sudden death, and his family and name are obliterated from earth.'[2]

Not least among the occasions when cursing is referred to in the OT. is in connection with the sanctuary. 'Like the blessing it may be "materialised" in words and rites --- (it) has its place in the cult and the rites of Israel'.[3] The man who has been slandered (cf. Ps.vii.13) protects his innocence by taking an oath of purgation (vv.3-5) and then calls upon God to pass judgement (vv.6-8).[4] The 'false witnesses' of Ps.xxvii.12 refers perhaps to a similar sort of situation. Whatever we decide about such Psalms there is no doubt that it was the function of the priest on

---

1. Pedersen, Israel, I-II, p.441. Cf. Pedersen's development of the ban aspect of the curse in connection with 'arar; Cain is cut off from the tilled land (Gen.iv.11), and the serpent is put outside the community of other animals (Gen.iii.14). 'When a man has sinned so greatly that he must be removed from the community, then it is the curse which is carried out and, as we have seen, it is accomplished in a more or less radical manner, through expulsion, burning or stoning.'

2. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II p.48.

3. Op.cit. p.48.

4. Cf. A Weiser, Psalms, p.135

occasion to pronounce a curse (cf.Num.v.11-31; I K.viii.31;Dt.xxvii.15-26). The ritual curse was used as a sanction and punishment against undiscovered theft or crimes committed in secret such as adultery. In such cases it became a legitimate defence against wrong-doers; Yahweh's curse would overtake the evildoer and bring him to justice. The only Hebrew inscription yet discovered on which 'ārûr is attested is in connection with tomb-robbing.[1]

In fact,perhaps the most frequent use of the curse is in connection with the breaking of law and right conduct. The 'ārûr formula, 'cursed be ---', is directed against disobedient sons by the tribal fathers (Gen.ix.25;xlix.7), against disloyal contemporaries and their families and property (Dt.xxviii.16-19;Josh.vi.26; I Sam.xiv.24,28), and against the dependents of foreign nations (Josh.ix.23) by Israel's leaders, against their own and God's opponents by the prophets (Jer.xi.3;xvii.5;xlviii.10;Mal.i.14), and against those who break the sworn covenant-law or a common decision by the assembled people and their priests (Dt.xxvii.15-26;Judg.xxi.18). The curse ('ālāh) is frequently connected with a covenant (e.g. Gen.xxiv.41;xxvi.28;Hos.x.4;Jer.xi.3;xxiii.10; Is.xxiv.6;Ezk.xvi.59;xvii.11-19;Neh.x.30;II Chron.xxxiv.24; Dan.ix.11; Dt. xxix.19; xxx.7).[2] This usage is amply illustrated amongst Israel's neighbours, where curses (and less frequently blessings) are found in treaties,boundary-stones and building inscriptions.[3] King Seti I protected the temple of Osiris

---

1.N.Avigad,'The epitaph of a royal steward from Siloam Village',IEJ 1953, pp.137-52;cf.IEJ 1963,pp.74-92.

2.Cf.J.Hempel,op.cit.,pp.52 and 106.

3.For a good survey see J.Scharbert,Solidarität im Segen und Fluch im Alten Testament und in seiner Umwelt,pp.38f.

at Abydos by means of a curse;[1] a grave at Aniba in Nubia is similarly protected.[2] Other similar curses are found in Mari, Sumeria, Chaldaea, the land of the Hittites and Phoenicia.[3] Among the most amply documented curses are those in connection with treaties.[4] In almost every case the curse is directed to the destruction of the land, name or family of the wrongdoer.[5]

It is not sufficient, however, in discussing the Old Testament simply to refer to curse in general. One of the great gains of modern studies of the curse in ancient Israel has been the emphasis on the different words used for 'curse'.[6] In a valuable monograph, discussing the meaning of the passages in which the various Biblical words for 'curse' appear, C.H.Brichto, rejecting the emphasis upon magic (Hempel), upon the absence of the name Yahweh(S.Blank), or upon the verbal nature of the curse (most authors), has sought to show that "the specific Biblical term for curse in the sense of 'imprecation' is *'ālāh* --- which is resorted to when[7]

---

1. Cf. ANET, p.327 ;'---the owner of the property (sc.Osiris) shall be behind him(sc.the thief) and his wife and children, to blot out his name, destroy his life and prevent his corpse being laid to rest in the necropolis'.

2. Cf. ANET, p.328 n.8; '--- Amon-Re, King of the Gods, shall be after (him) to destroy him'.

3. Vid. J.Scharbert, op.cit., pp.38f.

4. Cf. ANET, pp.205f; J.Friedrich, Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, I-II; D.J.McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant; D.R.Hillers, Treaty Curses and the Old Testament Prophets.

5. Cf. J.Scharbert, op.cit., p.38.

6. C.H.Brichto, The Problem of 'Curse' in the Hebrew Bible; J.Scharbert, loc.cit.

7. But cf. M.Noth, Exodus, p.187.

a failure of human resources is acknowledged or anticipated".[1] 'rr, on the other hand, refers to the operation of a curse rather than its pronouncement and 'has the sense of to impose a ban or a barrier, a paralysis on movement and other capabilities'. Brichto is at pains to correct the view of S.Blank and S.H. Gevirtz that the passive formula, 'cursed ('ārûr) be he who --' reveals the underlying notion that the curse is automatic and self-fulfilling, the power residing in the spoken word itself. He points out that in Mesopotamia the naming of gods who are actively fulfilling curses is highly necessary in view of the number of gods (of both sexes and multitudinous functions). 'By contrast a society which recognised but a single source of power could use passival constructions in its imprecations (and prayers) without there being any question as to the agent who rewards and punishes, vindicates and condemns'.[2] The broadest and most general semantic range is possessed by the third main root for 'curse', namely qll. The piel stands for a wide range of abuse, from spoken insult to inflicted destruction. 'As an antonym of bērēk and kibbēd it means "to treat in a disrespectful manner". With parents or kings as object it may have the sense of "repudiate". With the Deity as object it represents a lack of respect for the moral standards sanctioned by the Deity and is the expression antonymous

1. C.H. Brichto, op.cit., p.215. Cf. p.62 where 'ālāh is described as a 'conditional self-curse'. "If the asseveration implicit in the oath is false, the condition is thereby fulfilled and the taker of the oath knows that he has thereby invoked a curse ('ālāh) upon himself".

2. Op.cit., p.211. Cf. M. Noth, Gesammelte Studien, pp.167-8. Brichto finds support for his view in I Sam.xi.7 (kōh yē'āśeh): 'The following clause, "There fell upon the people the terror of YHWH, with the result that they came forth as one man", demonstrates conclusively that despite the passive voice in the imprecation there was no question that the agent invoked was YHWH'.

to yārē' 'elōhîm, "to show respect for (the moral standards ordained by) God"; thus it never refers to imprecation against the Deity, a concept alien to the biblical mind.[1] Scharbert's differentiation of the three terms is basically similar.

---

1. Brichto, op.cit., p.215.

PRIESTLY CURSING

We are now in a position to turn to the texts in which priests deliver curses. The first passage that calls for examination is Numv.

According to the present text the woman who is suspected by her husband of having committed adultery but who cannot be proved to have done so may be brought by her husband to the priest. The priest is to bring her into Yahweh's presence, unbind her hair, take dust and water for 'water of bitterness', place in her hands the cereal offering of jealousy/remembrance and make her take an oath:[1] 'if no man has lain with you and you have not turned aside to uncleanness while you were under your husband's authority, be free from this water of bitterness that brings the curse'. If she is guilty the curse will bring a swelling body and a falling thigh (the signs of pregnancy but without the issue).[2] The woman must say, 'Amen'. The priest then writes the curses in a book and washes them off into the water of bitterness; the woman then drinks the water and the priest offers her cereal offering.

The present text is probably the result of a period of growth and conflation.[3] The ritual is certainly not clear and free from obscurity.

---

1. Cf. Driver and Miles, The Babylonian Laws, Vol.II sec.138: 'If the husband of a married lady has accused her but she is not caught lying with another man, she shall take an oath by the life of a god and return to her house'. Many of the comments on this law are instructive for Num.v. E.g. Vol.I. p.467:'In four passages one of the parties is required to "invoke the life of the god" (Bab.nis ilim zakarum) and the documents show clearly that this procedure took place at the door of the temple, or before a shrine, or within the temple before the god or his emblem. --The oath-- is always accepted as final, since the taking of a false oath is inconceivable and to refuse the oath is tantamount to admitting one's guilt or the invalidity of one's case.' And p.467 n.1: 'Cuq EDB 348-9 suggests that a payment may have been made to the priests administering the oath; this in in itself likely but is not yet proved.'
2. G. Gray, Numbers, p.48 quoting H.W. Robinson.
3. Contra J. Pedersen, Der Eid bei den Semiten, p.104f. "Dieser ganzer Ritus ist vollkommen klar -- Nicht einmal eine Aurufung Yahwes findet statt" V.21 may be a later interpolation, but at least it is not obvious or undisputed.

Gray suggests that the present text may be a compilation from two parallel but distinct tôrôth[1] or alternatively a single text that has been modified and interpreted. At any rate, in our present text the woman is twice brought before Yahweh (vv.16 and 18), twice made to swear (vv.19 and 21) and twice, if not thrice, to drink the potion (vv.23f and 26f.), although the general import of the ritual requires only a single performance of each action.

There are other obscurities in the passage, but these need not be examined further in the present context where we are chiefly interested in the forms of priestly utterance. The words that concern us most run as follows:

v.21 yittēn yhwh ʾōṯāk lᵉʾālāh wᵉliššbūʿāh bᵉṯôk ʿammēk
bᵉṯēṯ yhwh ʾeṯ-yᵉrēḵēk nōpeleṯ wᵉʾeṯ-biṭnēk ṣāḇāh

v.22a ûḇāʾû hammayîm hamᵉʾārᵉrîm hāʾēlleh bᵉmēʿayîk laṣᵉbôṯ beṭen wᵉlanpil yārēḵ.

Even in its present form there is a certain rhythm about this curse, but it seems likely that the original form has been disturbed by expansion: the rhythm would certainly be improved by excision. The second and third lines (vv.21b and 22a) are verbose and prolix. It is not clear, however,

---

1. Op.cit., p.49. Cf. p.55, '--if a compiler could kill Korah and his company twice over (xvi.31-35), he would not have hesitated to give the woman two draughts instead of one. Still, unintentional disarrangement and glossing may suffice to account for the text.'

which has been added later. The repetition of Yahweh in the second line seems unnecessary[1], which might point to v.21b. being a later addition. On the other hand most source-critics[2] assign vv.21 and 22 to different sources; in the one (v.22) Yahweh finds no mention and the curse works automatically (via the water).

In view of the previous reduplications that we have noted it is more than likely that this is also true of vv.21-22. Failing a more satisfactory solution the division is probably best made between v.21 and v.22a, leaving a 4/3 4/2 rhythm in v.21.

There are reasons for thinking that the procedure was not limited to cases of unchastity in view of (a) the oath of purgation in Ex.xxii.9 and I K.viii.31. (b) the 'offering of memorial', a category which may well have included more than the 'offering of jealousy'. (c) names like En-Mishpat and Me-Meribah. Unfortunately none of these passages sheds any light on the forms of priestly curses which may have been used in connection with such ordeals. The present custom, which is only seldom attested in the OT. (cf.Ps.cix.18b; Prov.vi.27-9), certainly survived into the post-exilic period,[3] but it must be confessed that there seems to be no parallel to this form of individual priestly curse in the O.T.

---

1. This infinitive construct form is not uncommon with Yahweh (cf.Dt.i.27; vii.8; I K.x.9; Is.xiii.19) but then Yahweh is not usually the subject of the main clause (but cf. I K.x.9; Dt.vii.8). Cf. Gesenius - K.p.341.

2. R. Press, 'Ordal im AT I', ZAW 1933, p.123f: Holzinger, Numeri, loc.cit, assigns 22b to the same source as 21, but separates 21 and 22a. On p.134 Press considers that v.21 is possibly a late doublet of v.22, although his earlier distinction of two separate rituals makes no chronological assertions.

3. The Mishnah (Sotah ix.9) states that it was only abolished by Johanan b.Zaccai, who flourished in the last third of the first cent. A.D.

There are, unfortunately, no definite criteria which allow us to determine whether any of the imprecations in the Psalms should be classified as 'priestly cursings', although there is little doubt that these curses were uttered in the context of the cult (e.g. Ps.vi.11; vii.17; xxv.4-8; xl.15; lxx.3; lxxi.13; lxix.24-6; lviii.7-9; lxxix.12; lxxxiii.14-18; cix.6-19). vii.17 seems the most probably instance of the imprecation being uttered by a priest, but there is no certainty even in this case. In Ps.cix. it may be that the curses are the 'words of hate' used against the Psalmist (and) which he is quoting.

The classification of the forms of OT. curses, which is not yet solved, throws no light on our problem. S. Blank[1] has suggested a simple division into three types: (a) the simple curse formula - 'ārûr, followed by its subject, noun, pronoun or noun clause, and sometimes by a conditional clause with kî; (b) the composite curse, containing the previous curse formula, followed by curses freely composed, with the main verb in each main clause in the third person imperf. (or perfect with waw consecutive); (c) curses freely composed without the formula. Both the first and third divisions, however, conceal a variety of different forms, hence so does the second.

---

1. S.H. Blank, 'The Curse, Blasphemy, the Spell, the Oath', HUCA 23, 1950-1, pp.73-95. The evidence of this formal scheme certainly does not support the view that 'the biblical evidence concerning the curse suggests a development from the curse as a profane wish - profane in the sense of non-religious - to the curse as imprecatory prayer' (p.73). Cf. D.R. Hillers, Treaty Curses and the OT. Prophets, (esp.p.34n.13) who has a fuller treatment of one section of Blank's third division - which he labels 'futility curses'.

Is there, then, any other evidence of individual priestly cursings apart from Num.v.? There are 22 examples[1] of the simple curse formula and 16 examples[2] of the composite curse. But only the twelve simple curses of Dt.xxviii.15-26 have any apparent connection with the priesthood, although the cultic context of curses with <u>'ārûr</u> is generally admitted. Whether the curses in Dt.xxvii.15f. and xxviiii are, in fact, related to priestly cursings or not, it would be premature at this stage to assume. This also applies to priestly curses delivered in connection with the making of a covenant. We turn first, therefore, to an examination of Dt.xxvii.15f.

---

1. Gen.xxvii.29; Num.xxiv.9; Dt.xxvii.15-26; Judg.xxi.18; I Sam.xiv.24,28; xxvi.19; Jer.xlviii.10a, 10b; Mal.i.14a; Ps.cxix.21.

2. Gen.iii.14, 17; iv.11; ix.25; xlix.7; Dt.xxviii.16-19, 20; Josh.vi.26; ix.23; Jer.xvii.5; Ex.xx.14,15.

DEUTERONOMY XXVII - CURSE, LAW

At first glance Dt.xxvii.15f. seems a clear example of priestly[1] cursings. A closer examination, however, reveals that this is by no means so certain. Dt.xxvii, which seems to interrupt the sequence of chaps.xxvi and xxviii.,[2] is a conflation of several traditions;[3] but there is no agreement as to the precise delimitation and origin of the various units within the chapter. Vv.2-3 are substantially the same as vv.4 and 8;[4] v.9 seems to begin a new section, as does v.11;[5] v.14 does not easily follow vv.11-13;[6] singular and plural fluctuate without apparent reason;[7] and the Levites are referred to in three different ways.[8] It may be, therefore,

---

1. For the question whether the Levites were priests, particularly with reference to Gunneweg's contention that the Levites were originally not priests cf. p.1 n.2 above. At least Deut. tradition regards them as priests and Judg.xvii-xviii regards a Levite as an extremely suitable person to officiate as priest.

2. Both chap.xxvi and xxviii are in the form of direct speech and the speaker (presumably Moses) is presupposed. Chap.xxvii breaks this continuity. In fact chap.xxviii as it stands is spoken by the Levites.

3. See G.E. Wright, IB II, p.488; G.v.Rad, ATD 8, pp.117f.; M.Noth, Stämme, p.73 n.2 and Exkurs II, esp.pp.144f. and 150; Nielsen, Shechem, pp.52f.; J.L.'Hour, RB 'L'Alliance de Sichem', RB 69,1962,pp.5-36,161-184,350-368; Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien V, pp.76f.; Driver, Deuteronomy, pp.300f.

4. Even to the extent that within a single verse (e.g. vv.2 and 4) both 2nd pers. sing. and 2nd pers. plural are used (e.g. tā'abrû -- śadtā; b^{e}'ābr^{e}kem -- śadtā).

5. Moses is mentioned again (cf.v.1) as if for the first time; he is mentioned with the Levitical priests in v.9 and alone in v.11.

6. In vv.11-13 the Levites seem to belong to one of the groups of the people and are allocated to Mt.Gerizim to bless the people; in v.14 they alone are responsible for uttering curses.

7. E.g. vv.2 and 4; but cf. xiii.6, etc.

8. As Levitical priests (v.9), Levi (v.11) and Levites (v.14).

that, if v.14 is a later addition,[1] the curses in Dt.xxvii.15f. should not be connected with the Levites; in this case the passage would shed no light on the form of priestly cursings, unless there are other grounds for asserting that they were, in fact, pronounced by priests and not by any other group of Israelite society.

It will be necessary, therefore, before proceeding further to examine the relationship of vv.11-13, v.14 and vv.15-26.

It is clear that if the curse (v.13) is declared by six of the tribes (which do not include Levi), then v.14 must represent a variant and irreconcilable tradition. In this case vv.15 f. follow either v.13 or v.14, and if they follow v.13 then the passage throws no light on forms of priestly cursing.[2] It is by no means certain, however, that v.13 entails that the curse was declared by the six named tribes. Nielsen[3] has suggested that the tribes in vv.12-13 were only introduced at a later date by a Judaean editor and that originally 'these --- these (hā'ēlleh)' in vv.12-13 referred to two groups of Levites. J.L'Hour[4] objects to this - on what seem to be mistaken

---

1. So Mowinckel, op.cit., p.76f.; but cf. J. Hempel, Apoxysmata, p.86 n.268

2. This is also true of the reconstruction of E. Lewy, 'The Puzzle of Dt.xxvii: Blessings announced but curses noted', VT, 12, 1962, pp.207-11. Regarding Dt. as an essentially Northern document with Jerusalemite additions, he allocates xxvii.1,2,4,5-8,11-14 (but omitting Levites in v.14 as a Jerusalem addition) to his Northern source; the blessings and curses are to be found in xxviii. 1a, 2-6, 15-19; all this was concluded by xxvii.16-25 (exc.20ab,22ab, which like xxvii. 15,26 were added by the Jerusalemite source), which were presumably (it is not clear in Lewy's account) offered by Lewy's "leader or elders".

3. Shechem, p.73f.

4. RB 69, 1962, p.165.

grounds[1] - but like Nielsen accepts that theLevites, or at least one of the Levites,[2] was responsible for uttering the curses. A rather different line of approach is advocated by H.C. Brichto[3] (following the textual notes of A.B. Ehrlich)[4] who points out that curse and blessing (k^{e}lālāh - b^{e}rākāh) are not necessarily, or even chiefly, verbal, but rather stand for 'good and bad fortune'.[5] According to Brichto the curious phrase ʿal-hakk^{e}lālāh means that the tribes do not sing out curses and blessings, but represent the two contrasting fates (good and bad fortune) by their stance alone. This would also dispose of the objection that a list of blessings, parallel to the curses in vv.15-26, has fallen out of the text at some stage of the tradition.[5] In this case there need never have been a separate list of

---

1. He claims that Nielsen has overlooked the fact that the group of six tribes in which the Levites are placed are to 'bless the people' (his italics 'Cependant Nielsen ne tient pas suffisament compte des textes. Au.v.12, il est dit explicitement que c'est 'le peuple', donc tout le peuple, qui est béni.' But on p.168 Nielsen is quite explicit: 'the narrator has avoided the completely parallel ʿal-habbʳrāḵōāh, evidently because he wanted to state that it was the people as a whole (Nielsen's italics) which was to be blessed. It was not the whole people which was to be cursed; only those elements among the people which might have become apostate are threatened by the curses'. Nielsen's solution is not incompatible with a blessing of all the people; in fact, it explicitly requires it.

2. Op.cit., pp.165-6. 'Le lévite seul énonce la malédiction, mais le peuple répond ʾāmēn. --- un héraut proclame d'abord les bénédictions sur tout le peuple, les six tribus du Gaizim répondent "Amen"; puis le héraut profère les malédictions et les six tribus de l'Ebal répondent "Amen".'

3. Op. cit. pp.184-5.

4. Randglossen, vol.II., p.328

5. Op. cit., pp.181f.

blessings; the blessings are sufficiently represented by the presence of the group on Gerizim.[1] It seems reasonable,therefore,to follow Brichto[2] and Nielsen in retaining the tradition of v.14 and linking it with vv.11-13 and vv.15f., without deciding between the subsequent divergent interpretations of Brichto and Nielsen.

If,therefore,vv.11-13 do not imply that there were two groups,each consisting of six tribes,which spoke the blessing and the curse,it is no longer necessary to separate v.14 from vv.11-13 or from vv.15f.[3] Thus from the point of view of form alone there is no conclusive evidence against the connection of the Levites and the utterance of the curse. In fact,there are good reasons for maintaining this link. Confirmation of this can be found in a closer examination of vv.15-26 and related traditions.

1.Cf.BDB ʒʸ ,sec.7 (c).

2.Mishnah,Sota vii.5, assumes the Levites pronounce 12 blessings and 12 curses (the blessings being the reverse of Dt.xxvii.15-26). As Lewy remarks,'This is a not very plausible attempt of harmonization'.

3.G.v.Rad,op.cit.,p.119 seems to think there were two separate ceremonies. 'Es ist durchaus damit zu rechnen, dass hinter beiden Anordnungen Erinnerungen an zwei verschiedene kultische Begehungen stehen,die in alter Zeit bei Sichem zelebriert wurden. Bei ihrer Kombination ist allerdings die erste zugunsten der zweiten stark verkürzt worden ---'. He is here following S.Bülow,'Der Berg des Fluches',ZDPV 1957,pp.100-7,who interprets Dt.xxvii.12-13 in the light of Josh.viii.33 and Dt.xi.29 and concludes that the people faced Ebal and Gerizim in the ceremony of the curse and blessing (cf.Tonneau,RB 35,1926,pp.98f.),the words of which,apart from the 'amen',were spoken by a cultic official. Bülow,stressing the physical aptness of Gerizim(fertile) and Ebal(barren and dry) to represent blessing and curse, and noting the distance of the hills from the terebinth shrine at Shechem, argues that there must have been two ceremonies in two different places. But such a reconstruction is unnecessary if the whole of the proceedings are conducted in the valley at the foot of the hills. That such a ceremony of cursing and blessing at the conclusion of an act of covenant-making or -renewal should have been permanently linked with Shechem because of Ebal and Gerizim is highly unlikely (cf.Lev.xxvi), although Bülow's explanation in terms of physical geography may be valid for the original choice of Shechem.

Dt.xxvii.15-26 has been labelled a 'sexual Decalogue'[1] or, with more point, a 'list of secret sins'[2], but neither description will stand closer inspection. Driver's modest summary, which does not claim to discover any principle on which the curses are constructed, is much more accurate. 'The offences against which they are directed are the dishonour of Jehovah, certain grave breaches of filial and neighbourly duty and certain typical forms of immorality. The principles upon which the particular offences named are selected is not apparent' (p.299). By stressing the connections between vv.15-26 and other prohibitions in other law codes, however, we shall attempt to demonstrate some sort of principle behind the list.

It is generally accepted that the present form of these curses is fairly late.[3] This conclusion is based chiefly on vv.15 and 26; by its length and its reference to 'graven or molten image'[4] the first curse shows signs of several later hands, and 'torah' in the last curse seems to be equivalent to 'the Deuteronomic code'. On the other hand, most commentators find in the series of curses as a whole survivals of primitive

---

1. H. Gressmann.

2. G.v.Rad, op.cit., p.120; Moses, p.57.

3. Cf. Driver, Deuteronomy, p.300; Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien V, p.79; R. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp.226-8.

4. Mowinckel, op.cit., p. 179 ; G.v. Rad, op.cit., 120.

usage.[1] G. Fohrer seems alone among modern commentators in regarding the passage as a purely literary compositon.[2] Opinion is fairly evenly divided, however, as to whether this primitive usage actually stemmed from Shechem[3] or whether it was only brought into connection with Shechem at a later date.[4]

Before entering into a discussion of these various views and essaying our own interpretation we shall examine each curse in turn: The text to be examined is as follows:

---

1. Cf. Driver, op.cit., p.300: 'The text thus being constructed without special reference to Deuteronomy (ie. the aims of the Deuteronomic legislation as a whole) it is probable that it is in reality not the work of the author of Deut., but an old liturgical office, used on solemn occasions, which has been inserted by a later hand in the text of Dt., and accommodated to its position there by the addition (or adaptation) of v.26'; Pfeiffer, op.cit, p.228, 'A date in the 9th or 8th cent. B.C. seems to be in harmony with the characteristics of these curses'; G.v.Rad, op.cit, p.119, 'Der sichemitische Dodekalog ist die altertümlichste Verbotsreihe, die uns im AT, erhalten ist und eines der wichtigsten Dokumente, das uns etwas von dem Geist und der liturgischen Form des frühen Yahwehglaubens zu erkennen gibt.'

2. 'Das sogennante apodiktisch formulierte Recht und der Dekalog', Kerygma und Dogma, 11/1, 1965, pp.49-74: 'Die Reihe --- ist daher in der deuteronomistischen Zeit entstanden und in den Rahmen des Buches Deuteronomiums für die Darstellung eines fingierten kultischen Aktes eingearbeitet worden'. But why should anyone compose such a list when more specific definitions of wrongful acts and penalties already existed (e.g. in the Book of the Covenant), if older traditions are not being taken up? If this is the case, then it is not sufficient to give reasons for doubting the use of our present Deuteronomy as a sort of cultic text-book; it must also be shown that the traditions incorporated did not have cultic reference. (Cf. p.[illegible]0 below) at any previous time. Cf. C. Steuernagel, Deuteronomium, p.149, 'As the individual curses do not refer to Deuteronomy on the whole but to the Book of the Covenant and the Holiness Code it is to be assumed that the author lived during the Exile at the earliest'. We know too little about the formation of our present OT. to rule out this possibility altogether, but from what we do know of O.T. life and literature it seems improbable, to say the least; see p.[illegible] below. Even if the Bk. of the Cov. and the H. Code received their present literary form during the Exile, they are neither purely literary compositions nor of late origin.
3. So Sellin, Geschichte, p.101; Alt, Kl. Schriften I, p.324f.; Wright, IB 2, pp.325-6 Nielsen, op.cit., 52f ; V.Rad, op.cit., p.119.
4. So Mowinckel, Psalmenstudien V; p.79, Noth, Stämme, p.73 n.2 and p.144; Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.226-8

'ārûr hā'îš 'ᵃšer ya'ᵃśeh pesel ûmassēkāh tô'ᵃbaṯ yhwh ma'ᵃśēh yᵉdê ḥārāš wᵉśām bassēṯer

wᵉ'ānû kol-hā'ām wᵉ'āmrû 'āmēn (≒ Response Ia)

'ārûr maḳleh 'āḇîw wᵉ'immô

wᵉ'āmar kol-hā'ām 'āmēn (=Response I)

'ārûr massîḡ gᵉḇûl rē'ēhû --- (Response I)

'ārûr mašgeh 'iwwēr baddārek --- (Response I)

'ārûr maṭṭeh mišpaṭ gēr-yāṯôm wᵉ'almānāh --- (Response I)

'ārûr šōḳēḇ 'im-'ēšeṯ 'āḇîw kî ḡillāh kᵉnap 'āḇîw --- (Response I)

'ārûr šōḳēḇ 'im-kol-bᵉhēmāh --- (Response I)

'ārûr šōḳēḇ 'im-'ᵃḥōṯô baṯ-'āḇîw 'ô baṯ-'immô --- (Response I)

'ārûr šōḳēḇ 'im-ḥōtantô --- (Response I)

'ārûr makkēh rē'ēhû bassēṯer --- (Response I)

'ārûr lōḳēaḥ šōḥaḏ lᵉhakkôṯ nepeš dām noqî --- (Response I)

'ārûr 'ašer lō-yāḳîm 'eṯ-diḇrê hattôrāh-hazzōṯ la'ᵃśôṯ 'ôṯām --- (Response I)

Apart from the first and last curses all are construed with 'ārûr followed by an active participle. This has been labelled 'the simple curse formula' by S.H. Blank.[1] The subject of the kal passive participle of 'ārār may, of course, vary; it may be a common noun, a proper noun, a pronoun or a noun clause with 'ᵃšer instead of a participle. It is sometimes followed by a condition introduced by kî (cf. Gen.xlix.7; I Sam.xxvi.19; Jer.xi.3; Dt.xxvii.17). It is doubtful, however, whether we can determine the mood and tense of 'ārûr as strictly as Blank does; the tense is future rather than

---

1. HUCA 23/1, 1950/1, pp.73f.

present, and the mood optative rather than declarative, he states. This is almost certainly true of Dt.xxvii[1] which is dealing with actions which may not yet have been committed, but it would not be true of Gen.iii.14 etc. The truth, in Blank's view, is that whenever the curse comes into effect (present or future) its influence is not limited to the present but extends into the future. Blank's view that the tense is future means almost inevitably that the mood is labelled 'optative'. It is not possible, however, to be so dogmatic; just as the curse may be in the present tense there is no reason why it should not be declarative, especially when pronounced by God. The passive form of the participle, as noted above (p.39), does not mean that the 'ārûr curse was regarded as 'automatic and self-fulfilling'. Blank's 'simple curse formula', as noted on p.40 above, contains a variety of forms; these are best subdivided for purposes of clarity even if they are all united by their use of 'ārûr + noun or participle (+ kî clause sometimes). 'ārûr followed by a participle, meaning 'cursed be the man who --'. occurs 10 times in Dt.xxvii.15-26, and once in each of the following places - Gen.xxvii. 29 (= Num.xxiv.9); Judg.xxi.18; Jer.xlviii.10; and Mal.i.14; Ps.cxix.21. Closely related to this group are those cases where 'ārûr is followed by 'îš 'ašer, meaning, like ~~the first group~~ 'ārûr + participle, 'cursed be the man who --', as in Dt.xxvii.15,26 (without 'îš); Josh.vi.26; I S.xiv.24,28; Jer.xi.3;xvii.5 (haggeber instead of 'îš); xx.15; Jer.xx.14 (with hayyôm instead of 'îš).

---

1. But even here Driver, Deuteronomy, p.301, says: 'The copula is unexpressed in the Hebrew; and "is, be or shall be" must be understood according to the context. Here is is most suitable'.

is probably better grouped with the curses relating to objects and things (group 5). A third group consists of curses addressed directly to the person concerned (and not qualified by conditions) - Gen.iii.14; iv.11; Dt.xxviii.16a, 16b, 19a, 19b; Josh. ix.23 (plural); Mal.iii.9 (with nē'ārîm (niph.) instead of 'ārûr). Closely related to this group are two other curses, one using a proper name (Gen.ix.24) and the other using the pronoun hēm ('they') (I S.xxvi.19). A fifth group consists of curses relating to objects - Gen.iii.17 (the land), xlix.7 (their anger), Dt.xxviii.17/18 (thy basket and thy kneading trough, the fruit of thy body and the fruit of thy ground, the increase of thy cattle and the young of thy flock), Jer.xx.14 (the day).

The primary formal difference is that between the first two groups on the one hand and group three on the other; the former are couched in the third person sing. and are of general application providing the subject fulfils certain conditions, whereas the latter are couched in the 2nd person (usually sing.) and confront someone directly without conditions (if there are any then they must be assumed to have been fulfilled already). Of this second group Gen.iii.14 and iv.11 and Mal.iii.9 are spoken by God; the direct unconditional curse is here uttered by the one who fulfils it.[1] The other curses in this group are possibly dependent on those in which God is represented as pronouncing the curse. Cursing on the lips of Yahweh however can hardly have been the original model of the curse; this would be the reverse of all that we know about religious terminology and anthropomorphism.

---

1. Cf. p.65 below on ŷmāṯ, yāmûṯ and tāmûṯ.

On the other hand, unconditional curses such as we find in Dt.xxviii.16,19 and Josh.ix.23 or Gen.ix.24 or I S.xxvi.19 must have been preceded by a condition at least implicitly.

Even if we omit Dt.xxvii-xxviii for the moment, therefore, we find that common to all the groups is the undoubted antiquity of a high proportion of the curses in each group.[1] (e.g. Gen.xxvii.29 = Nu.xxiv.9; Judg.xxi.18; Josh.vi.26; I Sam.xiv.24, xxvi.19; Gen.iii.14; iv.11; ix.24; and Josh.ix.23)[2]. There is nothing in principle, therefore, that demands a late date for the use of ʾārûr in Dt.xxvii.15f. In fact, quite the reverse.

In that all the curses apart from the first and the last are followed by a participle it seems likely that the original form of these two curses has been altered; this is further suggested by the unusual length and the vocabulary of these two curses. The original form seems best preserved in those with only four words[3] (e.g. vv.16-18,21,23-4). This short form is easily restored in vv.19-20, 22 also.

---

1. Cf. the invitation of the angel of the Lord to curse Meroz in Judg.v.23, commonly acknowledged to be one of the oldest poems in the OT.

2. There is no reason to regard Josh.vi.26 as H.G.May, Peake's Comm., p.294 does, as 'prophecy post eventum'; even so he dates it to the 9th Cent.B.C. There are numerous ancient parallels to the cursing of a captured city so that it shall not be rebuilt (cf. Judg.ix.45). Cf. S. Gevirtz, 'Jericho and Shechem; a religio-literary aspect of city destruction', VT 13, 1963, pp.52-62. Josh.ix.23 may also owe its place in the tradition to its aetiological relevance (cf. the later Temple nethīnîm), but this says nothing about its origin, which may well be early. Judg.xxi.18 is linked with the early amphictyonic cult by Noth, Stämme, p.104fin view of n^{e}bālāh and 'Israel';cf.xx.6,10.

3. Cf. A. Alt, Kleine Schriften I, p.314; 'Dann ergibt sich -- ein Vierer-metrum ohne Zäsur für die Urform'. It is by no means impossible, however, that some if not all of the curses originally consisted of only 3 members, especially if in vv.21-4 ʿim be counted with its following noun. V.17 would end with gebûl; v.18 with ʿiwwēr; v.19 with mišpaṭ; v.20 with ʾābîw; v.22 with ʾaḥōtô; v.24 with rēʿēhû; v.25 with šōḥad.

xxvii.15. In v.15 we have the unusual occurrence of pesel and massēkāh, otherwise found together only in Judg.xvii.3-4 and xviii.14[1] (where it is thought by many scholars to be a sign that two accounts have been conflated) and Nah.i.14. ʿāśāh pesel (without massēkāh) is not infrequent in Dt.iv (vv.16,23,25). The expression tôʿabat yhwh also occurs several times in Dt., in one of two forms : a)by itself to signify 'something abominable', always in connection with the worship of other gods[2] and b) in the phrase 'for it is an abomination of Yahweh' or 'whoever does this is an abomination of Yahweh',usually connected in this case with a prohibition.[3] That the phrase need not necessarily betray later revision and conflation,however,seems indicated by the epitaph on the tomb of Tabnit,priest of Astarte,king of Sidon. 'My curse be with whatsoever man thou art that bringest forth this coffin ! Don't,don't open it and don't disturb me,for such a thing would be an abomination to Astarte'.[4] But tôʿabat yhwh adds nothing new or important

---

1.In xviii.17 and 18 the two nouns are separated,so that even if the phrase were once hendiadys two separate objects must be thought of. In vv.20,30 and 31 massēkāh is absent and pesel alone does duty for whatever object is to be thought of. A further difficulty is caused by the question whether the story presupposes a period when the use of images in the worship of Yahweh was not prohibited. If images were once permitted, as is suggested by Judg.xvii-xviii(unless the view of M.Noth,'The Background of Judg.17-18', that these chapters are satirical be accepted) this would mean that Dt. xxvii must be dated later than such a period.

2.Dt.vii.26;xiii.15; xiv.3; xvii.4; xviii.9; xx.18; xxiv.4; xxxii.16.

3.Dt.vii.25; xvii.1; xviii.10-12; xxii.5; xxiii.19; xxv.13-16.

4.Cf.ANET,p.505,where the inscription is dated c.300 BC; it is dated by N. Avigad,IEJ 1953,p.148 to the 5-4th cent.BC. Cf.also ANET,pp.421-4: the teaching of Amen-Em-Opet,xiii.15, 'Do not talk with a man falsely. The abomination of the god.' xv.20,'Do not confuse a man with a pen upon papyrus. The abomination of the god.' Cf.Prov.xi.20;xii.22; xv.8,9,26; xx.10,23; xxi.27; xvi.5; xvii.15.

in Dt.xxvii.15 and is probably secondary. Bassāṯer is used with reference to other sins committed secretly in II Sam.xii.12 ; Ps.ci.5; Job.xiii.10; xxxi.27; Prov.ix.17. In Job xxiv.13f.,which offers a list of crimes which men prefer to do in darkness and secret - murder,adultery,theft - there is a reference to their portion in the land being cursed (v.18 - t^{e}ḳullal). Other crimes similar to those of Dt.xxvii.15f. are mentioned earlier in the same chapter ,Job xxiv.2-4. Whether this points to an early connection of 'curse' and ' crimes done in secret' is impossible to say, except in the general sense that it was natural,as we have seen, to invoke the curse as a sanction in cases where tangible evidence was lacking. There is insufficient evidence to support a more decisive conclusion : sēṯer is not mentioned in Job xxiv.2-4 and the crimes listed in Job xxiv.13f. bear as much resemblance to the Decalogue as to Dt.xxvii. In fact, sēṯer may not be original to Dt. xxvii.[1] It is an exaggeration to call Dt.xxvii a list of typical secret sins and a mistake to emphasise this aspect of Dt.xxvii in comparison with Ex.xx and other groups of commandments. There are parallels to xxvii.15 in Lev.xix. 4; Ex.xx.4 and Lev.xxvi.1:

w'ēlôhê massēḵāh lō' ṯa'aśû lāḵem	Lev.xix.4
lō' ṯa'aśeh l^{e}ḵā pesel	Ex.xx.4
lō' ṯa'aśû lāḵem 'ĕlîlîm ûpesel ûmaṣṣēḇāh	Lev.xxvi.1

xxvii.16. The second curse has several parallels in the OT.- Lev.xx.9 (twice);Ex.xxi.15;17; Lev.xix.3; Ex.xx.12; Prov.xv.20. Apart from Dt.xxvii.

1.It is presumably partly because of the emphatic position of sēṯer at the end of the first curse that some scholars have interpreted the curses as referring to a list of secret sins (cf.p.50 above). The most that can be said with certainty,however,is that this was the interpretation placed on the curses at a later date.

16,however,qālāh is used only rarely elsewhere in the OT. (Dt.xxv.3; I Sam. xviii.23; Is.iii.5; xvi.4; Prov.xii.9),and always,apart from here, in the niphal.[1] H.Cazelles notes that the root klh occurs at Ras Shamra (eg. I AB i.37) meaning 's'incliner humblement,tomber à terre'.[2] J.Gamberoni has pointed out the frequency of passages dealing with relations to parents in the OT.,usually where rules and principles of conduct are being inculcated. For our present purposes the most significant factor about such passages is the variety of constructions used and the indications of equivalences to 'ārûr . Thus,in Ex.xxi.15 and 17 we have môṯ yûmāṯ preceded by an active participle; in Lev.xx.9b dāmô bô ; in Lev.xx.9a môṯ yûmāṯ preceded by 'îš 'îš 'ašer plus imperfect ; the original form of Ex.xx.12 may have contained the prohibitive lō' plus imperfect ('thou shalt not dishonour,curse--')[3] ; and a more poetic version of the same commandment is found in Prov.xx.20 (cf.xv.20).

xxvii.17. Apart from a few instances ,mostly in the Psalms, of šûg meaning 'turn away' in a general sense,the word occurs only in Dt. xxvii.17; xix.14; Hos.v.10; Prov.xxii.28; xxiii.10;Job.xxiv.2 and Mic.vi. 14, and always with gᵉbûl as object,except in Mic.vi.14. The sacredness of boundary landmarks is attested in Babylon,[4] Greece[5] and Rome.[6] The only direct parallel in the OT. is Dt.xix.14, a prohibition with lō' plus imperfect.[7]

1.Études sur le Code de l'Alliance,p.52
2.'Das Elterngebot im A.T.',BZ 8, 1964,pp.161-91.
3.Cf.A.Alt,Kleine Schriften I,p.321 n.1.
4.Cf.M.Noth,Ges.Stud.,p.163 n.25
5.Cf.Plato,Laws VIII 842e, 'probably repeating an older law',according to Driver,Deuteronomy,p.234.
6.Dion.Hal., II.74.
7.Contra E.Gerstenberger,Wesen und Herkunft des sogenannten apodiktischen Rechts im A.T.,p.90 : 'Dt.xxvii.17 und xix.14 sind zwei verschiedene Gattungen. Die Prohibitive,anstatt die verbotene Handlung unter den Fluch zu stellen,tendieren viel eher dahin,die bösen Folgen einer Überschreitung des Verbots --- in einem begründendem Satz anzugeben'. Cf.pp.63f.,73f.below.

xxvii.18. šāgāh (hi.) occurs only in Ps.xxix.10;Prov.xxviii.10 and Job xii.16,on each occasion with a metaphorical meaning,although derek is also used in Prov.xxviii.10. The closest parallel is Lev.xix.14, another prohibition with lō'.

xxvii.19. nāṭāh (hi.) occurs frequently with 'heart' (especially in Kings) or 'ears' (especially in Jeremiah) as object,meaning 'to turn one's heart,eye, (?) ear'. It is used in Ex.xxiii.2 & 6; Dt.xvi.19; xxiv.17; I Sam.viii.3; Job.xxiv.4;Prov.xvii.23; xviii.5; Is.x.2;xxix.21; Lam.iii.35; Am.ii.7;v.12; and Mal.iii.5 in connection with justice and the needy ,meaning 'to deflect (the course of justice)' or 'brush aside (the needy)'.[1] Mišpaṭ is the object of nāṭāh (hi.) in Ex.xxiii.6; Dt.xvi.19; xxiv.17; I Sam.viii.3 and Lam.iii.35; cf.Prov.xvii.23 ('orḥôt mišpaṭ), xviii.5 (ṣaddiḳ bammišpaṭ). In Isaiah and Amos the poor or the righteous (cf.Prov.xviii.5)are the object and in Malachi it is the gēr. The closest parallel is in Dt.xxiv.17: lō' taṭṭeh mišpaṭ gēr yāṭôm . The phrase 'the sojourner,fatherless and widow' is found only in Dt.xiv.29;xvi.11,14;xxiv.17,19,20,21; xxvi.12-13; Jer.vii.6;xxii.3; Ps.xciv.6; cxlvi.9. It would seem to be 'Deuteronomic',therefore. On the other hand,this need not necessarily indicate a late origin of the phrase if it is remembered that 'Deuteronomic' expressions are often 'cultic' expressions.[3] It should be noted that Dt.xxvii.19 and xxiv.17f. are terser in style (eg.the omission of 'among you','in your towns' as well as the definite article)than

---

1.In Ex.xxiii.2,where it is used without object,Cazelles,op.cit.,p.87 compares I.K.ii.28;viii.58;Prov.xvii.23,and translates with the Syriac 'prevariquer'.
2.Cf.W.R.Smith,Kinship,pp.49,168,193 on gēr:'men who had sought the protection of another tribe for various reasons'. There are frequent references to gēr in the Holiness Code. Cf.the parity of native and gēr in Num.xv.
3.Cf.S.Mowinckel,Le Décalogue,p.7; W.Beyerlin,Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions,p.70,n.229.

the other passages in Dt. This is especially important in view of the fact that the closest parallel (xxiv.17) has the form of a prohibition with lō' and may well represent material taken over by Dt.(cf.Ex.xxii.21). Support for this may be found in the two passages from Jeremiah,which also assemble the words in the style of Dt.xxiv.17 , xxvii.19, and are also prohibitions with lō' set in a context of Yahweh's ethical requirements (Jer.vii.6;xxii.3). Dt.x.18 also,which speaks of God's care for the gēr etc.,may reflect ancient law material ,now couched in the homiletic style of Dt..The phrase 'āśāh mišpāṭ ûṣedāḳāh is common in Jer. and Ezk.(Jer.xxii.3,15;xxiii.5;xxxiii.15; Ezk.xviii.5,19,21,27; xxxiii.14,16,19),often in contexts of cult and covenant-law.[1] Ps.xciv,which portrays God as judge (vv.1-2),reflects a group of prohibitions in v.6 and refers to the crimes being committed in secret in v.7. Finally mention must be made of an insignificant/textual variation in Dt. xxvii.19 -wᵉyāṯôm (cf.LXX kài ὀrphanoû) instead of yāṯôm.

xxvii.20 is paralleled in Lev.xviii.18 (lō' prohibition),xx.11 ('îš 'ašer + môṯ yûmᵉṯû + dᵉmēhem bām) and Dt.xxii.30 (lō' prohibition). Dt.xxii.30 suggests that škb refers to marriage rather than intercourse outside marriage.

xxvii.21 is paralleled in Lev.xviii.23 (lō' prohibition),xx.15 ('îš 'ašer + môṯ yûmāṯ)and Ex.xxii.18 (participle+ môṯ yûmāṯ). Similar practices are described in Gilgamesh Epic vi.47;[2] Hittite Law-code ii.87f.[3] and Herodotus II 46.[4] Cazelles ,commenting on Ex.xxii.18,says,'Le mieux est de voir là une pratique mi-rituelle,mi-magique,comme on peut en concevoir une chez une peuple pasteur pour obtenir la fécondité des troupeaux'. It is not impossible that such ritual practices obtained in Canaan (cf.the anti-Canaanite tendency of the law against boiling a kid in its mother's milk).

1.Cf.W.Zimmerli,Gottes Offenbarung,pp.178-192;esp.pp.180-5.
2.Cf.ANET,p.84. 3.Cf.ANET,pp.196-7. 4.Op.cit.,p.76.

xxvii.22 Is paralleled only in Lev.xviii.9 (lō' prohibition) and xx.17 (nikr^{e}tû - 'they shall be cut off'). The terminus post quem of such a law as this must be later than the patriarchal period, because marriage with a sister was allowed then (eg. Gen.xx12). There is one unimportant textual variation; Cod. Vat.85 omits 'daughter of', thus altering the relationship from that of half-sister to that of aunt (cf. Lev.xviii.12), but this reading has no support and seems to have arisen through a word being omitted in transmission.

xxvii.23. Hatan occurs only here. There is no exact parallel to this curse, therefore, but Lev.xviii.17 (lō' prohibition) and xx.14 ('aîš '^{a}šer --- zimmāh hû') deal with the same relationship.

It is striking that the curses using škb (vv.20-23) are paralleled on each occasion in Lev.xviii and xx. More significant, perhaps, is the fact that on three occasions the parallels occur in what K. Elliger[1] has argued to be an early pre-monarchical Decalogue regulating relations within the 'Grossfamilie'. On the other hand, it should be noted that Dt.xxvii has adopted a different order from that of Lev.xviii. (closer to that of Lev.xx?).

xxvii.24. Is paralleled in Ex.xxi.12 (participiple + môt yûmāt). Cf. Ex.xx.13 (lō' prohibition). Apart from the frequent use of rea' in phrases such as 'and one said to another', a high proportion of the sentences in which rea' occurs are exhortations or prohibitions, giving guidance in social conduct and occurring predominantly in the Decalogue, the Book of the Covenant, the Holiness Code, Deuteronomic lō' prohibitions and Proverbs (eg. Ex.xx.16-7; xxi.14,18,35; xxii.6-10, 13,25; Lev.xix.16,18; xx.10; Dt.v.20-1; xix.4-5, 11, 14; xxii.24, 26; xxiii.25-6; Prov.iii.28; vi.29; xxiv.28; xxv.8-9; I K.viii.31 & II Chron. vi.22; cf. Jer. xxii.13; Ezk.xviii.6, 11, 15; Zech.viii.10-17).

---

1. ZAW. 1955, p.1f.

xxvii.25. There are two much shorter parallels in Ex.xxiii.8 (wᵉšōḥad lō' tiḳḳaḥ) and Dt.xvi.19 (wᵉtiḳḳaḥ lō' šōḥad). šōḥad is used twenty four times altogether in the OT.,and of the nineteen instances where it means 'bribe' thirteen passages ,at least, are explicitly concerned with the administration of justice (Is.v.23;xxxiii.15;Mic.iii.11; II Chron.xix.11; Ex.xxiii.8a,8b; Dt.xvi.19a,19b; x.17;xxvii.25;I Sam.viii.3; Ps.xv.5; Prov. xvii.23). In Ezk.xxii.12 'Taking bribes' is linked with the 'shedding of blodd'. 'Innocent blodd' is referred to on a score of occasions in the OT;;the following passages are the most significant for our purposes - Dt.xix.13; xxv.9; I Sam.xix.5;Jer.vii.6; Prov.vi.17 ; Ps.xciv.21. Two of these passages, Jer.vii.6 and Ps.xciv, have already been referred to in connection with Dt.xxvii.19 (pp.59-60). The two passages from Dt.xix and xxi are part of a series of b'r stipulations (in which the object is usually hărā' - Dt.xiii.6;xvii.7,12; xix.13,19; xxi.9,21; xxii.21-2; xxiv.7;xxvi.13-14) which have some claim to be considered as a body of legislation taken over by Deuteronomy.[1] I Sam.xix.5 is in the context of an oath 'im yûmāṯ.[2]

One of the outstanding facts that emerges from such a lexicographical survey is the number of parallels to Dt.xxvii.15f. within other law-codes and passages dealing with Yahweh's moral demands. Several of these passages contain more than one parallel to Dt.xxvii.15f. Equally striking

---

1.Cf.J.L'Hour,Bib.44,1963,pp.1-28; RB 71,1964,pp.481-502.

2.xxvii.26 seems to have been added by the Dt.editor. This is suggested by vocabulary,style and content. Dibrê hattôrāh occurs only in Dt.itself or verses shaped by Dt.(i.e. Dt.xvii.19;xxvii.3,8,26; xxviii.58;xxix.28; xxxi. 24;xxxii.46; Josh.viii.34; II K.xxiii.3,24; II Chron.xxxiv.19; Neh.viii.9). Hēḳîm dibrê with man as subject occurs in I Sam.xv.11,13;Jer.xxxiv.18; II K.xxiii.3,24. 'This law' (cf.II K.xxiii.24) seems to refer to the whole Deuteronomic code,not just the preceding curses. Possibly there were only ten curses originally.

is the way in which the curse (_'ārûr_) form is replaced by sentences construed with _môṯ yûmāṯ_ or _lō'_ (Dt.xxvii.15 - thrice paralleled by _lō'_ clauses; xxvii.16 - twice by _môṯ yûmāṯ_ ; xxvii.17 - once by _lō'_ ; xxvii. 18 - once by _lō'_; xxvii.19 - four times by _lō'_; xxvii.20 - once by _môṯ yûmāṯ_ , twice by _lō'_; xxvii.21 - twice by _môṯ yûmāṯ_,once by _lō'_ ; xxvii. 22 - once by _lō'_,once by _nikr^{e}ṯû_ ; xxvii.23 - once by _lō'_; xxvii.24 - twice by _môṯ yûmāṯ_ ,once by _lō'_; xxvii.25 - twice by _lō'_). That the connection of _'ārûr_ , _môṯ yûmāṯ_ and _lō'_ is not accidental seems sufficiently demonstrated by the number of instances. But confirmatory evidence is not lacking.[1] In Judg.xxi.5 and 18 the assembly of the people takes an oath; on the first occasion it is expressed by _môṯ yûmāṯ_, on the second by _'ārûr_ and participle. There is little doubt that the two forms of speech are equivalent here. This is quite explicit in I Sam.xiv.24,28,39, if _yāmûṯ_ is accepted as equivalent to _yûmāṯ_ here; cf. LXX ἀποθνήσκω in v.42. _Yāmûṯ_ may correspond to the fact that in this case the person speaking is also the one who is/will be responsible for carrying out the penalty; i.e. it is really equivalent to _tāmûṯ_ (cf. Gen.ii.17; iii.17). That the death penalty could be exacted for breaches of _lō'_ prohibitions (again cf.Gen.ii.17f.) seems to be indicated by I K.xxi,the case of Naboth,who was charged with breaking the _lō'_ prohibition of Ex.xxii.27. The fact that the charge was false is irrelevant in the present connection.

---

1. The following passages form three of the six instances of 'Bundesstrafrecht' according to W.Preiser,'Vergeltung und Sühne im altisraelitischen Strafrecht',pp.7-39; the other three instances relate to Achan (Josh.vii), Saul's descendants (II Sam.xxi) and Jeremiah (Jer.xxvi). In Josh.ix.23 we have an interesting case of the curse being mitigated by a previous oath; the Gibeonites are not killed but simply relegated to the status of 'hewers of wood and drawers of water'. They are not completely 'cut off' but are banned from full fellowship with the Israelites.

One of the most significant contributions towards an interpretation of these parallels was made by A.Alt in Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts,[1] where he linked the ʾārûr series in Dt.xxvii.15f. with the origins of Israelite apodeictic law. Applying the form-critical methods used by Gunkel[2] and Gressmann[3] he sought to penetrate behind the literary complexes of legal corpora in the OT., particularly the Book of the Covenant. Alt dealt firstly with casuistic law[4] which he regarded as marked by 'if ---' (ʾim or kî), the impersonal third person ('Whoever does --/ If anyone does --'). Its Sitz im Leben was the normal justice administered by lay leaders at the town-gate.[5] Compared with law codes among Israel's neighbours there was nothing distinctively Israelite about the form of these laws (mišpaṭim). They derive from Israel's environment and reflect the usage not so much of local Canaanite shrines (so Jepsen, Caspari) but general Canaanite practice.[6] Alt then drew attention to other laws which did not subscribe to the above pattern, either in form or in content. These he called apodeictic. The first series he noted was Ex.xxi.12,15-17, short urgent sentences, without detailed reference to possible variations of circumstance, concluding with the words môṯ yûmāṯ. A second series was our present passage Dt.xxvii.15-26, which was again characterised by brief, urgent prohibitions, this time dealing with secret sins against Yahweh and acting as a sort of complement to the previous series in Ex.xxi.[7] A third series, more limited in theme and content but also

---

1. Kleine Schriften, pp.278-333.
2. Genesis; Die Psalmen.
3. Mose und seine Zeit.
4. Op.cit., p.285f.
5. Op.cit., p.289, 'Sie wissen nichts von beamteten Richtern, erwähnen die Priesterschaft überhaupt nicht, und berühren das sakrale Gebiet nur bei Bestimmungen über Rechtsakte die vor der Gottheit vollzogen werden müssen'.
6. Op.cit., p.297
7. Op.cit. p.314

regarded by Alt as apodeictic, consisted of Lev.xviii.8-17, where there is a striking use of lō' instead of the normal 'al.[1] A fourth series is to be traced in Ex.xxiii.1-3,6-9, a sort of 'Richterspiegel', again characterised by the use of lō'.[2] Finally, by eliminating later expansions from the Decalogue in Ex.xx Alt produced another series of pithy apodeictic prohibitions, but more comprehensive in scope than Ex.xxi, Dt.xxvii, and Lev.xviii.

It was at this point that Dt.xxvii assumed crucial importance in Alt's reconstruction. As the Sitz im Leben of these apodeictic series he looked for a situation 'in der wirklich die ganze Volksgemeinschaft und durch sie ihr Gott den Einzelnen so gebieterisch ansprechen und mit Verboten oder Androhungen von Fluch und Tod belegen kann'.[3] This he found ready to hand in Dt.xxvii. 'The apodeictic series here forms the kernel of a sacral act of national proportions, in which Yahweh commissions the spokesmen, namely the Levitical priests, whose function in the community was not limited to attending to man's cultic relationship with Yahweh, but involved also the duty of making his demands known in Israel'.[4] In Dt.xxvii Alt found proof of the sacral character of Israelite apodeictic law. Evidence that Dt.xxvii referred to a regular ceremony rather than a single occurrence[5] was found by Alt in Dt.xxxi.9, where a reading of the tôrāh at the Feast of Booths every seven years is mentioned.[6]

---

1. Op.cit., p.315
2. Op.cit. p.316
3. Op.cit., p.324
4. Op.cit., p.324
5. v.der Ploeg, CBQ, 1950, p.424 referring to Dt.xxvii makes the surprising statement 'Curses pronounced in the presence of the whole people and ratified by their "Amen", exercised their influence not only on those present at the ceremony but also on future generations. It was not, therefore, necessary to repeat them, though it may have been done.'
6. Op.cit. p.326

It seemed, therefore, that the Sitz im Leben of the curses in Dt.xxvii was established. In fact, Alt's contentions have been largely accepted up to the present, although it has occasionally been pointed out that some of the so-called apodeictic laws were hardly specifically Israelite in character.[1] Now, however, as a result of increasing information about early Israel's neighbours in Canaan Egypt and Mesopotamia it is becoming increasingly clear that what distinctions there may be between apodeictic and casuistic law must be expressed differently and that it is no longer possible to lodge claims of uniqueness for Israel's apodeictic law in the way that Alt did,[2] although there are scholars who still accept Alt's conclusions and seek to build on them.[3] There is no doubt that apodeictic law of the sort envisaged by Alt was not peculiar to Israel[4] and cannot be regarded as a distinctive expression of Israel's faith in Yahweh, except insofar as the worship of all gods but Yahweh is prohibited. On the other hand, it has been questioned[5] - rightly in our opinion - whether the so-called casuistic law is simply to be regarded as Israel's inheritance from the surrounding world.

---

1. R.H. Pfeiffer, Introduction, p.227; Nielsen, Shechem, p.184 n.6; G. Östborn, Tora in the OT., p.70 n.4
2. Cf. I. Rapaport, 'The Origins of Hebrew Law', p.166; E Gerstenberger, Wesen und Herkunft des sogenannten apodiktischen Rechts im AT.; R. Kilian, 'Apodiktisches und kasuistisches Recht im Licht ägyptischer Analogien', pp.185f; S.Gevirtz, 'West Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law', pp.137-58; F.C. Fensham, 'Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near-Eastern Vassal Treaties and the OT', pp.1-9; J.G. Williams, 'Concerning One of the Apodeictic Formulas', pp.484-9; and 'Addenda to "Concerning One of the Apodeictic Formulas"' pp.113-115;.
3. Cf. H-J Kraus, Gottesdient im alten Israel, 1954.p.45, 'Das apodiktisch formulierte Recht ist Gottesrecht --'.
4. Cf. n.2, esp. Gerstenberger, Kilian & Gevirtz. Cf. also T.J. Meek, Hebr.Origins, p.72 and ANET p.183 n.24; G.F. Mendenhall, BA 17, 1954, p.30; H. Cazelles, p.128.
5. I. Rapaport, op.cit., points out that Ex.xxi.2 ('ibri), xxi.6 (door-post ceremony and xxii.7-8,10 (YHWH), all regarded as casuistic by Alt, show signs of being specifically Israelite.

The present debate regarding Israel's law inevitably lacks finality and wholeness in view of the re-orientation of ideas that is taking place, but if due regard is paid to the close parallels in the various law-codes within the OT. itself a more balanced and satisfying solution to some of these difficulties may be found. In this task a proper understanding of Dt.xxvii.15-26 can play a useful part. And this, in turn, will contribute to a fresh understanding of the role of the priest in pre-exilic Israel.

The analytical work of Gese,[1] Gerstenberger[2] and Kilian[3] (to name but a few) has made it clear that Alt's broad classification of 'apodeictic' law was too diffuse, in that it included several different forms, and too exaggerated in the claims it made for distinctiveness. The participial forms of Alt's apodeictic law (i.e. môṯ yûmāṯ and 'ārûr series) bear a strong resemblance to the casuistic form, in that the participle can be translated 'if a man does ---/ whoever does --.'[4] The question has naturally been asked, therefore, whether such series should not be included among the casuistic stipulations,[5] or at any rate distinguished from the lō' prohibitions and treated separately.[6] Parallels in other ancient N.E. material[7] and in the tribal wisdom of Israel[8] have been used to discountenance

---

1. 'Beobachtungen zum Stil alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze', ThLZ 85, 1960, cols. 147-150. Apodeictic law, says Gese, 'establishes what is wrong in principle, but does not make it possible to pronounce sentence (Richten) because it contains no penalties' (col.148). The môṯ yûmāṯ clauses are not apodeictic, therefore.
2. Op.cit., is mainly concerned with an analysis of lō' prohibitions. See below.
3. Literarkritische v. formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes, 1963, esp. pp.1-4.
4. Cf. Gese, op.cit., p.148.
5. Cf. H.J. Boecker, Redeformen des Rechtslebens im A.T., pp.141 f.
6. Cf. Gerstenberger, op.cit.; R. Kilian, op.cit., p.62, who treats môṯ yûmāṯ as curse.
7. Cf. ANET pp.412-26 (wisdom sayings from Egypt)
8. Cf. Jer.xxxv.6f.; Prov.iii.27f. et passim.

the cultic origin of the brief lō' prohibitions, although it is admitted that they found their way in to the cult at an early date.[1] Nevertheless, it would be mistaken to ignore the similarities between the various groups of Alt's apodeictic laws, which our examination of Dt.xxvii.15f. so far has underlined. One of the dangers in the present debate is that partial truths are exaggerated and a view of the whole is lost sight of. Both finer differentiation and more careful synthesis are needed. Alt correctly noted certain differences between his casuistic and apodeictic law but unfortunately confused the difference between their origin and their use.[2] A similar confusion is to be found in H.J. Boecker's discussion of the môṯ yûmāṯ formula;[3] because he thinks he has established a non-cultic use of such a formula he assumes it was non-cultic in origin also.

We shall continue our examination of Dt.xxvii., then, in the light of this debate. One vital aspect of Dt.xxvii.15-26 which we have so far ignored is the response made by the assembled people to each curse. This response is the same on each occasion - 'āmēn (LXX genoito - 'so be it'); apart from after the first curse, where 'ānû ('and they reply') is added, each curse is followed by the words 'and all the people shall say ('āmar-sing), "Amen"'. These words seem to confirm the view that Dt.xxvii.15f. has preserved genuinely cultic material, even if the curses had an independent existence before they became part of the cult and at a later stage became a purely literary tradition. Of the 13 instances in which 'Amen' is used in the OT. (excluding Dt.xxvii for the moment) every single reference has some connection with blessing or cursing.[4] Num.v. and the ceremony of cursing in

---

1. Eg. by Gerstenberger, op.cit., pp.115-6. Repeated in 'Covenant and Commandment' JBL 84, 1965, pp.38-52.
2. Cf. Mowinckel, 'Zur Geschichte der Dekaloge', ZAW 55, 1937, p.219, n.1.
3. Op.cit., p.142f.
4. Cf. the congregation's response to the blessings and curses, which conclude 'The Daily Prayer of the King' in Hatti - ANET. p.397 col.B. Cf. also the Hittite 'Soldier's Oath' and their response - ANET p.353.

the case of the woman suspected of adultery we have already noted. Neh.v.13 records a curse invoked by Nehemiah (following the oath taken by the priests) to which the assembly responds 'Amen'. In Neh.viii.6 Ezra blesses the Lord and the people answer 'Amen', lifting their hands, bowing their heads and worshipping the Lord. In Jer.xi.3 Jeremiah says 'Amen' to God's conditional curse (which will be put into effect if the stipulations of the covenant are broken) and promise of blessing. Even if the passage is not from Jeremiah himself[1] it bears witness to the tenacious connection of 'Amen' with blessing and cursing and the worship of ancient Israel. The four instances of <u>'āmēn</u> in the Psalms are part of the blessing formula which concludes the first four books of the Psalter (i.e. Ps.xli.14; lxxii.19; lxxxix.53; cvi.48). Again, even if added by a later editor they must have been thought appropriate to the worship of the Temple. I Chron. xvi.36 records the 'Amen' pronounced by the people at the end of the hymn of blessing sung by the newly installed sons of Asaph on the occasion of David's transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem. Is.lxv.16f.[2] describes the reversal of the curses of Gen.iii. and Dt.xxviii (cf. Gen.i.1 - Is.lxv.17; Gen.iii.17b - Is.lxv.22b; Dt.xxviii.30 - Is.lxv.21) in the new golden age of blessing. I K.i.36 and Jer. xxviii.6 record the use of 'Amen' linked with an invocation of Yahweh in response to a previous solemn utterance (of implied blessing). The view that the cultic nature of Dt.xxvii is purely fictitious[3] fails to give an adequate explanation of this use of 'Amen'. Moreover, why should anyone invent a series of curses of extremely broad definition and application at a time when case-law had developed

---

1. J.P. Hyatt, <u>IB</u> 5, pp.905-6, notes several Deuteronomisms in the passage.
2. D.R. Jones in <u>Peake's Comm.</u> (1962) p.534 comments, 'All other instances of this word ('Amen') are liturgical!
3. G.Fohrer, 'Das sogenannte apodiktisch formulierte Recht und der Dekalog', <u>Kerygma und Dogman</u>, 11/1, 1965, pp.49-74.

formulas capable of dealing with more specific breaches of law and was able to apply more appropriate sanctions and penalties? The most obvious implication is that older traditions are incorporated in Dt.xxvii.15-26. The question to be asked, therefore, is not whether these words were used as part of a cultic ceremony as they stand, but rather, whether, espcially in view of their parallels, they had at any stage in the history of their tradition a place in the cult. An affirmative answer seems clearly indicated by the reference to the Levites, the use of ʾārûr and ʾāmēn, and by the way in which the stipulations are assembled.

If, then, Dt.xxvii. is connected with the cult, can its Sitz im Leben be located more exactly? It has been suggested that the curses in Dt.xxvii formed the conclusion of an act of covenant-making.[1] G.v.Rad[2] thinks that the form of Deuteronomy as a whole (viz.a) Historical description of the events of Sinai + parenesis - Dt.i.-xi; b) Proclamation of the Law - Dt.xii.-xxvi.15; c) Affirmation of covenant-obligation ('Bundesverpflichtung') - Dt.xxvi.16-19; d) Blessing and Curse - Dt.xxviif.) reflects a cultic act of covenant-making similar to that found in Ex.xix - xxiv. This suggestion has recently been taken up with renewed vigour by J.L'Hour[3] as a result of the attention that is being given to connections of ancient N.E. treaties in general and Hittite vassal-treaties in particular (which ended with a list of blessings and cursings) with the Sinaitic covenant.[4]

---

1. Cf. G.E. Wright, IB 2, p.488f.; G.v.Rad, Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch (= Gesammelte Studien, pp.9-86); and, in connection with the amphictyony, M. Noth, The History of Israel, p.92f.
2. Op.cit., pp.34-5.
3. 'L'Alliance de Sichem', RB 69, 1962, pp.5-36, 161-84, 350-68.
4. G.E. Mendenhall, 'Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition', BA 17/3, 1954, pp. 50-76; K. Baltzer, Das Bundesformular; W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions; D. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant; N. Lohfink, 'Der Bundesschluss im Lande Moab', BZ NF 6, 1962, pp.32-56.

Stressing the concluding act of blessing and cursing, L'Hour has sought to show that Dt.xxvii.15-26 was part of the concluding act of (blessing and) cursing of a covenant made at Shechem, and that the stipulations of this covenant are to be found essentially in the Book of the Covenant.[1]

Against such interpretations of Dt.xxvii.15-26,however, is the fact that it is not a list of curses of the same nature as those which conclude ancient N.E. treaties. It is not so much a divine sanction against the breaking of the covenant as a reiteration of the stipulations of the covenant in the form of a curse. Dt.xxvii.15-26 does not represent a concluding list of curses but a series of stipulations similar to those found in the Book of the Covenant and the Holiness Code. There is much more justification for finding traces of the concluding act of blessing and cursing in Dt.xxviii and Lev.xxvi.[2] Whether Dt.xxvii.15-26,interpreted as a list of stipulations, can still be given a place within the covenant-festival is a question that requires further investigation. It is in itself feasible and the conclusions of the present study would not rule out such a possibility.

It might perhaps be argued that Dt.xxvii would make a useful conclusion to a covenant-renewal ceremony which had included the reading of the law; it would pick up representative covenant-stipulations,and thus enforce not only these but all the covenant-stipulations with the curse.

---

1. Op.cit.,p.361. This stimulating theory is well argued and it is more than likely that the legal codes of the OT. represent syntheses of local usage,but it inevitably falls short of proof in view of the complete absence of geographical references within the Book of the Covenant. Such references are hazardous anyway,if Israel's pre-monarchical cult was linked with a mobile Ark and amphictyony.

2. Cf.pp.104f.below.

Against this,however,is the unrepresentative nature of the curses in Dt. xxvii. It is difficult to see why this particular list of offences should have been singled out unless they are,in fact,actual stipulations - with no more representative function than any other group of stipulations which might have been chosen.

If this is so, and if the arguments adduced above for retaining the connections of Dt.xxvii with the cult are valid, can it be shown that the stipulations in the other law-codes also formed part of the cult, or that they were declared by the priest?

PRIEST AND LAW

In the course of the following pages we shall seek to show that many of the stipulations in the three main law-codes in the OT. were guarded and recited within the cult by the priests/Levites. We shall not, at first, seek to determine the specific nature of this cultic event[1] -central amphictyonic shrine or local sanctuary, festival for the renewal of the covenant or otherwise - more narrowly, but will concentrate on the role of the priest in the transmission, ~~of~~ maintenance and development of legal traditions. This will necessitate a further examination of Alt's apodeictic law (especially the môṯ yûmāṯ series), other relevant phrases within the law codes, and references to priestly judicial activity scattered throughout the Old Testament.

The thesis of Gerstenberger, that the brief lō'-prohibitions (which for him are the only genuine apodeictic commandments) originate in the sphere of tribal wisdom[2] (cf. Jer.xxxv.6f.; the non-cultic contents of the lō' prohibitions; the parallels in Proverbs and other ancient N.E. wisdom material)[3] does not preclude their later cultic use[4], and is not, therefore, a decisive objection[5] to the view to be advanced here; namely, that at an early period in the transmission of these stipulations they were safeguareded and recited by the

---

1. It may well have changed its character over the years; hence precision as to its form is closely linked with chronological problems.
2. Wesen u. Herkunft des sogenannten apodiktischen Rechts im AT.
3. Cf. p.67 above.
4. Op.cit., pp.115-6, 'Da die Sippenordnung von jeher als unter göttlichen Schutz stehend gedacht wurde, muss eine Beziehung der Prohibitive zum Kult sehr alt sein!' Cf. 'Covenant & Commandment, JBL 84, 1965, p.52, 'Moral requirements must have entered the cultic zone very soon.'
5. Apart from certain sentences which seem to take a stronger line, e.g. op.cit. p.84 ' ---die grosse Masse der behandelten Prohibitive wâre sinnlos in einem Bundesschlussakt zwischen Yahweh und Israel.'

priests.

A more serious objection is that of Boecker, who seeks to make the môṯ yûmāṯ series non-cultic.[1] He blames Alt's essay on the origins of Israel's law for the perpetuation of the false notion that môṯ yûmāṯ has nothing to do with legal praxis or casuistic law. On the basis of Num.xxxv.9-34, which he regards as casuistic (and therefore equivalent to judgement at the gate) he infers that because môṯ yûmāṯ occurs here in the context of non-apodeictic law then the formula does not belong to sacral law at all, except in a derived sense. He refers to E. Gerstenberger's work as evidence that Alt's sacral derivation of apodeictic law is mistaken - at least in the case of lō' prohibitions. Boecker's interpretation seems to be supported by the fact that môṯ yûmāṯ could be construed as a fixed penalty, in this case the death penalty, for the breaking of the law. It seems to receive additional support from the way in which môṯ yûmāṯ is picked up by phrases such as 'they shall stone (him) to death with stones'. On the other hand, the short môṯ yûmāṯ form pointed out by Alt has strong claims to be more original than the longer form (with its more precise description of how death was to be inflicted) and there is no evidence in Ex.xxi.15f. of a more specific death penalty ever having existed. There are strong grounds for regarding the stoning in Lev.xx.2, for example, as a later addition. In other words, the author of the sanction was, as in the case of the 'ārûr stipulations, Yahweh himself. Even Boecker has to admit that the kārat formula (cf. p.60 above on Dt.xxvii.22), which belongs to the sphere of sacral law, offers close parallels to the môṯ yûmāṯ series. 'In this case one can speak of a curse- or ban-formula, for the death of a sinner mentioned in these clauses is not executed by man, but remains the privilege of God'.[1] Apart from the evidence just discussed

---

1. Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT., p.145 n.4.

Boecker assumes that sacral law has borrowed the terminology of secular legal praxis[1] and, in fact, he uses sacral law traditions as if they were casuistic and profane.

This raises the question whether it is possible to distinguish sacred and secular law in this way in ancient Israel.[2] Could not a single formula be used by several different groups of tradents in the course of its history? G.H. Reventlow, who has emphasised that it is impossible to distinguish between apodeictic and casuistic law in the way that Alt did, speaks of 'apodiktisch-kasuistisches Recht'.[3] He confuses use and origin, however, in the way that Alt did[4], when he proceeds to ask whether 'apodiktisch-kasuistisches Recht' did not have its origin in the cult. This confusion is made worse by his re-introduction of the terms 'casuistic' and 'apodeictic' (now distinguished) to refer to separate phenomena, and his emphasis on the cultic use of the latter. From the evidence preserved in the OT. of the judicial power of the king (II S. xii.1; xiv.1; xv.1-6; I K.iii.16; II K.viii.1-6; Ps.cxxii.3-5) Reventlow concludes that this is 'im unmittelbarsten Sinne kultisches Recht' (!). Continuing to

---

1. Op.cit., p.141, 'Wenn als Quelle auch sakralrechtliche Passagen herangezogen wurden, so geschah es deshalb, weil anzunehmen ist, dass von Sakralrecht Formulie-rungen des 'profanen' Rechts aufgenommen worden sind'.
2. Cf. J.R. Porter, Moses and Monarchy, p.12 n.26; G. Mendenhall, 'Relation of the Individual to Political Society', Biblical Studies, pp.105-6; R. Knierim, 'Ex.18 und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit', ZAW 73, 1961, p.147f. Contra M. Noth, Exodus, p.150.
3. 'Kultisches Recht im AT.', ZThK 60, 1963, pp.267-305. '-- die von Alt vorgenommene Trennung zwischen apodiktischen und kasuistischen Recht ins Wanken gerät; ein grundsätzlich verschiedener Sitz im Leben lässt sich nicht konstatieren' (p.282). On p.283 he speaks of 'die apodiktisch-kasuistische Gesetzgebung'. But on p.293 he speaks of the different planes of 'kultisch-apodiktisches Recht' and 'das kasuistisches Recht der Torgerichtsbarkeit'.
4. Cf. p.68 above.

distinguish between 'apodeictic' and 'casuistic' he draws on the work of v. Rad and Zimmerli relating to cultic declaration formulas to describe this distinction as follows: 'Der Unterschied zwischen der môt yûmāt Strafdrohung und der Vorschrift einer angemessenen Sühne im kasuistischen Recht scheint vielmehr darin zu bestehen, dass hier das Gottesverhältnis selbst in Spiel ist, es geht um einen Bann, um einen Fluch'.[1] A little later this 'Gottesverhältnis' is made more precise by a reference to law-giving on the occasion of Yahweh's ephiphany. Following J. Weissmann[2], he locates the distinctiveness of môt yûmāt sentences in their 'public nature'.[3] It is not necessary to follow the argument further in its attempt to show that the prophetic office was connected with the covenant-cult and the proclamation of sacral law. Reventlow's attempt to distinguish the origins of cultic law and 'Torgericht' (p.297) must be pronounced a failure: their allegedly distinguishing feature is what they have in common.

---

1. Op. cit. p.289

2. 'Talion und öffentliche Strafe im Mosaischen Rechte', Festschrift A. Wach I, 1913, pp.92f.

3. Op.cit. p.294, "öffentliche Delikte".

More germane to our purpose is the obvious difficulty of Reventlow in separating what he has once joined (and vice-versa). Most of this difficulty stems from confusing 'use' and 'origin', from lack of clarity in the use of such terms as 'sacral law'[1], and from failing to see that OT. traditions and their transmission were not the prerogative of one group of Hebrew society. Further difficulties inevitably arise when any attempt is made to trace in detail the historical development of Hebrew law and its administration: the nature of our sources precludes such an exact chronological reconstruction. Our particular concern at the moment is much less ambitious: namely, to show that Israel's so-called secular legal tradition need not have been the sole prerogative of the men at the gate, and that priests played an important part in the recital and preservation of both sacral and secular law.

---

1. Reventlow, op.cit., p.270: Wenn man in diesem Zusammenhang von einem ‚kultischen' Recht spricht, muss man allerdings beachten, dass dieser Begriff in einer wesentlichen anderen Färbung gebraucht wird, als es der altgewohnten Unterscheidung zwischen ‚kultisch' und ‚ethisch' oder auch ‚kultisch' und ‚weltlich' entspricht. In jenem Sinne wäre ‚kultisches' Recht alles das, was dem engpriesterlichen Bereich entstammt und der Regelung der sakral-rituellen Dinge dient: nach dem Begriffe Begrichs ‚priesterliche Thora'. Aber gerade diese Stoffe kommen auf keinen Fall als genuin israelitisch in Frage und weisen überhaupt keine ursprüngliche Beziehung zu den Bundesinstitutionen auf. Stofflich lässt sich ausserdem zwischen Kultischem und Profanem oder Ethischem im gewohnten Sinne beim israelitischen Bundesrecht gerade nicht trennen; Preiser sagt richtig, »dass eine derartige Vermischung das Vorhandensein rein ‚weltlicher' Vorschriften keineswegs hindert, da der ‚sakral' Charakter einer Gesetzgebung sich in der Hauptsache auf Herkunft und Geltungsgrund der in ihr zusammengefassten Bestimmungen und nicht notwendig auf ihren Inhalt erstreckt.« Unter ‚kultischem' Recht verstehen wir nach diesem Begriffe alle die Stoffe die in der Rechtsproklamation des Bundesfestes von dem bevollmächtigten Sprecher als Gotteswille verkündigt werden - ‚kultisch' im Rahmen einer Gestalt des Gottesdienstes, der Israel von den Kultformen aller umliegenden Völker gerade unterscheidet, welche die Bezeichnung ‚Kultus' im gewohnten Sinne verdienen.

This is denied or ignored by many modern scholars of the OT., even when the 'sacral' character of all OT. law is recognised.[1] This stems in part from a distinction between 'priestly torah' (relating to purely ritual matters)[2] and torah in general (relating to the whole field of personal and social life).[3] In part it is due to the late form of the present codes and a natural unwillingness to accept their statements at face value. There

---

1. Cf. G.E. Mendenhall, op.cit., pp.105-6. 'In time there grew up in the villages a body of customary law in which no distinction was made or even possible between secular and sacred law. --- The problem which faces us and which faced the later OT. community is a false question to early Israel. A sacred vs. secular law is a problem only where there is a clear-cut contrast, and early Israel presumably saw only the contrast between the law of Israel and that of its pagan neighbours. The sacred law of Moses as a body of legal tradition and religious obligation became an important issue because it contrasted with the secular law (at least to a large extent) which grew up during the Monarchy and for which we have almost no evidence at all.' Mendenhall subsequently emphasises, however, that 'the elders, not priests, were the legal administrators and arbitrators'. Similarly, R.deVaux, Ancient Israel, p.154f., 'All this presupposes that the priest took a certain part in judicial affairs. The problem is to know exactly what their competence was. ---It would seem, then, that the priests' role was only to distinguish between the sacred and the profane, clean and unclean. ---It seems that the priests were the authentic interpreters of the law, that they judged all strictly religious matters, 'the affairs of Yahweh' (2 Chr.xix.11), and intervened in civil cases at least when these involved some religious law or religious procedure.' But cf. H. Kleinknecht and W. Gutbrod, Law, p.24 n.1. 'Although it seems that it was the priests who recited the law (Dt.xxxi.11, xxxiii.10) tradition points to Moses, who was not a priest, (תּוֹרָה) for the Decalogue.' nb. p.29 'But the task of the priest is not only to give directions about clean and unclean. He has also to declare at the national assemblies the law as handed down, and to preserve it at the shrine. Furthermore, he is concerned with the divine judgement in those difficult cases in which the community approaches the shrine for a legal decision. This does not mean that the priest actually exercises a judicial function. The relationship between priest and law makes it proper to look for the formation of the Book of the Covenant in priestly circles.'
2. Begrich, 'Die priesterliche Tora'.
3. 'Torah' is a term of extremely wide meaning. We are not seeking to blur useful distinctions between different types of torah but to revise these distinctions which rest on a mistaken view of priestly torah.

are,in fact, clear indications within the OT. of the connection between law and priesthood.[1] (Dt.xxvii.14f.;Ex.xxi.6; xxii.7-10; Dt.xvii.8f.; II Chron.xix. 5f.;Ex.xviii.14f.; I Sam.iv.18; vii.15f.; xii.23; Judg.xvii.6; xviii.1; xix.1; xxi.25; Dt.xxxiii.10 ; Lev.xvii-xxvi passim).[2] We shall now turn to an examination of these passages.

The first piece of evidence - apart from Dt.xxvii.14f. - is to be found within the Book of the Covenant in Ex, xxi.6 and xxii.7-10. Sometimes the translation 'judges' for 'elōhîm has been adopted,but there is no good reason for this.[3] Nor is there any reason to alter the reading yhwh in xxii.10.[4] C.H.Gordon has usefully pointed to the term ilanu ('gods') in Nuzi legal texts; the ilani are used in domestic law to symbolise the right to private property and in communal law to enforce an oath (i.e. ordeal).[5] A.Draffkorn's suggestion that 'elōhîm in Ex.xxi.6 = 'household gods' is less convincing. The best commentary both on this passage and on the role of the priest in the administration of justice is that of S.R.Driver:

1.To accept this does not involve a denial of the place of the judge or king or elders in the administration of justice. Cf.G.Östborn,Tora in the OT.,p.58 n.5, '---the notion that the priests had no judicial functions in the pre-exilic period can scarcely be correct'.

2. Contra L.Köhler,Hebrew Man,p.163, 'First the question concerning the influence of the priests on legal practice. It is apparently much less than we are tempted to assume on a first examination of the Old Testament'. ---(The lively and important part of priests in legal assembly was) 'as citizens and not as priests'. ---As a last resort in difficult cases there was the priestly oracle. 'But we have little information concerning this, and we may guess that it was exceptional and seldom occurred.'

3.As Budde,ZAW 1891,p.99,does.

4.JBL 54,1935,p.139. Cf.ANET,p.220 B - a lawsuit at Nuzi regarding a slave. Nb. '---go and take the oath of the gods --'.

5.JBL 76,1957,p.222.

'From Ex.xxi.6, xxii.7f. (cf. I Sam.ii.25) it may be inferred that in ancient Israel judgement, especially in difficult or crucial cases, was regarded as a divine decision, and delivered at a sanctuary' ----'---- the priests would thus possess an hereditary knowledge of civil and criminal law not less than of ceremonial law, which, especially at a time when Hebrew law was still imperfectly codified, would naturally give them an advantage over either the local 'elders' or the ordinary lay judges. Hence they would be properly represented on a tribunal, appointed expressly for the purpose of dealing with difficult or serious cases'.[1] This avoids the suggestion that resort to the sanctuary priest in legal issues was exceptional or equivalent to abandoning rational justice and the normal channels in favour of enigmatic divine guidance. It is true that priestly decisions were often communicated by oracle or by lot; but such 'tools' depended for their usefulness on an experienced practitioner (cf. Hittite evidence)[2] and the priests who manipulated the lot or oracle would be aware of the growing body of Israelite law. Nor is it improbable that their interpretation of the law in difficult cases was not tied to the lot or oracle. It must, of course, be admitted that Ex.xxi.6 and xxii.7f. alone do not permit any far-reaching conclusions about the role of the priest in the administration of justice in ancient Israel.

In Dt.xvii.8f. (cf. xix.17; xxi.5f.), however, there is explicit mention of Levitical priests taking part in the administration of justice[3] at the 'central sanctuary'. This supreme tribunal is apparently already in existence and its

---

1. Deuteronomy, p.199 and 207.
2. Gurney, Hittites, p.089.
3. There is no need to excise 'the judge' in Dt.xvii.9 as a gloss, as Hölscher, Puuko and Hempel do; nor is there any need to excise 'the priests' as Noth ("Das Amt des„ Richters Israel", pp.404-17) does.

constitution is taken for granted.[1] It may be, therefore, that the priesthood is here taking over an established institution. In this case we need to know the earliest date to which this institution can be traced and at what date it was linked with the priesthood. In this connection the remarkable similarities both with Ex.xviii.14-27 and II Chron.xix.5-11, to which we shall return later, should be noted. An interesting question of interpretation is raised by the words d^{e}bar mišpaṭ (Dt.xvii.9; II Chron.xix.6). Can this mean that the central tribunal of priests and lay judges did not actually pronounce the verdict but recited the appropriate statutes which was to be followed in a particularly difficult instance? In favour of this is the fact that in II Chron.xix, the only other passage where d^{e}bar mišpaṭ occurs (v.6), the priests-judges are told to 'instruct' (hôrâ) those who come to them (v.10). Both in II Chron.xix 10 and Ex.xviii.20 (hôrâ) probably means 'to instruct' rather than 'to pronounce a verdict'. Further support for this interpretation of Dt.xvii.8 is the fact that here, as in II Chron.xix.10 (and Ex.xviii.16f.), the person(s) who consults the central tribunal is not the defendant or his accuser but the local judge. This is not explicitly stated in II Chron.xix.10 but is most likely in view of the phrase 'that they may not incur guilt before the Lord'. What does this phrase mean if it refers to the defendant or his accuser? In other words this is a case of 'Rechtsverkündigung' rather than 'Rechtsentscheidung'.

---

1. The passage is regarded by Welch (Code of Deuteronomy, p.165) as favouring an early date (9 - 8th cent.BC) for Deuteronomy. 'There must have come a time when both priests and judges were administering justice without their relation to each other being precisely defined. --- It is to this transitional period in Israel's national development that the law here under consideration -- may naturally be referred.' Pedersen Israel III - IV, p.163 says, of Dt.17$^{8-13}$, '--- as tradition created more comprehensive and complex laws, the expert knowledge of the priesthood was necessary for their administration. -- But gradually as the expert knowledge of the priests came to play a greater and greater part, we must assume, though we know nothing about it, that he (the king) came to lean largely on the priests in his function as judge.-- Dt. shows that the priesthood could do without (the king).'

Further evidence pointing to judicial activity by the priest is to be found in the references to Eli and Samuel 'judging' (I Sam.iv.18; vii.15-17).[1] De Vaux simply says that Eli is here 'improperly assimilated to the Judges of Israel'.[2] Hertzberg is more positive, however. After noting that Eli has previously appeared only as a priest, he continues: 'there is no compelling objection to his having been judge, as well as priest of the well-known shrine. It is not impossible that Eli's name originally belonged to the list of "minor judges" of which parts are preserved in Judges x - xii'.[3]

There is a similar conflict of opinion over the judicial acitivity of Samuel (I Sam.vii.15-17), who according to another tradition was a Levite as well as a prophet. Noth distrusts the tradition of I Sam.vii.15 although he grants the historicity of the place names in I Sam.vii.15-17.[4] Weiser accepts that there is a genuine historical kernel and that the passage 'is based on an ancient Samuel tradition'.[5] He agrees with Noth in thinking that this judicial acitivity was not the same as that of the tribal elders at the city gate but 'die Verwaltung und Verkündigung des Gottesrechts am Zentralheiligtum des sakralen Stämmeverbands'.[6] The loss of the Ark probably necessitated using local shrines instead of one central sanctuary, according to Weiser.

I Sam.xii.23 provides another reference to Samuel's (priestly)[7] judicial activity.

Have, then any traces of this judicial activity survived in older sources/traditions? It has been noted in recent discussion of Judg.xvii - xviii, xix - xxi

---

1. 'Forty years' is probably a round figure, meaning a generation. The LXX says 'twenty years'.
2. Le Sainte Bible, Samuel, p.36.
3. I & II Samuel, p.49. ET.1964.
4. U - Studien, p.56 n.6.
5. Samuel, p.10. Cf. G.v.Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol.I, p.33; Wildberger, ThZ, 13, 1957, p.463.
6. Op.cit. p.10.
7. Not prophetic, contra Weiser, op.cit., p.16f.

that the Levite in ch.xix seems to possess a certain 'amphictyonic status' (i.e. the cruel murder of the Levite's concubine and the infringement of hospitablity is avenged by the amphictyony - would this have involved the amphictyony if he had been regarded as a purely private individual?).[1] In ch.xvii-xviii we hear only that the Levite was a 'sojourner' (gēr) and that he agreed to serve in the shrine of Micah, until he received a better offer from the Danites. Of his activity during his wanderings and during his sojourn with Micah we know very little, apart from the fact that he was consulted, gave oracles and pronounced Yahweh's blessing. There are indications within the story, however, of possible judicial activity. M. Noth[2] has drawn attention to certain recurrent expressions in Judg.xvii-xxi which have frequently been regarded as 'editorial expansion' or 'Deuteronomic addition' (ie.xvii.6; xviii.1; xix.1; xxi.25). Disputing their purely editorial nature Noth has used xvii.6 and xviii.1 to trace 'a polemical narrative stemming from the circle of the royal Israelite sanctuary of Dan which was established by Jeroboam I'. In the nature of the case it is hardly possible to prove that the verses referred to are not glosses, but Noth has given good reason for regarding them as important glosses, at least, which attest the connection of king and priest; it can hardly be accidental that mention of the king in xvii.6; xviii.1; and xix.1 is preceded by reference to the Levite. It is significant also, we would add, that king and Levite are linked with 'doing what is right' (yāšār). Is it not possible,

---

1. Cf. H. Strauss, Untersuchungen zu den Überlieferungen der vorexilischen Leviten', pp.109 f.; A.H.J. Gunneweg, Leviten und Priester, pp.25f.
2. 'The Background of Judges 17-18', Muilenburg Festschrift, pp.68-86. The present writer had independently noted this connection of priest and king when studying Judg.17-18 from the standpoint of its contribution to our knowledge of the priestly office in early Israel.

therefore, to go one step further than Noth and link the absence of a royally appointed priest or Levite with the alleged absence of law and order? In short, to find here a further trace of the judicial activity of the priest? In Dt. xxxiii.10, at any rate, even if this verse is later than Dt.xxxiii.8 and 11[1], there is clear attestation of the connection of priest/Levite and mišpaṭ[2].

It is significant that there are ample signs of cultic framework in all three main law-codes - Book of the Covenant, Holiness Code and Deuteronomic Code. This is commonly admitted,[3] although it is usually maintained that this framework is secondary and late. For our present purposes the dates of the several frameworks are less important than their correct interpretation. H.G.Reventlow, in his interpretation of the Holiness Code in terms of a festival of covenant-renewal,[4] rejects Mowinckel's suggestion that priests may have been responsible for its transmission in favour of prophets who had an official position in the cult as covenant-mediators.[5] There are several occasions when this interpretation is obviously difficult to carry through (e.g. in the interpretation of rules

---

1. Cf.F.M.Cross-D.N.Freedman, 'The Blessing of Moses', JBL 67,1948,pp.181f.
2. The close connection of mišpaṭ and yāšār (only yāšār occurs in Judg.xvii.6) is attested by I K.xi.53; Ex.xv.26; Dt.vi.18; xii.8,25,28. I K.xi.38,xiv.8 link yāšār with miṣwôt; cf.Jer.xxxiv.15; Mic.iii.9; Ps.xxxvii.37; II Chron.xxxi.20f. In II K.xii.2, which probably stems from priestly tradition, this relation of king, priest and yāšār is quite explicit: 'And Jehoash did what was right (yāšār) in the eyes of the Lord all his days, because Jehoiada the priest instructed (hôrāhû) him'.
3. Cf.E.Gerstenberger, op.cit., p.55, referring to Ex.xxii.21,24,26: 'Diese Rahmung und Stilisierung der Prohibitivreihen ist ganz offensichtlich kultischen Ursprungs'. Cf.more positively, B.Gemser, VTS I,1953,p.62, 'The intrinsic connection of the lawcodes with the cultic life of the people must be kept in mind. The big gatherings of the people or of the amphictyony of a group of tribes at the sanctuaries undoubtedly were the occasions of their promulgation and of their recitation and re-encatment. There is certainly historical truth in the tradition which connects all the principal lawcodes with one or other general assembly of the people at a place of epiphany, revelation or guidance of God.'
4. Das Heiligkeitsgesetz, p.25f.
5. But the only evidence offered for this is Dt.xviii.18, following H-J.Kraus, Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel, and v.Rad's interpretation of Lev.xix as 'community instruction of a popular character carried out by the Levites' (Studies in Deuteronomy, p.31). His analysis of Lev.xvii-xxvi is often illuminating, but he uses the 'homiletic framework' to claim that everything is now declared by a cultic prophet.

relating to priests in Lev.xxi-xxii; in the ritual legislation of Lev.xxiii; and in the context of xix.22 and xxiii.20). Reventlow's forced interpretation, however, is most apparent in his attempt to equate the recurrent formula, 'And the Lord said to Moses, "Say to Aaron /the people of Israel, If any one --" ', with the prophetic formula 'Thus says the Lord', on the basis of II Sam.vii.4.[1] In fact, the former represents the priestly mediator, the latter prophetic directness. Even formally the two passages are hardly comparable.

In connection with the cultic framework of the OT law-codes B.Gemser[2] has suggested that the refrain 'for I am the Lord' in Lev.xix 'can better be understood as a kind of antiphon to the recital of the laws by the priest at the assembly in the sanctuary or like the response 'Amen' to the *'ārûr* of the Dodecalogue of Curses(Dt.27) than as an insertion of a scribe and redactor'. This is not improbable and would lend further weight to our argument if proven.

Reference has already been made to the connection of *'ārûr* and *môt yûmāt* (cf.p.63 above). Gen.ii.13-14,17;iii.4 also seem to point to the close connection of cult,curse and law[3] (and hence priest and law). In ii.17 God commands,'Do not eat--' (*lō'* --) on pain of the penalty of death (*môt tāmût*).[4]

1.'--the word of the Lord came to Nathan,Go tell my servant David,Thus says the Lord'.

2.'Motive Clauses in the OT.',*VTS* 1, 1953,pp.50f.

3.The connection of curse and law is also attested by Gen.ix.6. Cf.H.Gunkel, *Genesis*,p.149 ('mag ein alter Rechtsspruch sein');and G.v.Rad,*Genesis*, p.109 ('eine alte Sentenz aus der sakralen Rechtssprache'). Cf.also C.Westermann,*Forschung am AT.*,p.49 ;and Is.xxiv.5-6.

4. It is true that the phrase *môt yûmāt* is not found here,but in view of the fact that the person speaking(Yahweh) is also responsible for carrying the death penalty into effect,it is natural that the penalty should be put in the second person (cf. I Sam.xiv.39 and p.63 above).This seems preferable to the distinction of M.Greenberg,'Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law',p.22 n.36,between a judicial provision and a theological dictum, reserving *yûmāt* for the former.

In Gen.iii.3 Eve's version of God's command ('--and do not touch--')is often regarded as her exaggeration. This is possible,but it is more important for our present purpose to notice that the word 'touch'[1] occurs frequently in passages connected with the priesthood (eg. Lev.v.2-3;vi.11,20;vii.19-21;xi. 8,24,26-7,31,36,39; xii.4; xv.5,7,10-12,19,21-3,27; Num.iv.15;xvi.26;xix.11, 13,16,18,21-2; xxxi.19;Dt.xiv.8; Hagg.ii.12-13;Lam.iv.15) and is significantly linked with prohibitions whose sanction is the death penalty (môṯ yûmāṯ) in Ex. xix.12[2] and Gen.xxvi.11.[3] If,as Ringgren suggests,Gen.i-iii was recited in the other priestly cult,it is quite possible that it was also influenced by/traditions which related curse and law. This speculation does not perhaps carry much weight by itself,but taken in conjunction with the evidence already given and the further evidence to be considered it is significant.

The place claimed for the priest in our argument is sometimes assigned exclusively to the prophet. We have already given reason for rejecting some of these views (pp.84-5 above). R.Rendtorff,[4] contesting H.W.Wolff's view[5] that Hosea was linked with Levitical sources,but accepting that Hosea drew on amphictyonic traditions,has attempted to link early prophecy with the amphictyony and the office of 'Judge'. His view that Num.xv.32-6;ix.6;and xxvii.1 represent cases of 'inspirierte Rechtsentscheidung',which was the function of prophets,at least after the emergence of the monarchy,takes no account,however,of the priestly character of the passages. His warning that 'we should not distinguish too sharply between charismatic and purely institutional functions'[6] in the amphictyony does not entail that the prophet rather than the priest was responsible

---

1.Cf.U.Cassuto,Commentary on Genesis,Vol.I,p.145
2.Cf.Job i.11;cf.also Prov.vi.29,a poetic adaptation of apodeictic law?
3.'Är den bibliska skapelseberättelsen en kulttext?',SEÅ 13,1948,pp.9-21.
4.'Erwägungen zur Frühgeschichte des Prophetentums in Israel',ZThK 59,1962,p.144
5.'Hoseas geistige Heimat',Ges.Stud.,pp.232-251.
6.Op.cit.,p.162

for law-making. His use of the amphictyony to infer the activity of cultic prophets ,even when they are not mentioned,leads him to misinterpret several passages in the Book of Numbers. In each case (Num.xv a man who gathered sticks on the Sabbath; ch.ix - those unable to keep the Passover because of impurity; ch.xxvii - the right of daughters to inherit)[1] Moses waits on the Lord to discover his will (cf.Dt.xvii.8f.;Ex.xviii.3f.) . The replies have the form of A.Alt's apodeictic and casuistic laws. They point ,in fact,to the connection of priest and law (cf.Num.xxxv and Lev.xxiv.10f.).[2]

There remains one final group of passages to be considered as evidence of judicial activity on the part of the priest (Hos.iv.6;viii.12;Ex.xviii.13-27 II Chron.xix.5-11). So far we have noted various indications that the proclamation of justice was not entirely in the hands of the village elders or confined to the town gate. A fundamental objection to our argument,however,is the view of Begrich,[3] that priestly torah had nothing to do with secular law or with the delivery of an oracle,apart from the distinction of clean and unclean. In spite of many sound observations about ritual his remarks on the form of priestly torah lack cogency[4] and his conclusions about the purely ritual nature of priestly torah must be rejected as unfounded. It is necessary to emphasise this,as his conclusions have been taken over by a number of later scholars and incorporated either accidentally or fundamentally in their theories. Begrich's

---

1.On the priestly traits of Moses cf.p.17 n.1 and p.96 n.2.

2.Since this study was finished,J.Weingreen,'The case of the daughters of Zelophehad',VT 16,1966,pp.518-22,has drawn attention to the role of divine ruling in the growth of case-law. 'One should not regard these recorded cases (i.e.Lev.xxiv.10-16;Num.xv.32-6;Num.xxvii.1-11) as isolated instances which necessitated recourse to the divine ruling,nor should one conclude that the resultant legislation which flowed from the revealed verdicts were the only laws to have been enacted in this manner --- they are indicative of the growth of case-law in ancient Israel'.

3. 'Die priesterliche Tora',Ges.Stud.,pp.236-61,esp.p.237 n.39: 'die priesterliche Torah schafft und vermittelt keinerlei weltliches Recht'.But cf.p.78 above

4.Why,for instance,should the 2nd pers.pl.imperative of Am.iv.4f.preserve the form rather than the 2nd pers.sing.imper. with lō' or the 3rd pers.sing./pl.?

standpoint is assumed, for instance, by Reventlow[1], Boecker[2], Feucht[3], v.Rad[4], and Alt.[5] Östborn[6] also, after discussing the possibility that torah in Dt.xxvii and Josh.xxiv.26 included secular mišpāṭîm and ḥuqqîm concludes, 'In the main, however, tôra was used, I feel, of utterances made by priests regarding cults and rites of the kind now preserved in Lev. and Num. ---'. Begrich's narrow definition of priestly torah has been noticed by several writers (e.g. Mowinckel,[7] Weiser,[8] Mckenzie)[9], but even McKenzie, who attacks Begrich specifically, concludes that the original reference of torah was very probably to the cultic-ritual content of the priestly instruction. Rendtorff[10] questions Begrich's limitation of priestly torah in Leviticus but does not object to the more fundamental limitation of torah to ritual matters.

One of the difficulties implicit in any attempt to understand the meaning and development of torah in ancient Israel is that of dating the traditions incorporated in the OT. This is rightly stressed by Begrich, but it seems capricious to assume from the outset that Hagg.ii.11-12 (and other late prophetic statements) provides evidence of the earliest usage, even though it may be granted that priestly tradition and usage may have been tenacious. It is a pity that Östborn, in spite of his wide-ranging discussion, makes no attempt to date the traditions of the OT. with the result that the picture which he paints is

---

1. ZTh K, 60 p.270 n.17
2. Op.cit., pp.141f.
3. Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitsgesetz, p. 108f.
4. G.v.Rad, Theologie des ATs.I, p.243f.
5. Kleine Schriften, p.285 n.2. This is all the more surprising in view of his use of Dt.xxvii.
6. Op.cit., p.68
7. The Psalms in Israel's Worship, II p.53f.
8. ATD Kl. Propheten I, p.32.
9. 'Knowledge of God', JBL 74, 1955, pp.22-7. /in Hosea'
10. Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift, p.1f.

chronologically flat.[1] It must be admitted that torah seems to admit of very few instances that are clearly early[2] and that the texts quoted as linking priest and torah are mostly from the late pre-exilic or post-exilic period (Jer.xviii.18; Ezk.vii.26; cf. Mic.iii.11). But already in the first certain use of torah (Hos.iv.6; viii.12), where it is linked with da'at 'elōhîm and priests, it can hardly be referring solely to cultic-ritual matters,[3] One of the first clear historical references goes against Begrich's usage, therefore.

Hos.viii.12 implies that torah was already fixed in writing and the way in which Hosea refers to torah implies that it was no new or foreign body in Israelite society. Is it then possible to trace the antecedents of this torah further?[4] Has it any connection with priestly judicial activity? In his article on 'Hoseas geistige Heimat' H.W. Wolff located the background of Hosea and his theology in N. Israel, in circles which were connected with Deuteronomy and Levitical groups. After observing that much of Hosea's invective is directed against priests Wolff concludes from an examination of Hos.vi.4-6, ix.7-9, xii.8-11, 13-15 that Hosea 'is only acquainted with prophets who are willing

---

1. Cf. C. North's criticism of Pedersen and the Uppsala school in OTMS, p.77.
2. Ex.xxiv.12 is generally regarded as a late editorial addition. The date of Dt.xxxiii.10 is uncertain, but is probably later than vv.8 or 11, which may be 10th cent.Cf.Cross-Freedman,'The Blessing of Moses',JBL 67,1948,pp.181f.
3. Cf. A. Weiser, Kl.Proph. ATD I p.32; H.W. Wolff, Ges.Stud., pp.193-4, n.53-4; W. Robinson, Inspiration and Revelation in the OT., p.201 n.2.
4. It is doubtful whether it may be assumed, as van der Ploeg 'Studies in Biblical Law', CBQ 12 1950, p.253, does, on the basis of Hos.viii.12, and Deuteronomic passages where torah and covenant are associated, that 'already for Osee the tôrāh of Yahweh was that which Yahweh had given to Moses at Sinai.' Nor can we assume that the occurrence of tòrāh in Hos. (a northern prophet) and in Is. and Mic. (southern prophets) proves that 'this law already existed during the time of the united kingdom'.

instruments of Yahweh, and that he considers himself like them in opposition to the present official Israel and its cultus'[1]. This, however, does not explain a) the obvious cultic interests, background and knowledge of Hosea or b) his knowledge and familiarity with the traditions of early Isreel such as the Exodus and Jacob traditions. Nothing in the prophetic circles of the N. kingdom would lead us to expect such emphases. Further, Hosea judges the priests not by purely ritual standards but by their faithfulness in proclaiming God's law (cf.iv.1, 6; vi.6; viii.1,12; xiii.2; ii.10; xi.1 cf. p.194). Hence 'die Aufgabe ist unumgänglich, neben den Prophetenkreisen nach anderen Gruppen zu suchen, die sowohl mit Kultus wie mit Überlieferungen der Frühzeit rege beschäftigt waren und die zugleich wie Hosea und die Prophetenkreise in Opposition gedrängt waren'.[2] Such a group is to be found in the Levites of N. Israel, who were, temporarily at any rate, excluded from office by Jeroboam (I K. xii.31) and who seem to have been in opposition to the official priests for some time at any rate (cf. Ex. xxxii; Gen.xxxiv.25, Dt.xxxiii.9; Gen.xlix.5; Ezk.xliv.9). This is supported by an exegesis of Hos.vi.4-6 (which is interpreted as referring to a line of opposition prophets), ix.7-9 (where Gibea is taken as referring to the Levite's death in Gibea in Judg.xix.-xxi), xii.8-11 (where the early wilderness traditions and prophetic parallels are linked with Levitical interests by means of xii.10a, 'I am Yahweh thy God who brought thee out of Egypt', which belongs to the solemn proclamation of divine law) and xii.13-15 (where Moses, who elsewhere is firmly fixed in Levitical traditions, is described as the prophet). Finally confirmation for this hypothesis is sought in Deuteronomy, which has strong Levitical interests and probably stemmed from N. Israel; prophets and Levites are also associated

---

1. Op.cit., p.243
2. Op.cit., p.244

under Moses in Deuteronomy.

One of the obvious weaknesses of this otherwise convincing reconstruction is that in its present form it depends on certain unproven assumptions about the Levites (e.g. as proclaimers of sacral amphictyonic law).[1] To argue solely on the basis of Deut. is to argue in a circle. In the preceding pages, however, we have given other evidence relating to possible priestly 'Rechtsprechung'. We shall now turn to a form-critical study of Ex.xviii, 13-27, which contains what is probably the earliest attested use of torah. The passage has been extensively commented upon & the implications of the passage for the origins of Yahwism and Mosaic religion have not gone unnoticed,[2] but no special attention has been paid to the occurrence of tôrāh in vv.16 and 20.[3] There are, in fact, several points about Ex.xviii deserving further study.

Ex.xviii.1-12 is generally regarded as E-material with occasional J-expansions; xviii.13-27 is generally referred almost entirely to E, and most commentators consider vv.13-27 a unity.[4] There are, however, several perplexing and disputed points in the chapter. What, for instance, is the relation of the first incident to the second? What is the meaning of Jethro offering sacrifice? What does the division of judicial activity in vv.13-27 refer to? Does the narrative contain reliable historical information?

---

1. Cf. R. Rendtorff, 'Erwägungen zur Frühgeschichte des Prophetentums in Israel' ZThK 59, 1962, p.151. R's attempt to identify prophetic and amphictyonic traditions and deduce the early history of prophecy from this is equally unproven, however. Cf. p.86 above.
2. Cf. H.H. Rowley, From Moses to Qumran, p.52f.; C.H.W. Brekelmans, OTS, x, 1954, p.215; T.J. Meek, Hebrew Origins, p.88; M. Buber, Moses, p.94. A.H.J. Gunneweg, 'Mose in Midian', ZThK 60/1, 1964, p.1f. refers only to vv.1-12.
3. But cf. H.W. Robinson, op.cit., p.203 and n.1; cf. the works of Knierim and Junge referred to below.
4. Cf. M. Noth, Ü-Studien, pp.151f.; Exodus, pp.146f. But Simpson, The Early Traditions of Israel, pp.555 and 628 finds 2 somewhat contradictory strands.

R. Knierim, in a traditio-historical examination of the passage, relates it closely to vv.1-12.[1] V.8 contains a recital of Yahweh's saving acts, vv.9-11 are a doxology and confession of faith in Yahweh by Jethro, v.12 describes a sacrifice and cultic meal, and vv.13-27 the execution and proclamation of justice on the following day. In short, the proclamation of law is closely attached in form and content to the cultic gathering.[2] Interpreting 'able men' (v.21) as a reference to 'men who already had a profession connected with judging' in view of the three epithets ('God-fearing, trustworthy men,who hate a bribe') which follow (cf. Prov.xix.25; xxix.14; Ezk.xviii.8; Zech.vii.9; viii.16; Jer.ix.4; I Sam.viii.3; Is.xxxiii.15; Hab.ii.9; Ex.xxiii.1-3, 6-9) Knierim suggests that they were now being officially 'inducted' into an office (whereas the 'Ortsgerichtsgemeinde' is something one grows up into). Moses' office of judge is now decentralised, but no distinction of 'civil' and sacral justice is implied. This judicial innovation, which in the history of the tradition has been connected with a military innovation, namely the organisation of the levy, affects everyone and is to be permanent (cf.vv.21-2). This leads naturally to the question of the Sitz im Leben of this tradition about 'professional judges'.[3]

Following Noth,[4] Knierim regards vv. 1-12 as an old tradition referring to a cultic meeting between Israel andthe priest of Midian at a Midianite shrine on the 'mt. of God'. V.11. represents a confession of faith in Yahweh by Jethro,[5] but is probably the composition of E, and cannot be reconciled with the older trad-

---

1. 'Ex.18 und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtsbarkeit', ZAW 73, 1961, p. 146-71. So also Noth, Exodus, p.146; this represents a shift of opinion from Ü-Studien, p.150 ('keine sachliche Beziehung zueinander').
2. Op.cit., p.148
3. Op.cit., p.155f.
4. Ü-Studien, p.151
5. Cf. W. Zimmerli, Gesammelte Aufsätze, p.85.

ition in v.12 according to which Jethro offers sacrifice and Aaron and the elders of Israel eat with him. The mention of Aaron in v.12 is regarded as a sign that we are dealing with a levitical cult-aetiology.[1] In view of their vocabulary vv.16a, 20a, 20b, and 21b are regarded as later E additions, as is 25b. This means that judge and levy were only linked together at a later stage of tradition.[2] The aetiological character of vv.13-27 is confirmed by 'at all times' (vv.22a, 26a) and by the position of ch.xviii, which acts as a sort of introduction to the legal organisation of Israel after the Exodus.[3] Building on Noth and Kraus, Knierim regards vv.13-27 as an old original tradition which referred to Moses judging, filled out with prophetic features in vv.16b and 20 by E.[4] In its present form the tradition is aetiological rather than historical, but it points to a historical situation which Knierim identifies with the judicial reforms of Jehoshapat in II Chron.xix.[5] Thus, the significance of the passage (vv.13-27) as a whole is seen not in the separation of sacral and secular justice

---

1. This identification of Aaron and Levi is not supported by any evidence.
2. Op.cit., p.154
3. Cf. H. Gressmann, Mose und seine Zeit, p.175f.
4. Op.cit. p.156
5. The court of appeal set up in II Chron.xix. did not simply deal with cases between civil personnel and soldiers (so Rudolph), nor did it institute royal officials for the levy and temple officials for temple problems, leaving normal judicial procedures untouched (so Galling), but it acted in all disputed cases in Jerusalem (so Knierim), and function discharged by the judges of v.5(8) in the country.

(so Noth),[1] but in the subdivision of royal sacral law and the claim of certain groups, namely the judges appointed by Jehoshapat to serve in the garrison cities of Judah, to be the continuers of an office established by Moses.[2]

This is a useful and positive reconstruction, but it is open to correction in part. In particular the place of the Levites in the relationship of Ex.xviii. and II Chron.xix calls for further comment. The alleged 'prophetic' features of Ex.xviii.16 & 20 reveal distinctly priestly features on closer inspection. The passage contains valuable tradition not only about the regular lay judges who dealt with routine cases, but also about the judges (Levitical and lay) who continued Moses' work of dealing with difficult disputed cases. An examination of vv.16 and 20 will shed some light on this. The difference between Moses' procedure in v.16 and v.20 is not perfectly clear at first sight except that the latter is undoubtedly intended to be less burdensome for him. In v.16 Moses 'makes them know the statutes of God and his toroth' (hôda 'tî 'et ḥuqqê hā'^{e}lōhîm w^{e}'et tôrōtaw); in v.20 he 'makes them know the way in which they must walk' (wehôda'tā lāhem 'et hadderek yēl^{e}kû bāh). But in v.16 Moses actually pronounces judgement himself (w^{e}šāpaṭtî), whereas in vv.19-20 he 'represents the people before God and teaches(?) them the statutes and toroth' (mûl hā'^{e}lōhîm --- w^{e}hiz^{e}hartāh 'ethem 'et-haḥuqqîm w^{e}'et-hattôrōt), i.e. he apparently delegates his work of pronouncing judgement, except in difficult cases, to others. Knierim emphasises the connection of judge and levy under Jehoshapat[3]; but the verb zhr points rather

---

1. Exodus, p.150; cf. Stalker on Ex.xviii.13-27 in Peake's Commentary (1962); J.R. Porter, 'Moses and Monarchy', ~~Oxford, 1963~~, p.12 says, 'Noth's categories of sacral and state law ultimately depend on modern notions which are inapplicable to the ancient Near Eastern world'.
2. Op.cit., p. 163f.
3. This is certainly preferable to Junge's restriction of the levy to the time of Josiah (Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia, p.83)

to the linking of judge and Levite (priest). The verb zhr occurs elsewhere only in Ezk.iii and xxxiii. (passim), in passages which probably derive from a background of sacral law;[1] in Ps.xix.12 in a context of tôrāh; in II K.vi.10 of Elisha's advice to the King of Israel; by Ecclesiastes of the advice given to a king (iv.13) or to the reader (xii.12); and in II Chron.xix.10, where Jehoshapat commissions the Levites to act as judges. There is nothing prophetic about these passages, apart possibly from II K.vi.10, whereas several link the word with priestly activity. It is true that the Chronicler often relies on Deut. traditions, and this passage is reminiscent of Dt.xvii.9-11,[2] which we have already looked at in connection with priestly judicial activity,[3] but there is no reason to impugn the historicity of the Chronicler's account at this point.[4] Rather, it looks as if he has preserved an accidental (?) reference to an aspect of Levitical work which he did not otherwise stress. In fact, tôrōt in Ex.xviii.16 and 20 may also

---

1. Cf. W. Zimmerli, ' "Leben" u. "Tod" im Buche des Propheten Ezechiels', Ges. Aufsätze, pp.181f., 186f.
2. Cf. Driver, Deuteronomy, p.200. Cf. p.64 above.
3. P.81 above.
4. Cf. R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp.153 f.; W.F. Albright, 'The Judicial Reform of Jehoshapat', Alexander Marx Jubilee Vol, pp.61-82, esp.pp.74f., also records examples of judicial activity by Egyptian priests (cf. JNES v. 1946, pp.260-76). It is interesting to speculate on the origins of Jehoshapat's reform. Was he perhaps introducing a Northern Levitical tradition? It is known that he married into the Northern kingdom.

represent good historical tradition - the earliest attested use of tôrāh? - rather than late interpretation.[1]

If this is so we have yet another piece of evidence pointing to the judicial activity of the priest/Levite at an early date.[2] In short, there is ample external support for our interpretation of Dt.xxvii.15-26 as a list of stipulations, similar to parts of other law-codes in the OT., pronounced by Levites, rather than as a concluding list of curses recited at a covenant-renewal festival.

---

1. 'Torah' in Ex.xxiv.12 is generally regarded as 'late' by literary critics, although it is appealed to by Östborn as if it were early. J.Hyatt, 'Torah in Jeremiah', JBL 60 1941, p.386 makes an interesting comment on Jer.ii.8: 'Although Jer. professes to be talking about various groups who have led the people astray between the time of the desert sojourn and his own day, we may suppose that he was really concerned with leaders of his own day. It is easy to understand that the necessity for interpreters and administrators of Torah would have arisen with the publication of Dt. Their concern would have been with what we term jurisprudence in the wider sense, as Dt. contains not only ritualistic prescriptions but also regulations dealing with business practices, the establishment of social justice, family life and the like. It is impossible to determine precisely what the sphere of the tofᵉse hattorah was, and what was their relationship to the priests on the one hand and to the secular judges on the other. In spite of the fact that the present passage makes them appear to be a separate class, they probably were a subdivision of the priesthood.' If this was so at a later date, the practice may well have antedated Dt. In fact, Jer.ii.8 seems to refer to an established practice, not an innovation.
2. Cf.C.Hauret, Bib.40, 1959, p.518, quoting G.B.Gray, 'Moses here (in Ex.18) appears not as legislator and priest, or as legislator prior to legislating priests, but as priest in legislative activity; not as creating in the capacity of non-priestly legislator the primitive nucleus of future law to which man acting in a different, viz. a priestly capacity and by different methods subsequently added: but as creating that nucleus of Hebrew law by the same method as that characteristically used by the later priests in amplifying the law, viz. the oracular consultation of God --- Moses creates the nucleus of Hebrew law as the first of the Hebrew priests'. (Gray, p.205 of Sacrifice in the OT.). But Östborn, op.cit., p.58 ('In Ex.xviii we do not know if Moses is priest or king') and Pedersen, Israel III-IV, pp.162-3 are less certain. For evidence of the judicial authority of baru priests in Mesopotamia in Hammurabi's time see A.Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, p.65. For Egypt see ANET, p.212f. and H.Kees, Ägypten, pp.220f., 256.

This brings us to the end of our examination of Dt.xxvii.15-26 and priestly stipulations delivered in the form of a curse. It also brings us to the end of our examination of the role of the priest in relationship to the processes of law. From all this it appears that the ʾārûr form of words, even if it was characteristic of one group of priestly stipulations, was not the only form (cf.môṯ yûmāṯ etc.).[1] Moreover ,the ʾārûr stipulations occur elsewhere[2] ,and even if some of these passages have priestly connections,[3] there is no evidence which would allow us to limit this form of speech to the priests,or even to show that it was original to the priests.[4] But it has been shown that the above forms of speech were,in fact,used by the priests and have judicial reference. And this is important for an understanding of the priestly office in ancient Israel.[5] The question of priestly curses (and blessings) concluding an act of covenant-renewal (cf.pp.14,70.96 above) has yet to be examined; this will be undertaken in connection with a study of Dt.xxviii (pp.10ff f.).

1.Cf.pp.56f.,63.
2.Cf.pp.53f.
3.Cf.pp.53-5,85-6.
4.Cf.pp.67-8,73f.
5.Cf.p.117.

Ritual Toroth

We shall turn next to an examination of other forms of priestly tôrôt, namely those delivered in connection with ritual and sacrifice. Our examination at this point will not raise any new issues, but will consist largely of a qualified restatement of the views of Begrich,[1] v.Rad[2] and Rendtorff.[3] Although Begrich's views on priestly torah in general are restricted in value and sometimes misleading, yet when he discusses the priest's task of distinguishing between clean and unclean (cf. Ezk.xxii.26; xliv.23; Lev.x.10; xiv.57; cf. Zeph.iii.4) he is both sound and illuminating. This clean/unclean torah is not limited to the cult, although this is its primary reference (cf. Lev.vi.1-3; vii.1f; Is.i.13). The laity need to know how to approach Yahweh properly - at the right time, in the right place, in the right manner and with the right offering.[4] This explains why there is such great stress on preventing the contact of clean and unclean (cf. Ps.lxxix.1; Num.xix.20; Lev.xiv.46; xv.4-9, 21-27; Hagg.ii.13). Begrich distinguishes between torah, delivered by the priest for the laity, and da'at, which is applicable only to the priests (cf. Lev.vi-vii).[5] The latter is a late, post-exilic development of torah, he thinks, and is not strictly torah.[6]

G.v.Rad's contribution consists chiefly in drawing attention to certain other words similar to 'clean/unclean' (e.g. 'acceptable/unacceptable') which seem to have acquired a technical meaning in the cult as 'declaration formulas' pronounced by the priest.[7] This view was taken up and developed by R. Rendtorff,

---

1. 'Die priesterliche Tora', Gesammelte Studien, pp.232-61.
2. 'Die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit', Ges. Studien, pp.130-136.
3. Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift.
4. Begrich, Op.cit., pp.240-2
5. Op.cit., p.258
6. Op.cit., pp.258-9
7. G.v.Rad, Op.cit., pp.131-2

who rightly noted that Begrich's discussion omits several relevant passages (e.g. Lev. i-v)[1] and questioned whether it is possible to juxtapose later *da'at* and earlier *tôrāh* in the way that Begrich does. Rendtorff, therefore, examines the material, mostly in Leviticus, neglected by Begrich but noted by v. Rad, and shows that this consisted of a) short, repeated sentences which made up and accompanied a ritual;[2] b) other instructions of a more complex nature, for the priest. The former (e.g. Lev. i-v) was not finally given its present form until the Exile; the latter represents a gradual growth over many years and cannot be dated, although it gives an inside view of the cult and its workings.[3]

The forms of priestly torah according to Begrich[4] were as follows: a) imperatives, usually in the second person plural (cf. Am.iv.4-5; Is.i.16; Am. v.5; Lev.xi.8), addressed to the people as a whole and claiming to be words of Yahweh, and impersonal jussives (cf. Am.v.24; Lev.xi.13; xix.6); b) statements in direct speech by Yahweh[5] (cf. Is.i.11); c) decisions or pronouncements with an object, event, or person as the subject (cf. Is.i.13-16; lxvi.3; Lev.xix.7; xi.

---

1. Op.cit., p.2 and n.7
2. Op.cit. p.22. These rituals were not intended specifically for either priests or laity to the exclusion of the other, but were intended for recital (by the priests) in the Temple at Jerusalem, possibly in the pre-exilic period but more probably later, according to Rendtorff.
3. Op.cit., p.77
4. Op.cit., pp.243-6
5. When v. Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p.24 n.2, says, of priestly torah, 'Its general form is that of a command in which God speaks in the first person' this is true but has little use as a criterion of the form of priestly torah. It points also to the weakness of Begrich's classification.

4-8, 10-23); and d) a statement of consequences, usually in the imperfect or perfect consecutivum and often dependent on a condition (cf. Lev.vii.27; xix.7). As illustration of several of the above forms occurring together (usually the forms are only found separately) Begrich instances Am.iv.4-5 and Is.i.10-17.

Unfortunately Begrich's justification for picking out these particular forms of torah rests on rather general and inconclusive considerations, in spite of an appearance of formal precision. He refers back to the beginning of his essay, where he had noted that torah is often coupled with Yahweh and, therefore, consists essentially in a word of Yahweh; this was delivered not just to the individual but to the whole people. He then proceeds to describe the formal characteristics on the basis of a small group of a) prophetic b) Pentateuchal passages where 'torah' occurs.[1] His method, however, is most unsatisfactory. For example, verses are taken which occur in the same chapter as 'torah'; but other verses which also occur in the same chapter as 'torah' are omitted - because they do not suit his prior definition, based essentially on the general characteristics noted at the beginning of his essay (i.e. a word of Yahweh to the whole people). The difference between his third and fourth categories (c) and (d) is quite fluid, as may be seeen from Lev.xix.7 which is common to both.

These weaknesses in Begrich's article, however, should not obscure the fact that he has correctly pointed to certain forms of speech in Lev.vii.-xi. as forms of priestly torah:

a) --- lō' tō' kēlû, 'you shall eat no (fat)'. (Lev.vii.22). Cf.v.26

b) --- lō' ḥāpaṣtî, 'I do not delight in (= reject)[2] (the blood of bulls)'. (Is.i.11; 2 S.xv.26; Ps.xl.9)

---

1. Am.iv.4-5; v.4-5, 21-4; Hos.vi.6; Is.i.10-17; lxvi.2b-3; Mal,i.10 and Lev. vii.22-5, 26-7; xi.1-8, 9-12, 13-19, 20-3; xix.5-8; Dt.xiv.4-8, 9-10, 11-20.
2. The majority of instances of ḥapaṣ have no sacrificial or priestly reference, however.

c)---piggûl hû', lō' yērāṣeh 'it is an abomination,it will not be accepted' (Lev.xix.7).

d)---w^enikreṭāh hannepeš hahû' mē'ammeyāh 'that person shall be cut off from his people' (Lev.vii.27).

Statements about being 'cut off from the people' bear strong similarities to the 'ārûr and môṯ yûmāṯ stipulations, which we have already considered in connection with Dt.xxvii.15f. The other sentences have been convincingly interpreted by G.v.Rad as priestly 'declaratory formulas'. Starting from the word ḥāšab ('it is reckoned' cf.Gen.xv.6) ,which occurs in Lev.vii.18b (cf. Num.xviii.27;Lev.xvii.4;Ps.cvi.31; Lev.xxvii.23),v.Rad elucidates a whole series of similar formulas :[1]

(lō') yērāṣeh[2] 'it is (not) pleasing,acceptable' (cf.II Sam.xxiv.23; Jer.xiv.12;Ezk.xx.40;xliii.27;Hos.viii.13;Am.v.22; Mal. i.10; Lev.i.4; vii.18;xix.7; xxii.23,25,27)

ṭāmēh hû' 'it is unclean' (cf.Lev.xiii.15,36,46,51,66).

ṭāhôr hû' 'it is clean' (cf.Lev.xiii.8,13,17,39-41).

ṣāra'at hû' 'it is leprosy' (cf.Lev.xiii.8,25).

He proceeds to link such priestly 'declaratory formulas' with the recurrent stereotyped phrases that occur in connection with sacrifice,again in unmistakeably priestly contexts:[3]

'ôlāh hû' 'it is a burnt offering' (cf.Ex.xxix.28;Lev.i.9,13,17).

ḥaṭṭā't hû' 'it is a sin offering' (cf.Ex.xxix.14;Lev.iv.21,24;v.9).

---

1. Ges.Stud.p.132,'There is no doubt that the priest pronounced this authoritative "it is leprosy" or "it is clean" in the presence of the man concerned'.
2. It is perhaps significant,however, that in the prophetic and historical passages rṣh is used in the Ist pers.sing.,and placed on the lips of Yahweh.
3. Op.cit.p.132

minḥāh hû' 'it is a cereal offering' (cf. Lev.ii.6, 15)

ḳōdeš ḳodāšîm hû' 'it is most holy' (cf. Lev.vi.10, 18, 22; vii.1 etc.)

šeḳeṣ hû' 'it is an abomination' (cf. Lev.xi.41)

A further occasion for such formulas in view of Ezk.xviii.9b and Pss.xv and xxiv may have been on entering a shrine, if Ps.xv and xxiv belong to temple-entrance liturgies.[1]

R. Rendtorff, concentrating on Lev.i-v, has shown how these brief impersonal sentences, regarded by v.Rad as 'declaratory formulas', probably formed part of the sacrificial ritual along with such stereotyped expressions as 'he shall offer -- lay his hand -- kill -- (throw the blood)[2] -- flay -- burn' (Lev.i.3-9; 10-13; iii.1-5; 6-11; 12-17; iv.3-12; 14-21; 22-6; 27-31; 32-35).[3] These rituals, suggests Rendtorff, were applicable to both priest and laity,[4] and not confined to the sphere of priestly da'aṯ.[5] Nevertheless, if these rituals were recited (by the priests) in the Temple, as Rendtorff suggests, then we have here another example of a priestly form of speech.[6] But they can only be regarded as examples of priestly toroth in an extended sense; they are not so much instruction delivered

---

1. Cf. K. Koch, 'Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge', Studien zur AT. Überlieferu-ngen, pp.45-60; E. Würthwein, 'Kultpolemik oder Kultbescheid', Tradition und Situation, pp.115-31.
2. This may have been a later addition; whereas the other verbs are in the singular, this verb is always in the plural and has as its subject 'sons of Aaron'.
3. Op.cit., pp.1 ff.
4. Op.cit., p.22
5. Contra Begrich.
6. But whether these rubrics should count as priestly tôrōṯ, even according to our extended definition, is perhaps doubtful.

by the priest as instruction for the priest offering the sacrifice and guidance for the Israelite bringing his gift.

By their connection with the place of sacrifice andthe fact that they occur predominantly in P these sacrificial toroth seem to have become linked with the Temple at Jerusalem, at any rate at a later stage of the tradition, even if not originally. The form of these toroth does not permit any more definite conclusion.

DEUTERONOMY XXVIII

We are now in a position to examine the question of priestly blessings and cursings used at the end of an act of covenant-making.[1] We shall begin with an examination of the blessings and cursings in Dt.xxviii. Before we can proceed to analyse the forms of blessings and curses in Dt.xxviii, however, it will be necessary to examine the date and structure of Dt.xxviii, since it contains a variety ofmaterial and is commonly held to contain extensive later additions.[2] Vv.47f. are regarded as (post) - exilic additions because v.45 seems to represent a final summary and because the following verses, by their reference to siege and cannibalism, seemto reflect the conditions of 586 BC. in Jerusalem.[3] Vv.58-68 may represent a separate later addition in view of the reference to a book of torah.[4] Vv.25-42 are also regarded as containing later traditions.[5] Because of the parallelism of v.7 and v.25

---

1. Ex.xxiii.21-33; Lev.xxvi; Dt.xxviii; cf. Josh.xxiii.15-16; xxiv.27; Neh.x.29; II Chron.xv.13.
2. Cf. C. Steuernagel, Deuteronomium, pp.99-105; M.Noth, 'Die mit des Gesetzes Werken umgehen, die sind unter dem Fluch', Ges.Stud. pp.155-72; G.v.Rad, Deuteronomium, ATD 8, p.124; G.E. Wright, IB 2, p.493. Naturally these authors do not agree in detail. S.R. Driver, Deuteronomy, rejects the view that the chap. is a later addition or has been subjected to any appreciable interpolation (p.304). E. Mørstad, 'Overveielser til Dtn.28', NTT 60, 1959, pp.224-32, D. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant, and D.R. Hillers, Treaty Curses and the OT. Prophets, regard the chapter as embodying ancient treaty-curse traditions.
3. Cf. Lam.ii.10f.
4. Cf. p.112n.1 below.
5. M. Noth, op.cit., p.160 considers vv.20b, 21b, 29, 34, 36, 37 as definitely later; vv.38-41 are also probably later. Vv.22, 27, 28, 35 which display the same form may once have been joined together, and only came to be separate due to the addition of later material. Vv.35 and 41 are regarded as late even by Driver, op.cit., p.303.

G. v. Rad thinks v.25 stood at the head of the prose curses, as v.7 stands at the head of the prose blessings; vv.20-25, therefore, are regarded as a later addition,[1] although they are parallel to vv.7-14 and earlier than vv.25f.

As a result we are left with the two groups of brief parallel blessings and curses in vv.3-6, 16-19, which are generally regarded as ancient in view of their form,[2] although there are differences of opinion as to the original form because of the inexact parallelism between vv.4 and 18 and the inordinate length of these two verses compared with the other verses.[3] Vv.3-6, 16-19 read as follows:

bārûk 'attāh bā'îr

ûbārûk 'attāh baśśāḏeh

bārûk p^{e}rî-biṭn^{e}kā ûp^{e}rî 'aḏmaṭ^{e}kà ûp^{e}rî b^{e}hemṭ^{e}kā š^{e}gar '^{a}lāp^{e}kā w^{e}'aštᵉrôṯ ṣō'n^{e}kā

bārûk ṭan'^{a}kā ûmiš'art^{e}kā

bārûk 'attāh b^{e}bō'^{e}kā

ûbārûk 'attāh b^{e}ṣē'ṯ^{e}kā

'ārûr 'attāh bā'îr

w^{e}'ārûr 'attāh baśśāḏeh

'ārûr ṭan'^{a}kā ûmiš'art^{e}kā

'ārûr p^{e}rî-biṭn^{e}kā ûp^{e}rî 'aḏmaṭ^{e}kā š^{e}gar '^{a}laṗ^{e}kā w^{e}'aštᵉrôṯ ṣō'n^{e}kā

'ārûr 'attāh b^{e}bō'^{e}kā

w^{e}'ārûr 'attāh b^{e}ṣē'ṯ^{e}kā

---

1. G. v. Rad, op.cit., p. 125
2. G.E. Wright, op.cit., p. 498f. ; G.v. Rad, op.cit., 125
3. S. Mowinckel, Ps.Stud. V, pp.114-5, omits the phrase 'the fruit of your beasts' in vv.4 and 18 (with the LXX of v.4) in view of its omission in both LXX and Hebrew in v.18 (he thinks it is probably a gloss from v.11) but makes v.4 and v.18 into four separate blessings or curses. With the addition of a blessing and a curse from Dt.vii.13 this gives a total of 10 blessings and 10 curses as the reconstructed original form. It seems odd, however, to describe the present unbalanced text as a liturgical reconstruction (based on Dt.xxvii. 12-3).

These curses belong to the third and fourth groups listed on p.44 & 53 - i.e. those which are couched in the 2nd person singular and addressed directly to the person concerned. Three of the four instances in this group, i.e. omitting for the present the four instances in Deuteronomy, are uttered by God. These curses are to all appearances unconditional, although it is not impossible that conditions are presupposed.

The blessings belong to the categories noted on p.16f.,26. Blessings of the type, 'blessed art thou ---', are usually followed by layhwh ('Blessed art thou to/by the Lord'). Dt.xxviii.3f., I Sam.xxv.33b, xxvi.25, however, are not. The verses in I Sam. are spoken by David (to Abigail) and Saul (to David) respectively. There is nothing particularly priestly or liturgical about them. Ps.cxv, which does contain priestly elements, includes the phrase layhwh.

Closer consideration of the blessings and curses in vv.3-6, 16-19, particularly vv.3 and 6, 16 and 19, shows that the phrase 'in the city and in the field' occurs only seldom in close juxtaposition - Gen.xxxiv.28, I K.xiv.11 (= xvi.4 = xxi.24). The two words are also found, but less closely connected, in Dt.xxii.23-5, Judg.ix.32-3, Ezk.vii.15. 'Town and country' is a natural contrast to modern ears, but even in this general sense the two words occur only seldom in the OT. - Lev.xiv.53; Judg.ix.43-5; xix.15 - 17; xx.31; I Sam.vi.18; I Chron. i.46; xix.9 (cf. Lev.xxv.34; Dt.xx.19; I Sam.xxvii.5; Neh.xii.44; I Chron. xxvii.28; II Chron. xxxi.19). Is it accidental, however, that the only exact parallel to the use of 'in town and country' (Dt.xxviii.3 and 16) occurs in a curse, pronounced by a prophet in the name of Yahweh (I K.xiv.11 = xvi.4 = xxi.24, verses which may be the composition of the Deuteronomist, but may rest

on ancient tradition).[1]

The phrase 'go out and come in' admits of two chief uses, firstly in connection with military exploit (cf. Dt.xxxi.2; Josh.xiv.11; I Sam.xxi.6; cf. Am.v.3; I Chron.xxvi.1; I Sam.xviii.13, 16; Is.xxxvii.28), and secondly with reference to participation in the cult (e.g. Ex. xxviii. 35; Lev. xvi. 17; Ezk.xlvi.10: in the first two instances ofthis group, where it refers to entering the inner sanctuary, the chief priest alone seems to be designated). In Ps.cxxi.8 (cf. also I K. iii. 7 and II Chron. xv.5) the reference seems more general. This is also true of Dt.xxviii: the reference is not clearly cultic or clearly military. Nor is it clear whether 'thou' is individual or collective in reference, although the rest of the chapter is clearly referring to the people as a whole (cf. v.9).

It is when we seek the original Sitz im Leben of the passage, however, that the difficulties already mentioned become acute. If we separate the verses from their context, as the different literary form of the verses encourages us to do, it seems necessary to restore a preceding conditional clause (especially, perhaps, if 'thou' is interpreted collectively) or to supply two different groups as objects of the blessing and curse. The same group cannot be blessed and cursed unconditionally in one breath.[2] But to remove the blessings and curses from their present conditional structure and then reconstruct a similar conditional structure is both conjectural and unsatisfactory; it involves an unnecessary multiplication of hypotheses. To supply

---

1. Cf. G. v.Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p.82 n.1
2. Cf. Jer.xvii.5. This is the only other passage where ʾārûr and bārûk are used together, and here the conditional nature of the curse is very plain. The same point is also clear from Gen.xxviii: Isaac blesses Jacob, and curses Esau.

different objects of blessing and curse also finds no justification within the text.[1]

One further possibility remains: if no conditional clause is presupposed and the subject/object is the same in both cases, it may be that either the blessing or the curse has been modelled on the other and added later. It is not difficult to imagine an unconditional blessing being original (cf. Ps.cxxi). On the other hand, the only significant parallel to vv.3 and 16 is related to the curse, not the blessing, which might point to the curse being original. There is, however, no evidential justification for regarding either the blessing or the curse as secondary.

It must be asked, therefore, whether the customary literary isolation of vv.3-6, 16-19, which makes them unconditional, is, in fact, justified. Our text in its present form is clearly conditional. Jer. xvii.5f. illustrates the possibility of curse and blessing being set in contrast to each other when used conditionally. Moreover, there are good reasons for thinking that Dt. xxviii is much more of a unity than has often been supposed in the past. It has been recognised for some time that Dt. xxviii as a whole presents a close parallel to the way in which Codex Hammurabi concludes its stipulations with a list of blessings and curses in which curses predominate.[2] Further parallels have been discovered in Hittite state-treaties and in Babylonian kudurri

---

1. There are no good grounds for transferring the blessings and curses to Dt.xxvii, where they would refer to two separate groups.
2. Cf. M. Noth, 'Die mit des Gesetzes Werken umgehen, die sind unter dem Fluch', Ges. Stud., pp.160 f.

(border stones). The function of these curses was apparently to ensure that the law was carried out[1], especially in cases where no other sanction than the curse was available.

In recent years much more attention has been paid to the treaty forms of the ancient Near East by OT. scholars.[2] As in the recent discussion surrounding Alt's distinction of apodeictic and casuistic law exaggerated claims are sometimes made in discussing Israelite and other ancient NE.covenant forms. A general re-orientation of ideas is not accomplished without a certain amount of conflict, and there are no signs yet that the debate is nearing a verdict, partly because of the need for more evidence concerning Israel's neighbours and partly because of the need for more assured interpretation of the evidence we already have.[3] Bearing this provisional situation in mind, we shall argue for a position which, even if less certain than that maintained above (pp.63-73) in connection with Dt.xxvii. 15-26, does, nevertheless, do justice to several important factors.

Building on Korosec's[4] study of Hittite vassal treaties, Mendenhall,[5] Baltzer[6] and Beyerlin[7], in particular, have sought to establish the similarity of the forms of the Hittite vassal treaty and the forms of Israel's covenant

---

1. Op.cit., p.164
2. Cf. nn. 5- 7 below.; cf. also D. McCarthy, Treaty and Covenant; DrR. Hillers, Treaty Curses and the OT Prophets; relevant articles will be found in the Bibliography under the names of E. Gerstenberger, J. L'Hour, H. Huffmon.
3. For a discussion of discrepant interpretations in this field cf. E. Gerstenberger, 'Covenant and Commandment', JBL 84, 1965, pp.38-52.
4. Hethitische Staatsverträge
5. 'Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition', BA 17/3, 1954, pp.50-76.
6. Das Bundesformular
7. Herkunft und Geschichte der ältesten Sinaitraditionen

with Yahweh. The nature of this similarity is expressed somewhat differently by the above scholars, but is agreed to consist of: a historical prologue, followed by the stipulations of the stronger partner, concluded by sanctions ((curses) in the event of the treaty being broken by the vassal. Beyerlin also emphasises that these treaties, like Israel's covenant with Yahweh, were drawn up in writing, deposited in a shrine, regularly recited and attested by witnesses.[1]

Mendenhall, Baltzer and Beyerlin have concentrated on the Decalogue as a typical representative of these covenant-treaty features, but other scholars have not been slow to point out the distinctive differences: for example, the Hebrew covenant is between God and man in Ex.xx;[2] the Decalogue in its present form comes from a later period;[3] there are no specific commands, other than commands to obey the treaty, in Hittite and other treaties.[4] J. L.'Hour has sought to interpret the Book of the Covenant (linking it with Shechem) as a more plausible illustration of the treaty form, and has designated Dt. xxvii. 15-26 as the concluding list of treaty-sanctions.[5]

Making full use of the rich supply of evidence from surrounding cultures, McCarthy[6] and Hillers[7] have pointed to Dt.xxviii. and Lev.xxvi as examples of the curses which concluded such treaties. The preponderance of the curse over the blessing (in both ancient N.E. treaties and Dt.xxviii) is a recurrent feature, as Noth saw,[8] and need not imply an incomplete or revised tradition.[9] Hence,

---

1. Op.cit., pp.63-4 (ET).
2. Cf. H. Seebass, ZDPV 78,1962, reviewing Beyerlin.
3. Cf. McCarthy, op.cit., p.159-60; R. Knierim, 'Das erste Gebot', ZAW 77, 1965 pp.20-40; G. Fohrer, 'Das sogenannte apodiktisch formulierte Recht und der Dekalog' Kerygma und Dogma, 11/1, 1965, pp.49 - 74.
4. Cf. E. Gerstenberger, 'Covenant and Commandment', JBL 84 1965, pp.38-52.
5. 'L'Alliance de Sichem', RB 69, 1962, p. 6. Op.cit., pp.109f.
7. Op.cit., p.30f. 8. Op.cit., pp.160f.
9. Cf. McCarthy, op.cit., p.122f.; Hillers, op.cit., pp.35f.

it is argued, some of the commonly accepted literary-critical reconstructions and interpretations, which tend to eliminate some of the curses of Dt.xxviii as late, must be re-examined. There is notintrinsic reason for regarding any of the curses as later additions. A detailed comparison, in fact, reveals numerous loci communes between Dt.xxviii and ancient NE.treaties (e.g. the references to bread-making, drought, defeat, plague, illness, blindness, slavery, exile, locusts, ruin of the city and cannibalism).[1] In both Dt.xxviii and the treaties considered by McCarthy the curse refers to a future possibility rather than a present fact.[2] And lastly but not least Dt.xxviii. 1 and 15 seem to reproduce closely the form in which certain treaties (e.g. the Hittite treaty between Suppiluliumas and Mattiwaza; and especially the Esarhaddon treaties) express their sanction.[3] McCarthy concludes that Dt.xxviii 'reflects the ancient canonical curses of Mesopotamia, with, of course, significant differences' (e.g. no polytheism or ritual magic).[4]

D.R. Hillers has pointed out that the feature of several conclusions and introductions within Dt.xxviii (e.g. vv.15, 47, 58) is characteristic of the curse-list attached to the Esarhaddon treaty (cf. 414, 494-512, 513 f.) and to a lesser degree of several other treaties.[5] Further, 'the reference to stipulations written in a "book" (Dt.28,58) is normal treaty terminology'[6] and

---

1. Cf. McCarthy, op.cit., p.222
2. Ibid., p.121
3. Ibid. p.121
4. Ibid., p.123
5. Op.cit., p.32
6. Ibid. p.32

need not be dependent on the publication of the Deuteronomic code.[1] Changes of singular and plural without apparent reasons, changes in style, the marked use of repetition and the absence of a logical progression of ideas are all typical of the ancient N.E. treaty curses.[2] There is clear evidence that other sections than vv.3-6, 16-19 may also be early: there are frequent parallels in ancient N.E. treaties to those curses which G.E. Wright, for instance, styles 'the product of free Deuteronomic composition'. Moreover, even if the form of vv.30-2 and 38-41 is not adequately characterised by the description 'futility curses'[3] the brief curses in these verses do seem to represent a definite traditional form:

'išāh tᵉ'ārēś / wᵉ'īš 'aḥēr yišgālennāh

bayiṯ tiḇneh / wᵉlō'-ṯēšēḇ bô

kerem tiṭṭaʿ / wᵉlō' ṯᵉḥallᵉlennû (v.30)

These sentences possess a regular pattern and rhythm (2:2 in the three clauses of v.30, 3:3 in the three clauses of v.31). In vv.38-41 a third clause introduced by kî is added to each curse:

---

1. It is difficult to dissociate 'book of the torah' in xxviii.58 from xxix.20, xxxi.24,26 and the 'words of the torah' frequently referred to in Dt. But Hos.viii.12 points to the existence of written torah at an early date. The scope of the 'book of the torah' referred to in II K. xxiii. is uncertain but II K.xxii.19 points to it haveing included Dt.xxviii. Thus, there is certainly no necessity to date the tradition later than 621 BC (Josiah) and it is probably much earlier.
2. Hillers, op.cit., p.33
3. So described by Hillers, op.cit., pp.28f.

zera' rab tôsî' hassāḏeh / ûm^e'aṭ te'^esōp / kî yahs^elennû hā'arbeh (v.38)

One of the most striking verbal resemblances, which can hardly be purely accidental, is that between Esar. 528 - 32, Dt.xxviii.23 and Lev.xxvi.19 referring to the threat of drought, ' a copper sky and ground of iron' (Leviticus reverses the relation of the predicates to read 'iron sky and ground of copper').[1] In view of this and previous evidence, therefore, it is not surprising that Hillers concludes that Dt.xxviii (and Lev.xxvi)[2] is a 'gathering and adaptation of traditional materials'.[3]

There is clearly a great deal of work still to be done in connection with these comparisons from surrounding cultures, but the claims of McCarthy and Hillers regarding the nature of Dt.xxviii are well argued and supported by strong evidence. Applying their conclusions to our examination of the blessing and curse in vv.3-6, 16-19 (cf. vv.31-2, 38-41), we may affirm that these verses make much more sense in the context of a treaty or covenant, as indeed they are presented in Dt.xxviii. Vv. 3-6, 16-19 promise or threaten Israel with prosperity or failure in every department of the national life according to its obedience or neglect of the stipulations which form part of the covenant with Yahweh.

---

1. Cf. Hillers, op.cit., p.41, referring to Borger and Moran.
2. Cf. H. Reventlow, Wächter über Israel.
3. Hillers, op.cit., p.35

It remains to show that these blessings and curses at the end of an act of covenant-making were recited by the priests. The place of the priest in Dt.xxviii is not specifically mentioned, but he is by far the most likely person to have had the responsibility for the preservation and recital of any covenant sanctions. This is suggested by several factors: the cultic framework of the three main law codes in the OT., all of which conclude with blessings and curses[1], combined with the highly probable judicial activity of the priest to which we have pointed[2]; the evidence of cursing priests in Mesopotamia and Hatti[3] and the regular place of the curse in the conclusion of a treaty[4]; the frequent responsibility of the priest in ancient Israel for the pronouncing of a solemn blessing or curse and the fact that priests and Levites recited the blessings and curses which concluded the covenant of initiation into the Qumran community.[5]

There is little doubt that the Hittite and Egyptian treaties were in the hands of temple-priests who also recited the stipulations and sanctions on anniversaries and festivals. Copies of such treaties were deposited in the temple or inscribed on its walls.[6] In the O.T. where the leader (e.g. Moses, Joshua)[7] or the king often acts as mediator of the covenant between God and the people, we also know of a least one occasion where the priest assumed this

---

1. They are called 'blessings and curses' only in Dt.xxviii, but in this case the title is less important than the content. In Ex.xxiii the blessing preponderates (the curse forms only one sentence - Ex.xxiii.21) whereas in Dt.xxviii the reverse is the case, but this significant variation does not call for further discussion in the present context.
2. Cf. pp. 46-97 above, esp. pp. 68-97.
3. Cf. the inscription of K. Nabonidus (-538 BC). in Böhl, Symbolae Koschaker pp.167-9.
4. Cf. ANET pp.205f. and other references.
5. Manual of Discipline ch. ii.
6. Cf. ANET pp. 199f.
7. Nb. the priestly traits in Moses and Joshua; cf. p.17 n.1 above. For Joshua cf. Ex.xxxiii.11, Num.xi.28, Josh.i.1.

role (II K.xi.17). The evidence of I K.xv.9, II K.xi.13, II Chron.xxix.10, II K.xxiii.1, Josh.viii.30f., xxiv.24, Dt.xxxi.9f., Neh.viii, suggests that such a ceremony of covenant renewal was, if not annual, at least regular (every seven years according to Dt.xxxi.9). The important place of the priests and/or Levites is quite clear in II K.xi.17; Dt.xxxi.9 and Neh.viii. Although there is no definite proof that the Man. of Disc. ch.ii. was a continuation of ancient custom, this seems the most probable view. In short, the blessings and curses of Dt.xxviii, to which we have made particular reference on pp. 105-113 above, have strong claims to represent forms of priestly speech, even if they were not composed as such and cannot, therefore, claim to be distinctively priestly forms of speech in that sense.

SUMMARY

We are now in a position to draw together what we have gleaned about priestly forms of speech and estimate the relevance of this for understanding the priestly office and its history in ancient Israel.

As a result of examining forms of priestly blessing unduly narrow views of the priestly 'Heilsorakel' were rejected and the extensive links of the liturgical priestly blessing with Jerusalem and its traditions noted. Indications were given of the way in which this Jerusalem blessing of the priest may have developed from the traditions of the patriarchal blessing.

Our examination of Dt.xxvii.15-26, arising from discussion of the form of curses pronounced by the priest, led to a partial confirmation and extension as well as severe modification of Alt's views regarding apodeictic law. It was shown that although Alt's attempt to trace something genuinely and uniquely Israelitic in apodeictic, as opposed to casuistic, formulations, cannot be sustained in view of apodeictic formulations elsewhere in the ancient N.E., his recognition of the similarity of certain prohibitive formulas (lō', 'ārûr, môṯ yûmāṯ, nikrat etc.) and their cultic role (as distinct from the question of their cultic origin) is justified. Recent attempts to regard all apodeictic law as stemming from tribal wisdom and having no cultic roots were discussed and rejected. In view of its unsuitability as a conclusion to a covenant, Dt,xxvii.15-26 was finally interpreted as a list of stipulations pronounced by the priest/Levite. Fresh confirmatory evidence was then presented of the judicial role of the priest in the OT.

Begrich's view that priestly torah was originally limited to cultic and ritual matters was challenged, prior to a brief examination of the forms

of sacrificial priestly toroth . Finally,an examination of the curses in Dt.xxviii,related them to an act of covenant and opened the question of the possible role of the priest in ceremonies of covenant-renewal.

Thus,an important part of the work of the priest seems to have consisted in delivering oracles of blessing and guidance,in acting as guardian of the traditions of justice,which was administered by the elders, and in dispensing cultic and sacrificial toroth.

It is ,perhaps,not without significance that the priesthood was involved in three spheres that bulk large in Hebrew tradition and which all have some connection with the Temple: in the interpretation of justice and moral law (at the central sanctuary), in the liturgical blessing as it took root in the Temple at Jerusalem, and in the act of covenant-renewal ,which came to be associated exclusively with Jerusalem later. The wider historical implications of such evidence lie beyond the scope of this present study. Like all form-critical studies,therefore,the value of the present examination of priestly forms of speech is limited until its historical implications have been worked out.

This survey would not be complete,however, without further reference to Wellhausen's reconstruction of Israelite history and its literary documentation. It was pointed out in the Introduction (pp.4-12) how much his views depended on his interpretation of the priesthood . Is our evidence compatible with that interpretation,particularly as it affects the functions of the priest? Or does it lend support to those who urge reconsideration of his literary and historical reconstruction, not only in minor details but in fundamentals? [1] It is at this point, even more than in connection with the place of priest and

---

1.Cf.R.Abba,art. 'Priests and Levites',IDB,pp.876-889.

Jerusalem in the transmission of our OT. traditions, even more than in connection with the place of Dt. xxvii in the debate about Israelite covenant traditions, that the historical implications and relevance of the present survey need exploration. It is hoped that this study of one aspect of the priestly office will lead to a fuller and more comprehensive treatment of priesthood in ancient Israel.

Appendix: How priestly oracles were obtained.

One of the oldest methods used by the priest in giving divine instruction[1] was the use of Urim and Thummim (cf.I Sam.xiv.41f.;xxviii.6). There is no certainty as to the etymology of the words,but they seem to represent two objects,perhaps two sticks or stones coloured differently.[2] According to whether Urim or Thummim jumped out when the container of the lots was shaken the answer of Yahweh was taken to be 'yes' or 'no'. The lack of response mentioned in I Sam.xiv.37; xxviii.6 seems to indicate either that nothing had come out of the pocket or that both had come out together. The way the sacred lot was manipulated is best illustrated by I Sam.xiv.41f. The priest continued to put his questions until a definite answer to the problem was received,or until it became clear that no resolution of the problem was forthcoming . Exactly how the priest manipulated the sacred objects is not clear, but it seems evident that skill was required in the formulation of the questions.[3]

---

1. In I Sam.xiv.37f. Saul seem to take over from the priest.

2. Various interpretations have been suggested. The easiest is perhaps 'light' and 'truth'. Alternatively the names may be connected with the first and last letters of the Hebrew alphabet,aleph and tau,or with the light and dark colours of the lots. E.Robertson,'Urim and Tummim; What were they?',VT 14, 1964,pp.67f.,has recently suggested that they refer to all the letters of the Hebrew alphabet and were used either representatively (i.e. odd and even letters to indicate 'yes' and 'no') or to spell out messages.

3.Cf.O.R.Gurney,The Hittites,p.159 ,'On this basis questions were put to the oracle, and by an enormously lengthy process of elimination it was possible to determine without fail the precise offence which required expiation. Following is an example of such an inquiry:

> Whereas they have written to me (i.e.the officiating priest) from the palace (saying),'The oracle has declared that Ishtar of Nineveh is angry in her temple',we consulted the priests and they said,'A singer stole a golden jug,and it has not been replaced; the golden Amurru-tunic which the god wears is worn out; the chariot is broken --- the ajaru festival used to be celebrated every year,but now it has been neglected'. Are these sins the cause of the god's anger? Then let the omen be unfavourable. (Here follow the details of the findings in technical language). (Result:) unfavourable. If this is the cause and there is nothing else,then let the omen be favourable --- (Result:) favourable.

Had this omen been unfavourable the inquiry would have continued indefinitely, until a fayourable answer was received.'

The use of Urim and Thummim seems to have died out after the time of Saul and David. At least there is no explicit reference to its use after their reigns. Neh.vii.65 is evidence of its disuse by the time of the Exile; it looks forward to the time when a priest with Urim and Thummim shall arise. This decline of the sacred lot is confirmed by the absence of the term šā'al after Sam.-Kings, apart from Hos.iv.12,Ezk.xxi.26(Heb.),which are non-Yahwistic oracles, and by the increasing references to prophets being consulted for oracles.[1]

Closely related to the lot was the ephod,another term of uncertain meaning. The primary reference,however,seem to have been to a garment of some sort;[2] cf. I Sam.ii.18;xxii.18;II Sam.vi.14. There are other texts,however, where the reference seems to have been to an object that was worshipped, brought out or put away. (cf.Judg.xvii.5;xviii.14f.;I Sam.xiv.3;xxiii.6,9;xxx.7). Possibly the ephod was originally a garment placed on the statue of the god and the Hebrews adapted it to their imageless cult. Whatever the exact truth of this,it seems to have been used as a receptacle for sacred lots. Whether it was already linked with the sacred lots in the Mosaic period[3] is uncertain,but like the Urim and Thummim it seems to have declined in importance after the reigns of Saul and David.

What other instruments the priests could use in giving oracles is not clear. Josh.vii.14f and I Sam.x.17f. use the word lakad of people being selected by lot ,but there is no indication as to how this was done. There are also several references to Yahweh being consulted ,where it is not said how this was done (cf.I Sam.xiv.37;xxiii.2;II Sam.ii.1;v.19;xvi.23). But since the word šā'al is used this suggests that the ephod was used.

2.Cf.Eichrodt,Theology of the OT.,vol.I,p.113; R.de Vaux,Ancient Israel,p.350
3.Cf.Eichrodt,op.cit.,p.114
1.Cf.I K.xx.13-14;xxii.6;II K.iii.11;xxii.14.

It has frequently been stated that the Tent of Meeting was also used for giving oracles in view of Ex.xxxiii.7.[1] The word used is not šā'al, however, but bikkeš, which in II Sam.xxi.1;Hos.iii.5;Ps.xxiv.6;xxvii.8;lxxxiii.17;cv.3, seems to refer to an epiphany of Yahweh in the cult, rather than an oracle.[2] On the other hand, the occasion of Yahweh's epiphany seems a fitting time for men to receive guidance from Yahweh by a priest. As in the case of the Tent, there is no definite evidence that the Ark was used to obtain oracles - apart from I Sam.xiv.18, where the reading is disputed.

The teraphim[3] which are sometimes mentioned in connection with oracle-giving are of uncertain provenance and form, but they seem to have been considered non-Yahwistic and they are never specifically linked with the priests. Gressmann's view that they should be linked with Moses' veil or mask (cf.Ex. xxxiv.34) has found little support[4]. Moses' priestly mask, paralleled in other cultures but never mentioned elsewhere in the OT., does seem to have been used in obtaining oracles but we know nothing further about it.

There remains only one further important way in which oracles were probably delivered - namely in connection with sacrifice. There is little direct evidence within the OT., however. The most explicit reference occurs in Num. xxiii.23, but this relates to a foreigner, Balak, at an early date in Israel's history and can hardly be described as positive proof of similar practices in Israel later. Similar reservations must be entered regarding I K.iii (the oracle and sacrifice of Solomon at Gibeon); the passage does not provide very secure evidence of what happened in normal Yahwism.

---

1. Cf. R. Brinker, The influence of sanctuaries in early Israel, p.76
2. Cf. W. Beyerlin, Origins and History of the oldest Sinaitic Traditions, p.123
3. Cf. A. R. Johnson, The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, p.33 n.4.
4. But see M. Noth, Exodus, p.267.

More certain,but less direct,evidence of the connection of sacrifice and priestly oracles is to be found in certain psalms. This suggestion was made by both F.Küchler[1] and S.Mowinckel[2] about the same time. The two main passages cited by Küchler[3] were Ps.v.4 and lx.7. To these Mowinckel has added Ps.xx.3;xxii.25;xxvii.4;lxvi.13 and cxvi.17 referring to sacrifice; li.19; lxxii.13;cxvi.13 and cxviii.27 referring to the cult generally; Ps.xxiv; lxviii; cxviii; and cxxxii as processional psalms; and Ps.v.7;xxvi.6;li.7;lxiii.2; lxvi.13 and lxxxvi.17 referring to various parts of the cult. Evidence for the connection of sacrifice and priestly oracle is found by Mowinckel in Num.xxiii.23; I K.iii.4; Ps.xxvii.4; v.4; Gen.iv.5; various Nabataean inscriptions (CIS 2118,2593, 2667-9) and Zad.Doc.xiii.4. The first two passages are not - by themselves - convincing,as we have seen. But the continuity of the word bikker[4] throughout these passages makes the sacrificial reference inescapable . Having established the connection of oracle and sacrifice,Mowinckel seems happy to leave the question as to who pronounced the oracle - priest or cultic prophet - open.

---

1. F.Küchler,'Das priesterliche Orakel in Israel und Juda',BZAW 33,1918,p.294

2. S.Mowinckel,Psalmenstudien I,pp.146f.

3. The Psalms in Israel's Worship,vol.I,p.12f.;vol.II,pp.53-4.

4. The sacrificial reference of bikker is attested by several passages (eg. Lev.xiii.36;xxvii.33;Ezk.xxxiv.11-12); see II K.xvi.15 especially.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Abba,R.,art.'Priests and Levites',IDB,N.York,1962,pp.876-889.

Ackroyd,P.,'Ephod and teraphim',ET 1950-1,pp.378-80.

Ahlström,G.W.,'Der Prophet Nathan und der Tempelbau',VT 11,1961,pp.113-127.

Albright,W.F., Archaeology and the Religion of Israel,Baltimore,1942.

'The list of Levitic cities',Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Vol.I,N.York, 1945,pp.49-73.

'The Reform of Jehoshaphat', Alexander Marx Jubilee Vol.,N.York, 1950,pp.61-82.

'Some remarks on the Song of Moses',VT 9,1959,pp.339f.

Alt,A., Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts (=Kleine Schriften I ?München, 1953,pp.278-332).

Arden,E.,'How Moses failed',JBL 76,1957,pp.50-2.

Avigad,N.,'The epitaph of a royal steward from Siloam Village',IEJ,1953,pp.137 -152.

Baltzer,K.,Das Bundesformular,WMANT 4,Neukirchen ,1960.

Baudissin,W.W.,Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priestertums untersucht, Leipzig,1889.

art.'Priests and Levites',Hastings DB,Edinburgh 1900,vol.4,pp.67 -97.

Bauer,J.B.,'Könige und Priester,ein heiliges Volk (Ex.19.6)',BZ NF 2,1958,pp. 283-6.

Begrich,J.,'Das priesterliche Heilsorakel',ZAW 52,1934,pp.81-92 (=Ges.Stud., München,1964,pp.217-31)

'Die priesterliche Torah',BZAW 66,1936,pp.63-91 (=Ges.Stud.,pp.232- 266)

Bentzen,A.,Studier over det zadokidiske Praesteskabs Historie,Copenhagen,1931.

Introduction to the Old Testament I-II,Copenhagen,1952^{2}.

Bernhardt,K-H.,Das Problem der altorientalischen Königsideologie im A.T., VTS 8 Leiden,1961.

Beyerlin,W.,Origins and History of the Oldest Sinaitic Traditions,Oxford,1965 (ET).

Blank,S.H.,'The Curse,Blasphemy,the Spell and the Oath',HUCA 23,1950-1,pp.73-95

Boecker,H.J.,Redeformen des Rechtslebens im AT.,WMANT 14,Neukirchen 1964.

Böhl,F.M.Th.de Liagre,'Priester und Prophet',Opera Minora,Groningen,1953,p.50-62

Bowman,J.,'Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood',TGUOS 16,1957,pp.1-14.

Breasted,J.H.,'The Development of the Priesthood in Israel and Egypt', Biblical World,1893

Brekelmans,C.H.W.,'Exodus xviii and the Origins of Yahwism in Israel',OTS 10, 1954,pp.215-24.

Brichto,H.C., The Problem of 'Curse' in the Hebrew Bible,JBL Monograph xiii, Philadelphia,1963.

Brinker,R.B., The influence of sanctuaries in early Israel,Manchester,1946.

Cazelles,H., 'A propos du Pentateuque',RB 35,1954,pp.279-98.

Études sur le Code de l'Alliance,Paris,1946

Clements,R.E.,God and Temple,Oxford,1965.

Prophecy and Covenant,London,1965

Cross,F.M.,'The Tabernacle',BA 10,1947,pp.45-68

Cross,F.M.-FReedman,D.N.,'The Blessing of Moses',JBL 67,1948,pp.181f.

Daube,D., Studies in Biblical Law,Cambridge,1947.

David,M.,'The Codex Hammurabi and its Relation to the Provisions of the Law in Exodus',OTS 7,1950,pp.149-78.

Dhorme,P.,'Prêtres,devins et mages dans l'ancienne religion des Hébreux,RHR cvii,1933,pp.113-43.

Draffkorn,A.E.,'Ilani / Elohim',JBL 76,1957,pp.216-224.

Driver,G.R.,and Miles,J.C., The Assyrian Laws,Oxford,1935.

The Babylonian Laws,Oxford,1955.

Dumermuth,F.,'Josua in Ex.xxxiii.7-11',ThZ 19,1963,p.161-8.

Dus,J.,'Gibeon -eine Kultstätte des Sms und die Stadt des benjaminitischen Schicksals',VT 10,1960,pp.353-74.

Eerdmans,B.D.,'Sojourn in the Tent of Jahu',OTS 1,1942,pp.1-16

Ehrlich,A.B.,Randglossen zur hebraischen Bibel I,Leipzig,1908.

Eichrodt,W.,Theology of the Old Testament I,London ,1961.(ET)

Eissfeldt,O., 'Psalm 80',Geschichte und Altes Testament (Alt Festschrift), Tübingen,1953.

Elliger,K.,'Das Gesetz Lev.18',ZAW 67,1955,pp.1f.

Emerton,J.,'Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy',VT 12,1962,pp.129-38.

Engnell,I.,Studies in Divine Kingship,Uppsala,1943

'Israel and the Law',SBU 7,1954,pp.1-16

Falk,Z.W., Hebrew Law in Biblical Times,Jerusalem ,1964.

Fensham,F.C.,'Malediction and Benediction in Ancient Near-Eastern Vassal-treaties and the OT.,ZAW 74,1962,pp.1-9.

Feucht,Chr.,Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitsgesetz,Berlin,1964

Fohrer,G., ' "Priesterliches Königtum Ex.xix.6',ThZ 19,1963,pp.359-63.

'Das sogennante apodiktisch formulierte Recht und der Dekalog', Kerygma und Dogma 11,1965,pp.49-74.

Friedrich,J., Staatsverträge des Hatti-Reiches in hethitischer Sprache, I and II MVAG.1926 and 1930,Leipzig.

Gamberoni,J.,'Das Elterngebot im AT.',BZ 8,1964,pp.161-91.

Gemser,B.,'The importance of the motive clause in OT.law',VTS 1,1953,pp.50-66.

Gerstenberger,E., Wesen und Herkunft des sogenannten apodiktischen Rechts im AT. Bonn,1961.

'Covenant and Commandment',JBL 84,1965,pp.38-52.

Gese,H.,'Beobachtungen zum Stil alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze',ThLZ 85,1960, pp.147-50.

Gesenius,W.,-Kautzsch,E., Hebrew Grammar,Oxford,1910 (ET).

Gevirtz,S.,'West -Semitic Curses and the Problem of the Origins of Hebrew Law', VT 11,1961,pp.137-58.

'Jericho and Shechem:a religio-literary aspect of city destruction', VT 13,1963,pp.52-62.

Gordon,C.H.,Ugaritic Handbook,Rome 1947.

Ugaritic Manual,Rome,1955

'Elohim in its reputed meaning of Rulers,Judges',JBL 54,1935,pp.139-144.

Götze,A.,Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients,München,1957^2.

Gray,G.B.,Sacrifice in the OT.,Oxford,1925.

Numbers,ICC Commentary, Edinburgh 1903.

Gray,J.,'Cultic Affinities between Israel and Ras Shamra',ZAW 62,1949-50,pp.207-220.

The Legacy of Canaan,Leiden 1957.

I & II Kings,London,1964.

Greenberg,M.,'A New Approach to the History of the Israelite Priesthood',JAOS 1950,pp.41-7.

'Some Postulates of Biblical Criminal Law',Y.Kaufmann Jubilee Vol., Jerusalem,1960,pp.5-28.

Gressmann,H.,Mose und seine Zeit,Göttingen,1913.

Gross,H., Weltherrschaft als religiöse Idee im AT., BBB6,Bonn,1953

Gunneweg,A.H.J.,Leviten und Priester,Göttingen ,1965.

Gutbrod,W.,with Kleinknecht,H., Law (Bible Key Words),London ,1962 (ET).

Haldar,A., Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, Uppsala,1945

Hauret,C.,'Moïse était-il prêtre?',Bib.40,1959,pp.509f.

'Aux origines du sacerdoce Danite',Mélanges Bibliques --A.Robert, Paris 1957,pp.105-113.

Hempel,J.,'Priesterkodex',RE xxii^2,1954,col.1943-67.

Die israelitische Anschauungen von Segen und Fluch im Lichte alt-orientalischer Parallelen(=Apoxysmata),Berlin,1961 (=ZDMG NF 4,1925)

Herbert,A.S.,Worship in Ancient Israel,London,1959.

Hillers,D.R., Treaty Curses and the OT.Prophets,Rome ,1964.

Hölscher,G.,'Levi',RE xii^2,1925,col.2155-2208.

Hooke,S.H., (ed.) Myth and Ritual,London,1933.

Labyrinth,London,1935.

Myth,Ritual and Kingship,Oxford,1958.

Horst,F.,'Segen und Fluch',RGG ^{3} v,col.1649f.

'Segen und Segenshandlungen in der Bibel',Gottes Recht,München,1961.

L'Hour,J.,'L'Alliance de Sichem',RB 69,1962,pp.5-36,161-84,350-68.

'Une législation criminelle dans le Deuteronome',Bib.44,1963,pp.1-28

'Les Interdits To'eba dans le Deuteronome',RB 71,1964,pp.481-502.

Huffmon,H.B.,'The covenant lawsuit in the prophets',JBL 78,1959,pp.285-295.

Hyatt,J.P.,'Torah in the Book of Jeremiah',JBL 60,1941,pp.381-96.

James,E.O.,The Nature and Function of Priesthood,London ,1955.

Johnson,A.R., Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel,Cardiff,1955

'The Psalms',OTMS,London 1951.

The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel,Cardiff,1962.^{2}

Jones,D.R.,'The Cessation of Sacrifice after the Destruction of the Temple in 586 BC.',JTS NS 14,1963,pp.12-31.

art.'Priests and Levites',Dictionary of the Bible (rev.ed.),Edinburgh 1963,pp.793-7.

Junge, E., Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia, Stuttgart, 1937.

Kees, H., Ägypten (Kulturgeschichte des Alten Orients), München, 1953.

Kennett, R.H., OT Essays, Cambridge, 1928.

Kilian, R., 'Apodiktisches und kasuistisches Recht im Lichte ägyptischer Analogien, BZ vii, 1963, pp.185-202.

Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes, BBB 19, Bonn 1963.

Knierim, R., 'Ex.xviii und die Neuordnung der mosaischen Gerichtbarkeit', ZAW 73, 1961, pp.146-171.

'Das erste Gebot', ZAW 77, 1965, pp.20-40.

Koch, K., Die Priesterschrift von Exodus 25 bis Leviticus 16, FRLANT 71, Göttingen 1959.

'Tempeleinlassliturgien und Dekaloge', Studien zur Theologie der alttestamentlichen Überlieferungen, Neukirchen 1961.

Köhler, L., Theology of the OT., London, 1957 (ET)

Hebrew Man, London, 1956 (ET)

Kosmala, H., 'The so-called Ritual Decalogue', Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute I, 1962, pp.31-61.

Kraus, H-J., Gottesdienst in Israel, München 1954 and 1962[2].

Die prophetische Verkündigung des Rechts in Israel, Zollikon-Zürich, 1957.

Küchler, F., 'Das priesterliche Orakel in Israel und Juda', BZAW 33, 1918, pp.285-301

Kuenen, A., Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur Biblischen Wissenschaft, Freibourg 1894.

Lefèvre, A., art. 'Lévitique', Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément V, Paris, 1957.

Lewy, E., 'The puzzle of Dt, xxvii: Blessings announced but curses noted', VT 12, 1962, pp.207-211.

Liebreich, L.J., 'The Song of Ascents and the Priestly Blessing', JBL 74, pp.33-6.

Lindblom, J., 'Lot casting in the OT.', VT 12, 1962, pp.164-179.

Lohfink, N., 'Der Bundesschluss im Lande Moab; Redaktionsgeschichte (Dt.28.69- 32.47)' BZ NF 6, 1962, pp.32-56.

'Die Bundesurkunde des Königs Josias. Eine Frage an die Deuteronomiumforschung', Bib. 44, 1963, pp.261-88, 461-98.

McCarthy, D.J., Treaty and Covenant, Rome, 1963.

McKenzie, J.L., 'The elders in the OT.', Bib. 40, 1959, pp.522f.

'Knowledge of God in Hosea', JBL 74, 1955, pp.22-7.

Meek, T.J., Hebrew Origins, N.York, 1936.

'Moses and Levites', AJSL 1939, pp.113f.

Mendelsohm,I., 'Authority and Law in Canaan-Israel',JAOS Supp.17,1954,pp.27-9.

Mendenhall,G.,'Covenant Forms in Israelite Tradition',BA 17,1954,pp.50-76.

'Relation of the Individual to Political Society',Biblical Studies in memory of H.C.Alleman,N.York,1960,pp.89-109.

Morgenstern,J.,'The Book of the Covenant', HUCA 5,1928,pp.1-151

'The Decalogue of the Holiness Code',HUCA 21,1955,pp.1-27.

Mørstad,E.,'Overveielser til Dtn.28',NTT 60,1959,pp.224-232.

Mowinckel,S., Psalmenstudien i-vi,Oslo,1922-6.

'Levi und Leviten',RGG iii^2,1929,col.1601.

'Zur Geschichte der Dekaloge',ZAW 55,1937,pp.218 f.

Le Décalogue,Paris,1927.

He that Cometh,Oxford,1956 (ET)

The Psalms in Israel's Worship I-II,Oxford,1962 (ET)

Nielsen,E., Shechem,Copenhagen,1955

'The Levites in Ancient Israel', Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute III,1964,pp.16f.

Noth,M., Das System der zwölf Stämme Israels,Stuttgart,1930.

Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch,Stuttgart,1948.

Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I, Halle ,1943 (=Wiesbaden,1957)

'Die Gesetze im Pentateuch',Ges.Stud.,Munchen 1957,pp.9-141

' "Die mit des Gesetzes Werken umgehen,die sind unter dem Fluch" ', Ges.Stud.,Munchen,1957,pp.155-171.

History of Israel,London,1960 (rev.) (ET)

Exodus,London,1962 (ET)

'The Background of Judges 17-18', Israel's Prophetic Heritage,N.York, 1962.

Nougayrol,J., Le palais royal d'Ugarit,Paris ,1955

Östborn,G.,Tora in the OT.,Lund 1945.

Peake's Commentary on the Bible,London,1962 (ed.M.Black & H.H.Rowley).

Pedersen,J.,Israel: its Life and Culture, I-II Copenhagen,1926,III-IV 1940.

Pfeiffer,R.H., Introduction to the OT., London 1948.

Plath,S., Der Begriff yr' im AT.,Stuttgart,1963.

Ploeg,J.,van der,'Studies in Biblical Law',CBQ 12,1950,pp.248-59,416-427;
CBQ 13,1951,pp.28-43,164-71,296-301.

Plöger,O.,'Priester und Prophet',ZAW 1951,pp.157-93.

Pope,M.,El in the Ugaritic Texts,VTS II ,Leiden,1955

Porteous,N.W.,'Prophet and Priest in Ancient Israel',ET lxii,1950-1,pp.4 f.

Porter,J.R.,Moses and Monarchy(Inaugural lecture),Oxford,1963.

Preiser,W.,'Vergeltung und Sühne im altisraelitischen Strafrecht',Festschrift
für E.Schmidt,Göttingen 1961,pp.7-39.

Press,R.,'Ordal im alten Israel',ZAW 51,1933,pp.121-40;227-55.

Pritchard,J.B., ANET, Princeton,1955.

Rad,G.von, Studies in Deuteronomy,London,1953 (ET)

Das Formgeschichtliche Problem des Hexateuch,BWANT IV,26 1938 (=
Gesammelte Studien,pp.9-86)

'"Gerechtigkeit" und "Leben" in der Kultsprache der Psalmen', (=
Ges.Stud.,pp.225-247)

Theology of the Old Testament, vol.I,Edinburgh,1962.(ET)

Genesis,London,1961.(ET)

'Die Anrechnung des Glaubens zur Gerechtigkeit',(= Ges.Stud.p.130-5)

Rapaport,I., 'The origins of Hebrew Law',PEQ 1941,pp.158-167.

Rendtorff,R., Die Gesetze in der Priesterschrift, FRLANT 62,Göttingen 1954.

'Der Kultus im alten Israel',JLH II 1956,pp.1-21.

'Priesterliche Kulttheologme und prophetische Kultpolemik',ThLZ
81,1956,col.1339-42.

'Erwägungen zur Frühgeschichte des Prophetentums in Israel',ZThK
59,1962,pp.144f.

'Genesis 8.21 und die Urgeschichte des Jahwisten',Kerygma und
Dogma,1961,pp.69-78

Reventlow,H.Graf., Das Heiligkeitsgesetz,WMANT 6,Neukirchen 1961.

Wächter über Israel.Ezechiel und seine Tradition,BZAW 82,
Berlin,1962

'Kultisches Recht im alten Israel',ZThK 60,1963,pp.267-304

Ringgren,H.,Israelitische Religion,Stuttgart,1964.

'Är den bibliska skapelseberättelsen en kultext?',SEA 13,1948,p.
9f.

Robertson,E.,'Temple and Torah',The Old Testament Problem,Manchester,1950.

Robertson,E.,'Urim and Tummim: What were they?',VT 14,1964,pp.67f.

Rowley,H.H.,'Melchizedek and Zadok',Bertholet Festschrift,Tübingen 1950,pp.461

'Moses and Monotheism', From Moses to Qumran,London,1963.

'The meaning of sacrifice in the OT', From Moses to Qumran,London 1963.

Scharbert,J.,Solidarität im Segen und Fluch im AT und in seiner Umwelt,BBB 14, Bonn,1958.

' "Fluchen" und "Segen" im AT',Bib.39,1958,pp.1-26.

Schmid,H.,'Jahwe und die Kulttraditionen von Jerusalem',ZAW 67,1955,pp.168-97.

Schreiner,J.,'Segen für die Völker',BZ NF 6,1962,pp.1-31.

Scott,R.B.Y.,'A Kingdom of Priests (Ex.xix.6)',OTS 8,1950,pp.213-19.

Seierstad,I.P.,'Hovedspørsmal i den kultiske tolkning av Salmene i det GT.', Teologi og Kirke,1963,pp.33-46.

Smith,J.L.P.,The Origin and History of Hebrew Law,N.York,1931.

Smith Robertson,W.,The Religion of the Semites,London 1927³.

art.'Priest',Encyc.Bib. III,1902,col.3838-3847.

Snaith,N., The Jewish New Year Festival,London,1947.

'The Priesthood and the Temple',Companion to the Bible (rev.), Edinburgh,1963

'Sacrifices in the OT.',VT 7,1957,pp.308-17

Speiser,E.A.,'Coming and Going at the City Gate',BASOR 144,1956,pp.20-23.

'Leviticus and the Critics',Y.Kaufmann Jubilee Vol.,Jerusalem, 1960,pp.29-45.

Spiro,A.,'A Law on the Sharing of Information',PAAJR 28,1959,pp.95-101.

Strauss,H.,Untersuchungen zu den Überlieferungen der vorexilischen Leviten, Diss.,Bonn,1960.

Thompson,R.J.,Penitence and Sacrifice in early Israel outside the Levitical Law,Leiden,1963.

Vaux,R.de , Ancient Israel, London,1961 (ET)

Les Sacrifices de l'Ancien Testament,Paris ,1964

Weingreen,J.,'The case of the daughters of Zelophehad',VT 16,1966,pp.518-22

Weiser,A., The Psalms,London,1962 (ET)

Samuel. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu I Sam.vii-xii, FRLANT 81,Göttingen,1962

Weiser,A.,'Zur Frage nach den Beziehungen der Psalmen zur Kult: Die Darstellung der Theophanie,Bertholet Festschrift,Tübingen,1950,p.513-531

Welch,A.,The Code of Deuteronomy,London,1924

Prophet and Priest in Old Israel,Oxford,1936(rep.1953)

Wellhausen,J.,Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel,London,1878 (Meridian ed.,N.York ,1957)

Westermann,C.,Forschung am AT., München,1964.

Widengren,G.,'King and Covenant',JSS 2,1957,pp.1-32

Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets,UUA 1948/10 , Uppsala , 1948

Williams,J.G.,'Concerning One of the Apodeictic Formulas',VT 14,1964,pp.484-9

'Addenda to "Concerning One of the Apodeictic Formulas"',VT 15, 1965,pp.113-115.

Wolff,H.W., 'Hoseas geistige Heimat', Ges.Stud.,pp.232-50,München,1964.

'Das Kerygma des Jahwisten',Ges.Stud.,pp.345-73,München,1964.

Amos' geistige Heimat,WMANT 18,Neukirchen,1964.

Wright,G.E.,'The Levites in Deuteronomy',VT 4,1954,pp325-30.

'The Book of Deuteronomy',Interpreter's Bible II,N.York,1953,pp. 311-537.

Biblical Archaeology,London,1957.

'The Lawsuit of God:a Form-critical Study of Deuteronomy 32', Israel's Prophetic Heritage,N.York,1962,pp.26-67

Zimmerli,W.,'Erkenntnis Gottes nach dem Buche Ezechiel', Gottes Offenbarung , (=Ges.Stud),S.München,.963,pp.41-119

'"Leben" und"Tod" im Buche des Propheten Ezechiel', ibid.,pp.178-191.

The Law and The Prophets,Oxford,1965 (ET)

Addenda

Barr,J.,Old and New in Interpretation ,London,1966.

Engnell,I.,'The Call of Isaiah',UUA 1949/4,Uppsala ,1949.

Stevenson,W.B.,'Hebrew 'olah and zebah Sacrifices',Bertholet Festschrift, Tübingen 1950,pp.109-118.

Sugden,E.H, Israel's Debt to Egypt,London,1929.

Wildberger,H.,'Die Völkerwallfahrt zum Zion. Jes.ii.1-5',VT 7,1957,pp.62-81.

'Samuel und die Entstehung des israelitischen Königtums',ThZ 13,1957,pp.442-69.

Urie,D.,'Officials of the cult at Ugarit',PEQ 80,1948,pp.42f.

SCRIPTURE REFERENCES

SUBJECT INDEX