

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

2

Rolf P. Knierim

Text and Concept
in Leviticus 1:1–9



J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

herausgegeben von
Bernd Janowski und Hermann Spieckermann

2

Text and Concept
in Leviticus 1:1–9

A Case in Exegetical Method

von

Rolf P. Knierim



J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen

ROLF P. KNIERIM was born 1928; he studied Theology 1950–55; 1948–50 and 1955–59 he was in Church Ministry; 1957 Promotion, 1958–63 Assistant and Lecturer Old Testament in Heidelberg, 1963 Habilitation, 1963–66 Lecturer in Heidelberg; since 1966 Professor of Old Testament, School of Theology at Claremont, and Avery Professor of Religion, Claremont Graduate School.

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Knierim, Rolf P.:

Text and concept in Leviticus 1:1–9: a case in exegetical
method / von Rolf P. Knierim. – Tübingen: Mohr, 1992

(Forschungen zum Alten Testament; 2)

ISBN 3-16-145859-1

NE: GT

978-3-16-157796-3 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019

© 1992 by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), P. O. Box 2040, D-7400 Tübingen.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was typeset by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen using Times typeface, printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on acid free stock paper from Papierfabrik Buhl in Ettlingen and bound by Heinr. Koch in Tübingen.

Printed in Germany.

ISSN 0940-4155

Foreword

This study focuses on a particular aspect of exegetical method. Rather than abstractly discussing the theory of method, it concretely applies this aspect to the actual exegesis of a text. In the process, exegetical method and actual exegesis – are intended to – complement and control each other. This format also lends itself to a more direct dialogue with those publications on the same text in which methodology and exegesis interpenetrate in relevant ways.

At issue is the relationship in a text between its statement and its thought, between what is explicit and what is implicit, between what a text expresses and what is operative in, and even the presupposition for, that text, although it is not expressed. Texts not only speak, they also think as they speak. They are not simply story, but thoughtful story. Indeed, and this must certainly be said for the written biblical texts, they are in many respects the result of intensive intellectual processes into which considerable critical discernment was invested before, and for, making the decision regarding what had to be put into writing, and how it was to be put into writing. In this study, the relationship between a text's expression and its implicit thought is called Text and Concept.

The encounter with this issue in exegetical publications, or in the entire arena of biblical interpretation for that matter, is not new. It has never been avoidable. In more recent developments, it has surfaced in one way or another in virtually every established exegetical method. Yet the way in which the relationship between the text and its concept is handled is all too often more coincidental than methodologically conscious. This demonstrates not so much the violation of method by exegetes as a certain deficit of the method itself, within which this aspect is not sufficiently located in its own right.

That the exegetical process starts at the individuality of the extant text is based on the fact that each text exists first of all in its individual kind. However, this starting point is by no means intended to replace the study of the text's typical features, especially its genre and setting and their tradition history. It only means that a more controlled discernment of

the text's genre may be attained after, rather than before, all factors of its individual nature are taken into account. Consequently, the starting point in the present study at the text's individuality is just as advisable as the subsequent discussion of its genre is necessary.

The choice of Lev 1:1–9 is coincidental. This text is merely a case for the same focus which is necessary for all texts. Whatever the hoped for merits of the results of our study may be for our understanding of this specific text, the results themselves point to what may be exegetically achieved for all texts. Should the relationship between text and concept play more than a coincidental or peripheral role, this focus may affect the system of our exegetical method more than has been realized thus far.

I wish to express my admiration for and indebtedness to the editors of the *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*, professors Bernd Janowski and Hermann Spieckermann, and the publisher, Georg Siebeck, for their daring consent to publish this study written in English so early in their new series.

In Claremont, I am indebted to Marilyn Lundberg, senior Old Testament Ph.D. student and my former research associate at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, for editing the manuscript, to Randy Merritt and Michael Phelps, senior Old Testament Ph.D. students and my current research associates, for their extensive contribution to additional editorial work and for creating the indices, to Cynthia Eades for word-processing, and to her husband Keith, also a senior Old Testament Ph.D. student, for voluntary assistance. Claremont Graduate School, the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, and the School of Theology at Claremont have provided various kinds of support without which even a short scholarly book could scarcely be carved out from an otherwise full professional schedule. Last but not least, the distinction between writing and instruction discussed in this study also applies to the different settings in which the study itself has been encountered: alone at my desk, and in the classroom with the doctoral students of my seminar. For the former and its purpose, the responsibility is mine alone. Regarding the latter, quite different, setting and purpose, I cannot but always be impressed by the commitment of these men and women to intensive exegetical labor, and thankful for our learning together.

Claremont, California
September, 1991

Rolf P. Knierim

Table of Contents

Foreword	III
Abbreviations	VII
Introduction	1
§ 1 Lev 1:1–9 within 1:1–3:17	5
§ 2 Lev 1:2α within 1:2–3:17	8
§ 3 Lev 1:2αβ + b and 3–9	9
§ 4 Style and theme in vv. 2αβ + b and 3–9	11
§ 5 Conceptual terminology	13
<i>Excursus: אדם I:2αβ</i>	14
§ 6 The concept of the text, not of the performance	17
<i>Excursus: Ritual in anthropology, structuralism, and exegesis</i>	19
§ 7 The issue of presuppositions	23
§ 8 Lev 1:3–9. The relationship of protasis and apodosis	29
§ 9 The apodosis in 1:3αβ–βα	31
§ 10 The firm pressing down of the hand, Lev 1:4	34
§ 11 רצון–Favor	41
<i>Excursus: The discussion about רצון</i>	42
§ 12 Lev 1:5–9	46
§ 13 Specific aspects	50
1. Clusters of actions	50
2. The role of the actants	50
3. The distribution of the work	52
4. The quality of the acts	54
<i>Excursus: The sacrificial quality of the blood-rite</i>	56
5. The participants' knowledge of the value system	57
<i>Excursus: The position of v. 9a in the text</i>	58

§ 14	The unity of the text	65
	1. Direct signals	65
	<i>Excursus</i> : עלה אשה ריח-ניחוח ליהוה	67
	2. Indirect signals	82
	<i>Excursus</i> : <i>The altar</i>	85
	3. Conclusions	86
§ 15	The genre of the text	91
	1. The discussion about “Ritual”	91
	2. Prescription of ritual, as case law	94
§ 16	The purpose and setting of the text	98
	1. Instruction?	98
	2. Prescription for procedure	101
	<i>Postscript. On K. Koch’s “Alttestamentliche und altorientalische Rituale”</i>	106
	Bibliography	113
	Indices	115
	Scripture Index	115
	Subject Index	117
	Hebrew Word Index	123
	Author Index	125

Abbreviations

I. Miscellaneous abbreviations

BB	<i>Das Bundesbuch</i> (The Covenant Book)
Diss.	Dissertation
H	<i>Das Heiligkeitsgesetz</i> (The Holiness Code)
imperf.	imperfect
MT	Massoretic Text
P	Priestly Source
perf.	perfect
pers.	person
plur.	plural
sing.	singular

II. Publications

ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament-Supplement Series
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
THAT	E. Jenni and C. Westermann (eds.), <i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
TWAT	G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

Introduction

It has always been observed in biblical exegesis that the texts contain not only statements but also presuppositions. The surface level of a text communicates to the reader explicit information, but it also points to aspects beneath itself which are, nevertheless, implicitly operative in it and which generate and control its form and content. Texts are linguistic semantic entities in which explicit statements and their presuppositions interact. Exegesis must, therefore, do more than paraphrase what a text says. It must also, however hypothetically, reconstruct a text's assumptions which lie underneath its surface.¹ It must explain its system, its *Gestalt*, if for no other reason than to help us achieve a better understanding of the text's statements. In doing so, it must distinguish between the critical paraphrase of the text's message and the reconstruction of its assumptions, and attempt to explain the relationship of both and their mutual convertibility.

The message of a text and its assumptions are mutually convertible. This is especially true for the relationship between a text and those of its assumptions that are conceptual in nature. However, in order that we

¹ Some terminological distinctions are necessary for this study. The term "reconstruction" is, together with "deconstruction," frequently used in the arena of biblical hermeneutics for the reordering of dismantled = deconstructed biblical thought-systems, e.g., the system of patriarchy. This type of deconstruction and reconstruction is done in the process of reinterpreting the Bible for our modern time. In a similar sense, but also for the change of forms and contents within the biblical transmission history, terms such as "transformation" and "recontextualization" are used. In this publication, I prefer to employ the following terminological distinctions: "transformation" refers most generally to either the contextual or conceptual change of both form and/or content, in the process of innerbiblical transmission. "Recontextualization" refers to the adaptation of a given or traditional text and its concept into a new socio-historical context which is considered analogous to the old so that no conceptual change happens. "Reconceptualization" refers to the reordering of a biblical thought-system itself in the innerbiblical transmission history, but especially in its adaptation by modern interpreters for our time. As in the case of recontextualization, reconceptualization is complemented by deconceptualization. In distinction to these terms, the term "reconstruction," without the complementary notion of "deconstruction," is used specifically for the exegetical attempt to discover the presupposed but inexplicit assumptions or the conceptuality underneath a text.

may determine the relationship of these two factors, each must be recognized in its distinctiveness. The reconstruction of biblical “ideas” or “concepts” or “patterns,” and the focus on them in the study of the Bible, is valid in its own right and for its own purposes, apart from its function in the exegesis of texts — as long as it does not replace, or claim to replace, that exegesis. But apart from the fact that various types of reconstruction — via texts — aim at scholarly interpretations of worldview systems for their own sake, they demand a virtually complete body of literature rather than individual texts or confined groups of texts. While the “ideas” or “concepts” or “patterns” of worldview systems play a role in the so-called deep structure of texts, they neither self-evidently, nor necessarily, represent the concepts or assumptions (or assumed concepts and conceptual assumptions) that belong to the immediate reason for and meaning of an individual text, or of a coherent group of texts, or of a larger literary work. The conceptualities that are operative in the immediacy of a text are directly important for exegetical work. They represent the focus of the present study.

A *caveat* needs to be kept in mind, namely, the danger of circular argumentation in the determination of the relationship between text and concept. This danger always exists. But the possibility or danger of circular argumentation invalidates neither the basic necessity for determining the relationship between text and concept nor the legitimacy of hypothetically reconstructing a concept from a text. While reconstruction necessary for understanding is inevitably hypothetical, a hypothesis is better than none at all. Our option consists of the alternative between more or less substantiated hypotheses, not between a hypothesis or no hypothesis. The danger of circular argumentation is at any rate alleviated by the fact that the reconstruction, to whatever extent it can facilitate a better understanding of the text, is controlled by what the text permits.² Texts are more than lists of independent words (lexemes) and chains of unrelated sentences (syntagms). They are held together by supra-syntagmatic factors which constitute their entity. These factors are signaled by the grammatical and syntactical *cohesion* of the surface-

² An updated study of the role which either the neglect of or attention to the presuppositions operative in the messages of the texts has played in the history of exegesis, beyond what is generally known and in addition to the developments generated by the fields of, e.g., form criticism, linguistics, semiotics, and structuralism, would be very instructive methodologically.

texts, while their *coherence* is conceptual in nature.³ Whereas particular terms or statements on the surface of the text often point to these conceptualities, the concepts themselves are basically *infratextual*. And their typology is heterogeneous. A concept governing a text may be, e.g., genre-, style-, or situation-specific; it may be a particular theme, plot, concern, or intention. Its presence beneath the surface of a text may be strictly pericope-immanent, i.e., *intratextual*, but it may also be determined *contextually* as in larger literary works, or *intertextually* as in the coherence of separate literary works or documents,⁴ or even *supra-textually* as, e.g., by certain worldview concepts. It may be traditional or new.

Of course, many existing studies pay attention to conceptuality. Among those that directly focus on the relationship between text and concept are interpretations concerned primarily with the composition or structure of identified literary works or biblical books. This is not the place for presenting a review on the surge of interest in the composition or structure of texts, on the different approaches and findings, or on a methodology of composition-analysis. Suffice it to say that, e.g., the interpretations of the composition of the Pentateuch or of parts of it in the recent works of E. Blum, H. Utzschneider, J. Milgrom, R. P. Knierim, and others, differ considerably. It is the difference in approaches and results that is a matter of concern at this moment, rather than the question of who is more or less correct. In any case, it seems that the interpretation of the composition of texts cannot ignore the relationship between text and concept but must consciously face it.

Last but not least, discernible individual pericopes exist in their own right. In the biblical literature they are usually parts of compositions or works, and the influence of context on them must not be ignored. Nevertheless, they are units in their own right, and sometimes reveal their individuality even in tension with their context. While it is certainly legitimate to start the exegetical process of a larger literary work with the explanation of its macro-structure or -composition and subsequently to move to the explanation of its parts, it is equally legitimate to reverse that exegetical process because either process will ultimately control the

³ For the helpful distinction between *Kohäsion* (cohesion) and *Kohärenz* (coherence), see H. UTZSCHNEIDER (15–16, etc.).

⁴ Cf., e.g., the coherence of psalms which belong to the same group or genre, or of separate prophetic books which are based on the theological system of the deuteronomistic redactors.

results of the other. Specifically, however, an individual pericope in principle may, and often does, have a distinct focus which sets it apart even from such pericopes to which it belongs generically. And its distinctive individuality includes the relationship between its text and its concept or conceptual aspects. For this reason alone, exegetical work needs to inquire into the relationship of text and concept in individual pericopes as well as in larger works. It is, after all, not impossible that an outside concept controlling the interpretation of a pericope may obscure or even destroy its individuality.

The following study of Lev 1: 1–9 ventures into the direction just mentioned. If anything justifies this quest at the outset, it is the fact that the texts about the *עֹלָה*, the burnt offering, are on several grounds clearly distinguishable. They individually focus on different subtypes of the same *עֹלָה*. They may, and to a certain extent do, presuppose and indicate a common *עֹלָה* pattern. But they are first of all the obvious result of a differentiated understanding of, and need for presenting, the subtypes, the different “cases” of the *עֹלָה* sacrifice, rather than the common pattern itself. While the comparison of all subtypes and the interpretation of the entire *עֹלָה* system is important, the degree and perhaps the quality of its reconstruction may be significantly enhanced by the exegesis of the conceptual nature of the distinctly individual texts.

These introductory remarks are only meant to focus attention on the distinction between text (specifically, surface text) and concept in the following study. The study itself, as an exemplar, and also the literature referred to will be concerned with highlighting this distinction more than with presenting a complete register of all exegetical data. These data are, at any rate, discussed in the relevant commentaries, monographs, and articles.

§1 Lev 1:1–9 within 1:1–3:17

In the extant text, Lev 1:1–9 is part of the macro-unit 1:1–3:17. This unit is a report of a Yahweh speech to Moses. It consists of two parts: the narrator's – expanded – introductory report formula (*about* a Yahweh speech) in 1:1, and his quotation *of* the speech itself to Moses in 1:2–3:17.⁵ For the interpretation of the setting and intention of the text it is as important to note that the entire unit 1:1–3:17 is simply a report about a Yahweh speech to Moses mediated by the narrators who speak *about* Moses – and not a Yahweh speech without that mediation – as it is to note that the reported instructions themselves from 1:2, especially v. 2aβ on, were given by Yahweh himself, and not by “the priests” of the priestly writings. The text does not even have a statement, let alone a report, about Moses' compliance with Yahweh's command given to him in v. 2aα.⁶ Nevertheless, it certainly presupposes that compliance. And the conceptual nature of this presupposition should be assumed as implicitly operative in the text in view of the fact that the priestly literature reports such obedient compliances as one of the mainstays of its theology. That this conceptual presupposition coincides with the absence of a reference to it in the context means at least, whatever its inscrutable specific reasons may have been, that for the chain of transmission of the following laws (given for Israel's permanent existence rather than the commands given for the immediate execution of acute actions such as the building of the sanctuary, the ordination of Aaron, the judgment against Nadab and Abihu and against the blasphemer, and the organization of the camp) the emphasis on their origin was so

⁵ For different subdivisions cf., e.g., K. ELLIGER (27); G. J. WENHAM (48–49). R. RENDTORFF's “Auf die Anrede folgt der Befehl zur Weitergabe” (1985: 23) needs reformulation. V.1 contains no *Anrede*; it contains at best, in v. 1a, a reporting *reference to* a personal address (such as “Moses”), a reference that presupposes the address, and in v. 1b a reporting reference to the entire following speech. For the stylistic observations and their redaction historical implications here and in the following text, see the commentaries.

⁶ In Leviticus, such reports or statements of compliance occur only within the contexts of Lev 8–10 and 24:10–23, in 16:34b, and in an indirect statement in 26:46.

decisive that their content quoted in the extant text was sufficient evidence for their mediation through Moses so that this mediation did not have to be explicitly mentioned.

The modern exegetical assumption that the laws about the rituals were originally created by priests means that the redactors created a hermeneutical shift by presupposing that their priestly laws about the sacrificial rituals originated in Yahweh's own instructions. According to this hermeneutical shift these instructions were given immediately after Yahweh occupied the tent of meeting, and before he gave any other instructions to Moses who (by conceptual implication) transmitted them to Aaron and his sons, our redactors. This shift, undoubtedly intended to absolutize the authority of the redactors' laws, amounts to more than a mere *recontextualization* of the same concept of the cultic laws. It amounts to a twofold *reconceptualization*: the laws themselves are Yahweh's laws and no longer priestly laws, and the authorization for the priests to transmit the laws and to perform the rituals depends on the mediation of the laws through the authority of Moses at Sinai and no longer on their own priestly tradition and authority.⁷ The priests were no longer lawgivers or instructors of laws; they were reporters of received laws.

The phrase **מֵאֵהָל מוֹעֵד** in v. 1 b β deserves particular attention. It is an explicit signal for the macro-structure of the entire Sinai narrative. After the tabernacle had been erected and the cloud had covered it and the **כְּבוֹד** filled it (Exod 40), Yahweh no longer called Moses from Mt. Sinai but now from the tent of meeting.⁸ This signal points to the concept of the movement of the Yahweh revelation from the mountain to the tent, which is clearly operative on the contextual level itself and which reflects the tradition history about the relationship between Sinai and Israel's central sanctuary.⁹

Our focus on vv. 1–9 in Lev 1 does not mean that these verses represent, or ever were, a self-contained pericope. They represent only the beginning of the Yahweh speech report which continues after 1:9

⁷ For the interpretation of the "Orakel-Konzept" of these Mosaic-priestly instructions, see H. UTZSCHNEIDER (148–149).

⁸ See R. P. KNIERIM (1985: 404–405).

⁹ For Lev 1:1 as well as for Exod 24:16–18 it is true that Moses must wait until he is called, so K. KOCH (1959: 45); B. JANOWSKI (313); R. RENDTORFF (1985: 22). The relevant difference, however, for the composition of the Sinai narrative, is that in Exod 24:16–18 and 25:1 Moses is called from the top of the mountain whereas in Lev 1:1 he is called from the tent of meeting.

until 3:17. An interpretation of the composition itself of 1:1–3:17 would have to address all its pertinent factors, which is not our aim. But it is necessary to include attention to the introductory statements in vv. 1 and 2a α in the discussion of the first specific unit, vv. 3–9 (which is our aim) because these two introductory statements, redactional as they are, may have affected the original text of the body of the following units; and they have certainly cast a hierarchic semantic structure over that body which affects it conceptually. As will be discussed later, the question of the generic identity of the texts contained in the quoted Yahweh speech is thereby affected. E.g., as far as the notion of “instruction” is concerned, it seems at the outset that this instruction is envisioned as a one time event in which the only instructor is Yahweh. Yahweh orally instructs Moses about laws concerning sacrificial rituals. Vv. 2a β + b and 3–9 contain the first of these. This impression, however, is only gained from vv. 1 and 2a α , and also from the 2nd pers. plur. forms in v. 2a β + b which belong to the redactors’ hands. The text from v. 3 on is not, at least not self-evidently, formulated in specifically instruction language, i.e., language that points to an instructional setting. The interpretation of the texts from v. 3 on as “instruction” seems either influenced by the instruction language of their introductory context in vv. 1, 2a α + b, which does not mean that their own language is self-evidently instruction language; or it rests on the grounds of our reconstructions of transmission historical processes behind those texts rather than on the characteristics of their own language. We need to be aware of these distinctions so that our focus on the material from v. 2a β + b and vv. 3–9 on is not blurred by *a priori* exegetical assumptions.

§2 Lev 1:2α within 1:2–3:17

The second part of the macro-unit, 1:2–3:17, the quoted Yahweh speech, also consists of two parts: Yahweh's commission of Moses in v. 2α to promulgate what follows to the Israelites, and the content of the commanded promulgation, now given to him in 1:2αβ–3:17. With regard to v. 2α we again note the implicit presupposition operative in the text, namely, that this content must have been orally transmitted by Moses to the Israelites, or it would not be known and its text could not exist. This observation is simple, but its explanation is complex and will not be pursued at this point. Suffice it to say that the text and its context imply an *infratextual* or *subtextual* conceptuality which must be rooted in the importance of the tradition-history of the Moses-concept for the priestly writers' claim to their own cultic legitimacy, even exclusivity, not only as the practitioners of the sacrifices but especially, and primarily, as the heirs and guardians of Yahweh's instructions to Moses for the Israelites.

§3 Lev 1:2aβ + b and 3–9

The content of the quoted Yahweh speech to Moses will be the actual object of this study, whereby we will confine ourselves to vv. 2aβ–9 as the paradigm for pursuing the questions raised in the introduction.

Before discussing vv. 2aβ–9 specifically, we need to identify the place of these verses within the macro-unit 1:1–3:17. Its structure appears as follows:

Report of a Yahweh speech to Moses	1:1–3:17
I. The narrator's introductory report formula	1:1
II. His quotation of the speech	1:2–3:17
A. The commissioning of Moses	1:2aα
B. The content of the commission: on קרבן	1:2aβ–3:17
1. Concerning עלה	1:2aβ–17
2. Concerning מנחה	2:1–16
3. Concerning זבח שלמים	3:1–17 ¹⁰

The subsection II.B.1. = 1:2aβ–17, concerning the עלה, is further subdivided into two parts:

1.a. The main case	vv. 2aβ + b ¹¹
1.b. Three subordinate cases	vv. 3–17
1) Concerning בקר	vv. 3–9
2) Concerning צאן	vv. 10–13
3) Concerning עוף	vv. 14–17

The statement about the main case, 1.a. = v. 2aβ + b, expresses an aspect that belongs to the entire section on the עלה, 1.b. = vv. 3–17, and to each of its subcases. It is not an abstraction of them, but introduces the

¹⁰ The systematized order of this content, B., and also the problem of its arrangement are discussed in the pertinent publications.

¹¹ The signals in the text for this placing of the “main case” together with the עלה-unit are ambiguous. According to its literal statement, v. 2aβ + b could function as an introduction to the entire macro-unit, B., on קרבן. However, that unit in the extant text is interrupted by Lev 2, to which 1:2aβ + b does not refer, and the content of the apodosis in 1:2b is in part resumed in 3:1, so that 1:2aβ + b seems in the extant text to function specifically as the introduction to 1:3–17.

condition and the first regulation common to each of them. With this in mind, we can focus on vv. 2aβ–9.

Before any other consideration of structure and genre, it is important to note that the two sections in vv. 2aβ + b and 3–9 are composed according to the traditional method by which case law corpora were composed, by moving from the common to the specific aspect(s). Furthermore, each of the two sections is composed according to the basic structure of case laws themselves, by an introductory protasis stating the case and a following apodosis stating the prescription for the case. Substantively, as well as syntactically, the two parts of each law belong together, and neither is isolated from the other.¹² And this is the point where the conceptual problems arise.

¹² The genre of case law in which this Yahweh instruction is cast means that an assumed genre “Ritual” consisting only of the texts contained in the apodoses (vv. 2b without 2aβ, and 3aβ–9 without 3aα, etc.) will not only have to be isolated from its extant redactional layers; it either will also have to be isolated from its case law protases in order to demonstrate an originally pure form of “Ritual,” or its case law form will have to be included in the explanation of the form of a genre “Ritual.” In any case, the relationship of case law and “Ritual,” and the possible transformation of a purely prescriptive “Ritual” to case law will have to be explained.

Scripture Index

Genesis

8:21 68, 73

Exodus

12 106
 20:25 f. 83
 24:16–18 6n.9
 25 ff. 95, 106, 109
 25:1 6n.9
 27:1 ff. 86
 27:1–8 85
 29 62
 29:13 63
 29:15–18 61
 29:17 60–62
 29:17b α 59, 61
 29:17b β 61
 29:22 63
 35:4 f. 82
 35:22–29 82
 36:1–7 82
 40 6

Leviticus

1–7 103
 1–5 94–95, 103
 1–3 11, 13n.17, 14, 98, 103
 1 62
 1:1–3:17 5–7, 9
 1:1–9 3, 5–7
 1:1+2a α 11
 1:1 5, 5n.5, 6n.9, 7, 9
 1:1b β 6
 1:2–3:17 5, 8, 9
 1:2 5
 1:2a α 5, 7, 8, 9, 98–99
 1:2a β ff. 5
 1:2a β –3:17 8, 9
 1:2a β –9 9–10
 1:2a β –3 55n.59
 1:2a β 10n.12, 14–16, 66, 68, 90,
 94n.75

1:2a β +b 7, 9–10, 11–12, 17,
 94–96, 101–102, 110
 1:2b–5 55n.59
 1:2b 9n.11, 10n.12, 11–12,
 55n.59
 1:3 ff. 7, 11–12
 1:3–17 9, 9n.11
 1:3–9 7, 9–10, 11–12, 15–16,
 17, 23, 29–30, 46, 53,
 61–62, 66, 82, 86–87, 94,
 97, 99, 104–105
 1:3a α +b–9 110
 1:3–5a 50
 1:3–4 37–38
 1:3 48, 53n.54
 1:3a+b 27
 1:3a α 10n.12, 13n.16, 29–30,
 32, 68, 94n.75
 1:3a β ff. 34–35
 1:3a β –9 10n.12, 29, 30
 1:3a β –9b α 50
 1:3a β +b 66
 1:3a β +b α 31–33, 50, 53, 53n.54, 58
 1:3a β 31–32, 39n.40, 46
 1:3b α 15, 32–33, 46
 1:3b β –4b α 41, 45
 1:3b β 30, 34–35, 35n.27,
 43–44, 87, 90
 1:4 ff. 31–32
 1:4–9 23, 27, 29, 31, 53, 53n.54,
 110
 1:4–8 58–60, 63
 1:4–5 48, 55n.59
 1:4 34–40, 47, 79–81, 88
 1:4a+b 26, 66
 1:4a 32, 34, 34n.25, 38n.38, 46,
 48, 50, 53, 53n.54, 77–78,
 90, 100–101
 1:4b 34, 79
 1:4b α + β 80, 90
 1:4b α 34n.26, 35n.27, 38n.38,
 43–44, 77, 79, 87

1:4bβ	35n.27, 38n.38, 39n.40, 77, 78, 81–82, 87, 90	1:11	32
1:5–9	35n.27, 37–38, 46–49, 80	1:14–17	9, 11, 66, 87
1:5bff.	41	1:14	29
1:5	23, 52	2	9n.11, 12n.15
1:5a+b	26	2:1–6	9
1:5a+bα	53	3:1–17	9
1:5a	23, 24n.21, 32–33, 34, 41, 46, 47, 48, 50, 53n.54, 66, 88–89, 90, 100–101	3:1	9n.11
1:5b	27, 59, 87, 88	3:3–4	63
1:5bα+β	50–51, 53n.54, 58, 66, 88	4:27–30	15
1:5bα	46, 48	4:32f.	15
1:5bβ+γ	46	4:35	15
1:5bβ	48, 53, 85	7:3–4	63
1:6ff.	50–51	7:18b	44
1:6–9	48	8–10	5n.6
1:6–9bα	47, 66	8:16	63
1:6–7	26, 55n.59	8:25	63
1:6	26, 51, 53, 58	12:6f.	15
1:6a+b	26, 48, 50, 53n.54, 58, 100–101	13:8	45
1:6a	13n.16, 46, 90	14:12f.	15
1:6b	46, 60, 62	15:29	15
1:7ff.	51	16:34b	5n.6
1:7–8	84	17:4	45
1:7	26, 46, 51, 53, 62, 63	17:14	56
1:7a+b	27, 48, 50, 53n.54, 58, 59, 87	22:22–24	22, 31n.22
1:7a	46, 85	24:10–23	5n.6
1:7b	46, 83	26:3	68
1:8–9	55n.59	26:46	5n.6
1:8	26, 46, 48, 50–52, 53, 53n.54, 64, 83	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	
1:8a	63	12	106
1:8α	62, 87	12:16	88
1:8αβ	63	12:23	56
1:8αγ	63	26	106
1:8b	85	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
1:9a+b	26	14:32	88
1:9a+bα	53	<i>2 Kings</i>	
1:9a	26, 27, 46, 48, 50, 52, 53n.54, 58–64, 100–101, 106	16:10–16	86
1:9α	111	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
1:9b	50, 58, 62, 75	6:13	68
1:9bα+β	83–84	16:19	69
1:9bα	46, 52, 53n.54, 55, 63–64, 85, 87	18:9bβ	45
1:9bβ	13n.16, 30, 66–82, 90	20:8	69
1:10–13	9, 11, 66, 87	20:41	69
		43:13–17	86
		<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
		4	86

Subject Index

- Aaron 5, 6
Aaronides (see Priests, Aaronide)
Acceptance 34n.26, 35n.27, 70–71, 75–78, 84
Acts/Actions 26, 32, 39, 43, 50–57, 87–89, 105, 107
– approval of 43
– auxiliary/subsidiary 47, 51, 55, 58, 62, 87, 89 (see also Side-actions)
– constitutive 47, 49, 59, 87, 89
– disapproval of 43
– prescribed 24, 30, 34, 50, 53n.54, 80
– procedural 46, 48
– presuppositions for 36, 51, 89
– ritual 26–27, 31n.34, 55n.59, 59
– sequence of 30, 46, 52, 53, 59–64, 107
– simultaneous 26, 51
– successive/consecutive 26, 34, 60
 (See also Work, distribution of)
Altar 50, 52, 53, 55, 55n.57, 56, 60, 63, 66, 83, 85–86, 87, 88, 100
– as belonging to the deity 57
– as place of God's presence 56
– elevation of 85
– conceptual matrix for 85
– function of 85
– location of 85
Ambivalency of text 81
Anger, divine 73–74, 77–78
Animal 29, 37, 39n.40, 53, 62, 90 (see also עֲלֵה – as animal in Hebrew Index; and Bull in Subject Index)
– anatomy of 63
– bringing of 15, 31–32, 40, 42, 55, 66, 100
– consumption of (with fire) 51, 66, 82
– death of (purpose of) 37, 38, 42
– dedication of sacrificial death of 39–40
– dissection of 24, 26, 48, 50–52, 55, 58, 60–61, 62, 101
– identification of offerer with 78
– killing of 15, 37–39, 50, 55, 80, 83, 88, 101
– movement of 83 (see also Procedure, movement of)
– offering of 15, 66
– processing of 51
– rite of passage of 83–84
– selection of 11n.14, 15, 31, 31n.22, 35, 40, 48n.48, 55, 66, 100
– skinning of 24, 25, 26, 48, 51–52, 55
– slaughter of 32, 47–48 (see also Slaughter)
– surrender to death of 38–39, 39n.40, 40, 42, 66
– transproportion/transfer to Yahweh of 38n.39, 39n.40, 40, 80, 83
– transformation into smoke of 83–84
– transition from life of death of 36
Animal pieces, washing of 48, 55, 58, 59–64
Anrechnung (see Imputation)
Anthropology 18, 19–22
– of text 28, 37
Anweisung (see Instruction)
Appeasement 67–76, 81, 82, 83, 90
Apodosis 10, 10n.12, 13, 17, 17n.18, 29–30, 31–33, 46, 47, 83, 100, 105, 108, 109
Assumptions 1, 1n.1, 2, 6, 7, 17, 23
Atonement 38, 38n.38, 70, 72–74, 76–81
Belehrung (see Instruction)
Beschwichtigung/beschwichtigend (see Appeasement and Atonement)
Blood 53, 56
– as belonging to Yahweh 57, 66
– catching of 48, 50, 88
– meaning of 56
– prohibition against eating 56
– spillage of 56, 58
– sprinkling/tossing of 25, 48, 50, 52, 55, 56–57, 66, 83, 88
Blood-rite 25, 38, 50, 52, 56–57, 87
Blutritus (see Blood-rite)

- Bull 23–24 (see also Animal)
 – bringing of 34
 – selection of 34
- Case law 10, 11, 17n.18, 29–30, 31, 46–47, 65n.61, 78, 83, 92, 98–102
 – in cultic setting 44, 65n.66, 96, 101
 – form/pattern of 17, 94, 104
 – genre of 10n.12, 94, 96, 97, 101, 110–111
 – imitation of 95, 110
- Coherence 70
 – of actions 87
 – conceptual 37, 48n.48, 53, 68
 – of prescriptions 89
 – of texts 2, 3, 86–87
- Cohesion 2, 57, 86
- Concept(s)
 – conscious vs. unconscious 20–21
 – as governing a text 3, 4
 – relationship with text 1–4
 – as signs of textual coherence 86
 – as signs of textual cohesion 86
 – tension between 12, 16, 86
 – unity of 46, 50, 53
- Conceptuality 1–3, 8, 14, 23–24, 39, 41, 52–53, 71, 84, 85, 90, 103
 – conscious vs. unconscious 22
 – reconstruction of 2, 24
 – of sacrificial procedure 41, 85
- Conceptualization 18, 66
- Connotation 71–72, 74–75, 76
- Context 3, 6–7, 8, 22, 35, 68
- Da'at* 91, 93
- Declaration 42–44
- Declaratory formula 42
- Declaratory language 44
- Deconstruction 1n.1
- Denkakt* vs. *Sprechakt* 43–45
- Description 18, 19–20, 23, 49, 88, 107, 110
- Exile 18, 104
- Expiation 13n.17, 72–73, 75, 76–80, 82
- Explicit/Explicitness 1, 6, 14, 16, 22, 25, 42, 49, 50, 52, 55, 60
- Favor 34–36, 36n.28, 38, 38n.38, 40, 41–45, 66, 79 (see also רצון in Hebrew Index)
- Fire 25, 48, 50–52, 55, 61, 82, 84, 84n.65, 87
- Folgehandlungen* (See Acts/Actions, sequence of)
- Geistesbeschäftigung* 18, 86
- Genre 7, 10, 13, 27, 48n.48, 65, 86
 – assessment of 110
 – conflation of 109
 – identification 111
 – of Lev 1:1–991–97
 – transformation of 10n.12, 95
- Gift 67–72 (see also עֵלָה=gift, in Hebrew Index)
 – function of 71
 – nature of 67, 70, 75
 – odor of 71, 74–75
 – purpose of 70–71
 – relationship to Yahweh 66, 68–70, 81
 – significance of 67
- Guilt offering/sacrifice 73, 74
- Handlungen* (See Acts/Actions)
- Handlungsanweisungen* (See Instructions)
- Hermeneutic 1n.1, 6, 19–20, 99
- Implication(s) 6, 15, 30, 42, 70
- Implicit/Implicitness 1, 5, 8, 15
- Imputation 42–45
- Inexplicit 1n.1, 22, 23–28, 39
- Infratextuality 3, 8
- Instructions 7, 24, 27, 40, 61, 98–100, 105
 – for lay persons 24–25, 28, 100
 – as the purpose of the text 54, 98–102
 – for sacrifice 98, 100
 – transmission of 6
 – by Yahweh 6, 7, 8, 10n.12
- Interaction of priest and lay person 25, 52 (see also Work, distribution of)
- Intertextuality 22, 41, 68
- Intratextuality 3, 22, 66
- Joy 81–82
- Knowledge
 – conceptual 13
 – presupposed/presumed 13, 14, 17, 24, 29–30, 31n.22, 36, 49, 54, 56, 82
- Law (see also Case law)
 – apodictic 65n.66
 – application of 103
 – cultic 6, 44, 96–97, 101

- implementation of 18
- non-cultic 96
- prescribed 54
- priestly 6, 81, 96
- procedural 31, 39n.41, 65–66, 81, 97
- proclamation of 81
- purpose of 102
- of redactors 6
- relationship to instruction 98, 103, 109
- relationship to prescription 105
- about rituals 6, 7
- substantive 66, 97
- transmission of 5
- written, purpose of 103
- of Yahweh 6
- Lay person(s) 24–26, 30, 50, 105
 - actions of 18n.20, 23, 25, 48 (See also Acts/Actions)
 - instruction of 24–25, 98, 100
 - knowledge of 23, 24, 29
- Laying on of hands (see Pressing the hand down firmly)
- Levites (see Priest, Levitic)
- Life situation (see Sacrifices, life situation of)

- Moses 5–8, 9, 93, 98

- Nebenhandlungen* 26–27, 58–62, 89, 111
(see also Acts/Actions, auxiliary)

- Odor 67–76
 - appeasing nature of 68
 - function of 69, 73, 75–76
 - of gift 71, 74
 - pleasing nature of 34n.26, 66, 67–76, 81–82, 83–85, 90
 - soothing nature of 67, 72, 74
- Offerer 37, 39, 40, 44, 54, 68, 71 (see also Lay person)
 - actions of 53, 53n.54, 99–100
 - decision of 78, 80
 - instruction of 28, 99
 - knowledge of 24, 31n.22
 - pilgrimage of 32, 83, 100, 105
- Offering 13n.17, 29, 75
 - materials for 12n.15, 29 (see also Sacrificial material)
 - types of 11, 13, 30
- Orality 44–45, 91, 95

- Parenesis 81–82
- Performance 17–18, 19, 24, 26–27, 47, 57, 94, 108–109, 111
 - description of 18, 19
 - prescription of 18, 105, 108
 - *rite* 44, 47, 89n.68
- Prescription 17n.18, 18, 24, 26, 30, 31, 34–36, 38, 46–49, 54, 58, 66, 81, 89–90, 91, 92–93, 98, 105–106, 109
 - of actions 15, 24, 25, 30, 32, 34, 46, 49, 50, 53n.54, 61, 63, 80, 89, 100
 - explicit 49, 50, 55
 - as nature of text 19, 37, 44, 53, 101
 - of procedure 13, 32, 36, 39–40, 44, 57–58, 65–67, 68, 70, 84, 91, 99, 101–106
 - reconceptualization of 54
 - relationship to law 17, 54, 98–99, 105
 - relationship to performance 23, 108
 - of ritual 19, 28, 47, 86, 94–97, 111
 - for sacrifice 93–94, 95
 - for sanctuary construction 93, 95, 110
- Pressing the hand down firmly 15, 27–28, 32, 34–40, 55, 77–81, 101
- Presuppositions 4, 5–6, 13, 23–28, 29, 31, 41, 52–53, 63, 67, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 78, 83, 86 (see also Knowledge, presupposed)
 - of actions 36, 51, 54, 89
 - conceptual 5, 13, 17, 22, 32, 48, 50, 52, 86
 - implicit 8, 107
 - inexplicit 23, 48n.50, 50
 - as operative in the text 2n.2, 28, 72
 - of text 1, 18, 37n.34, 43
- Priest(s) 5, 6, 15, 18n.20, 25, 28, 30, 39, 42, 43, 48, 50–56, 60, 64, 73, 77, 87, 91, 99, 102, 105
 - Aaronide 18n.20, 104
 - actions of 18n.20, 50, 53, 53n.54, 54n.56, 55–56, 77–78, 82, 84, 85n.67, 93, 99–100
 - Levitic 38n.39, 48, 87
 - mediation by 41, 44
- Priestly laws 6, 81, 96
- Priestly texts 5, 32n.23, 37, 82
- Priestly theology 71, 73
- Priestly tradition 6, 17n.19, 24n.21, 111
- Priestly writer (P) 69, 72–73, 81, 95–96
- Priestly writers 8, 14, 102, 103

- Procedure 13, 15, 17, 26, 31, 35–36, 38, 40, 41, 44, 46, 51–55, 57–58, 64, 65–66, 77, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89–90, 94, 97, 99, 101, 105 (see also Law, procedural)
- acts of 46, 48
 - movement of 31, 51, 53, 58, 64, 82–85, 89
 - prescription of 13, 32, 36, 39–40, 44, 57–58, 65–67, 68, 70, 82, 84, 91, 99, 103, 104–105 (see also Prescription of procedure)
 - proper 40, 43, 54
 - stages of 36, 46, 50
 - ritual 28, 59, 93, 94n.74
- Property
- right of 37, 39n.40
 - transfer of 36, 40, 80
- Protasis 10, 10n.12, 13, 17, 17n.18, 29–30, 96, 99, 100, 104–105, 108–109, 110–111
- Reconceptualization 1n.1, 6, 16, 38n.38, 54, 81–82
- Reconstruction 1–2, 4, 7, 14–15, 22, 24, 25, 27, 46, 51, 53, 86
- Recontextualization 1n.1, 6, 16
- Redaction 5n.5, 6, 7, 11, 11n.14, 15–16, 18n.20, 35, 38n.38, 44, 55n.57, 58, 63, 81, 87, 95
- Redemption 77–78
- Rite 47, 106–108
- Ritual(s)
- (event) 16, 17–20, 24, 27, 31, 32, 36, 38, 86, 89–90, 94, 103
 - (genre) 10n.12, 27, 51, 55n.56, 55n.59, 58, 91, 93–96, 106–111 (see also *Rituale*)
 - description of 18, 19–20
 - laws regarding 6, 7, 97
 - performance 17n.19, 94, 111
 - prescription of 19, 28, 47, 86, 94–97, 111
 - procedure of 28, 59, 93, 94n.74
 - systems of 18, 19–20
- Rituale* 95, 101, 106–111
- Ritualstil* 92–94
- Sacrifice 6, 8, 14, 17, 40, 47–48, 48n.48, 54, 57, 71, 93, 104 (see also Ritual [event])
- acts of 55, 89
 - life situation of 14, 30, 32, 36n.28, 76, 78, 82, 99
 - performance of 40, 47
 - prescriptions/instructions for 93–95, 98, 100
 - procedure of 54, 55, 64, 85, 93, 97, 100–101, 103–104
 - purpose/intention/meaning of 38, 39, 40, 75, 105
 - stages of 31, 65, 82, 85
 - types of 11–12, 13n.16, 14, 15, 29, 30, 38, 65, 103, 104 (see also Offering, types of)
- Sacrificial cult 14, 18, 54, 65, 70, 91, 93, 103, 106
- Sacrificial material 11–12, 13, 15 (see also Offering, materials for)
- Sacrificial system 13n.17, 15, 28, 48, 70, 82, 83, 86, 98–99, 103, 104, 104n.78
- Sacrificial text 47, 85, 94
- Sanctuary 18n.20, 32, 36, 40, 50, 55, 66, 82–83, 83n.64, 85, 100, 101, 105 (see also Tent of Meeting)
- construction of 5, 103, 109
 - legitimate 32n.23, 86
- Semantics 1, 7, 38n.38, 63, 71, 73, 80, 81
- Settings
- administrative 65
 - civil 65n.61
 - cultic 65n.61
 - instructional 100, 102
 - sacrificial 102
 - of text 5
 - writing vs. instructional 102
- Side-actions 55n.57, 55n.59, 58–59, 62 (see also *Nebenhandlungen*)
- Sin 37, 38n.38, 73, 76, 81
- Sin offering 73–74
- Sinai 6, 6n.9, 18, 98, 101, 103, 104n.78
- Slaughter 39n.40, 47, 48, 88
- place of 33, 34, 53, 56, 83
 - prescription of 34, 88
- Soothing 67, 72, 74
- Sprechakt* vs. *Denkakt* 43–45
- Structure 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 20–22, 27, 86, 89, 92
- Structuralism 20–22
- Style 92, 102, 111 (see also *Ritualstil*)
- Subordination 11–12
- Subtextuality 8
- Supratextuality 3
- System 4, 26, 28, 47, 82–83 (see also Sacrificial system)
- Systematization 11n.14, 37, 48n.48, 103

- Tabernacle 6 (see also Sanctuary and Tent of Meeting)
- Tent of Meeting 6, 6n.9, 15, 32, 32n.23, 34 (see also Sanctuary)
- Tradition history 6, 8, 15, 16, 73–74, 91, 96–97, 99
- Transmission history 1n.1, 7, 96–97
- hermeneutic of 6, 99
- Unterrichtung* (see Instruction)
- Verbal forms 26, 28, 53, 87–88
- imperfect 31, 59–62, 111
 - imperfect and perfect 25, 47, 59
 - inverted imperfect construction 63, 93
- perfect 27, 59–61, 63, 93, 110–111
 - perfect consecutive 53n.55, 91–92, 96, 106
 - person, second 7, 92–93, 99, 109
 - person, third 91, 92, 96, 99, 101, 109
- Washing (see Animal pieces, washing of)
- Waw* 26, 53, 57
- Women 14–15
- Work, distribution of 25, 52–54, 53n.54, 87
- Worldview 2, 3, 86
- Yahweh speech 5–7, 8, 9

Hebrew Word Index

- אדם 14–16
אל־פתח 32–33
אל־פתח אהל מועד 31, 32
אם 94n.75
אֵשׁ 84, 84n.65
אִשָּׁה 67, 68, 72–73, 75
אִשָּׁה רִיחַ נִיחּוּחַ לִיהוּהָ 67–82, 84–85
אִשִּׁם 72
בֹּהַ 43
בֶּן־בָּקָר 23, 24n.21
בָּקָר 9, 15, 16, 23, 24n.21, 29, 32, 65–66, 86, 89, 100, 101
דַּעַת 91
הוּא 68
הַכֵּל 55, 63
הַמִּזְבֵּחַ 83n.63
הַקִּטְוִיר 64, 84
זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים 9, 11, 48
זֶכֶר תָּמִים 31
חַטָּא 81n.62
חַטָּאת 15, 48, 72, 74, 79
חֹשֶׁב 42–44
יָדוּ 39
יִקְרִיבוּ 31
כְּבוֹד 6
כֹּהֵן 54n.56
כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל 87
כִּי 94n.75
כֹּפֶר 77, 81n.62 (see also לִכְפֹּר)
כִּי־פָרָה 79
כִּרְעִי 63
לִיהוּהָ 36, 68, 76
לִכְפֹּר 34, 35n.27, 38n.38, 77–82
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה 34–36, 41
לִרְצֹנוֹ 34–36
מֵאֵהֶל מוֹעֵד 6
מִנְחָה 9, 11
מַעֲלָה 83
מַעֲרִכָה 55n.58
נִיחּוּחַ 67–69, 76
נִפְשׁ 14–15
נִרְצָה לוֹ 34–35, 35n.27, 38n.38, 79
נִתְחַוִּי 62
עוֹף 9, 66, 100
עַל 62, 83
עֹלָה 4, 9, 9n.11, 11, 13, 13n.16, 15, 26, 29–30, 32, 35, 36, 37n.33, 38, 40, 41, 44, 47–48, 53, 56, 65, 66, 67, 68, 73, 77, 79, 82, 83, 86, 89, 96, 101, 102
עֹלָה, acceptance of 75–78
עֹלָה-animal 44, 56
– bringing of, 21, 73, 78, 101
– consumption by fire of, 64
– dead, 36
– dedication to death of, 80
– fate of, 40
– living, 36
– purpose of, 40
– rite of passage of, 90
– transfer to the altar of, 53
– transformation of, 90
– transmission of, 53, 90
עֹלָה as cultic act 76
עֹלָה, enactments of, 90
עֹלָה, function of, 18n.20, 30, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 81
עֹלָה-gift 21, 70, 71, 73, 80, 81, 90
עֹלָה, initiation of, 56
עֹלָה, life situation of, 76, 78
עֹלָה, occasions for, 14, 36n.28
עֹלָה, odor of, 75
עֹלָה, prescription of, 48, 81
עֹלָה, priestly concept of, 73
עֹלָה, procedure of, 50, 53, 57–58, 65–66, 90
עֹלָה, processing of, 31, 53
עֹלָה, purpose of, 66, 71, 73, 90
עֹלָה, result of, 78
עֹלָה-ritual 38, 86
עֹלָה-sacrifice 31, 90
עֹלָה, structure of, 21
עֹלָה as subtype of קָרְבָּן, 66, 82–83
עֹלָה-system 4, 26, 28
עֹלָה as thanksgiving 72

- עלה -tradition, reconceptualization of, 82
עלה, type of, 100
עלה, upward movement of, 83–85, 85n.
67, 90
עצים 48
ערך 48, 55n.58, 64
פדר 63
פר 24n.26
פתח אהל מועד 31, 32, 32n.24
צאן 9, 15, 100
קרבו 63
- קרבן 9, 9n.11, 11–12, 12n.15, 13, 29,
37n.33, 40, 48, 66, 82–83, 96, 102
סמך 34n.25, 35, 38n.38, 88
ראש 63
ריח ניחוח 67–77
רצה 34n.26
רצון 34n.26, 35n.27, 38, 38n.38, 41–45
– grantor of, 41, 44
– recipient of, 41
שור 24n.21
שחט 88–89
תמים 23, 31n.22

Author Index

- Bartelmus, R., 32n.24
Begrich, J., 91
Blum, E., 3
Brichto, H. C., 79–81
- Elliger, K., 5n.5, 11n.14, 18n.22, 22, 24,
25, 26, 31n.22, 46n.44, 48n.48, 52–54,
52n.52, 52n.53, 54n.56, 56, 62, 69,
72–74, 78, 81–82, 91, 93n.73, 96
- Fabray, H. J., 36n.29
Farber, W., 111n.79
- Gerleman, G., 34n.26, 41n.42
Gruber, M. L., 14, 15
- Hutton, R. R., 45n.43
- Janowski, B., 6n.9, 34, 36n.29, 38n.37, 42,
68, 70, 73, 78, 92, 92n.71, 94n.74
- Kiuchi, N., 35n.27, 36n.29, 37n.35, 79
Knierim, R., 3, 6n.8
Koch, K., 6n.9, 32, 54n.56, 58–62, 69, 91,
95, 96, 103n.77, 104n.78, 106–111
- Levine, B., 34n.26, 39n.40, 39n.41, 55n.58,
75–76, 77, 84n.65, 84n.66, 94n.75
Levi-Strauss, C., 20
Liedke, G., 94n.75, 96
- Maimonides, M., 75
Milgrom, J., 3, 13n.17, 32, 32n.23, 36n.29,
38n.39, 72, 73
- Noth, M., 24, 26, 51n.51, 52n.52, 55n.59,
57, 74–75, 85–86, 93n.72, 95–96, 99
- Pedersen, J., 37n.34
- von Rad, G., 43–45
Reicke, B., 32
Reiner, E., 111n.79
Rendtorff, R., 5n.5, 6n.9, 11n.14, 12n.15,
13n.17, 14, 18n.20, 22, 24, 26–27, 32,
33–35, 34n.26, 36n.29, 37n.32, 37n.33,
37n.34, 37n.36, 38n.37, 38n.38, 38n.39,
41n.42, 42, 46–47, 46n.44, 48n.46,
48n.47, 48n.49, 48n.50, 51, 52n.52,
53n.55, 54, 54n.56, 55n.57, 55n.59, 56,
56n.60, 57, 58–59, 62, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72,
73–74, 75, 79, 83, 83n.63, 91–93,
92n.71, 95, 96, 98n.76, 101, 103, 104,
110, 111
Rigby, P., 17n.19, 20–22, 80
Rodriguez, A. M., 37n.35
- Schottroff, W., 43
Stolz, F., 36n.29, 69
- Turner, V., 19–20
- Utzschneider, H., 3, 3n.3, 6n.7, 32n.33,
32n.24, 57
- Wenham, G., 5n.5, 26, 27–28, 32–33,
34n.25, 34n.26, 36n.31
Wright, A., 36n.29, 38n.39

Reinhard Gregor Kratz

Kyros im Deuterocesaja-Buch

Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Theologie von Jes 40–55

Die Kyros-Aussagen im Jesajabuch spielen eine entscheidende Rolle bei der Erklärung von Jes 40–55 als einem separaten Textbereich, für den sich die Bezeichnung Deuterocesaja eingebürgert hat. Sie werden fast einhellig zu den zentralen Verkündigungsinhalten von Buch und dahinter vermutetem Propheten gerechnet. An ihnen bricht denn auch die deuterocesajanische Frage in aller Schärfe auf, die die Forschung seit Entdeckung des Buches begleitet hat und heute besonders kontrovers diskutiert wird: Wie erklärt sich die Einheitlichkeit der Schrift, die sich doch aus vielen einzelnen Worteinheiten zusammensetzt? Die hier vorgelegte Analyse der Kyros-Texte und der literarischen Kontexte im Dtjes-Buch macht deutlich, daß es sich dabei weder um eine nur zufällige Sammlung von Einzelworten noch um eine einheitliche, planvoll durchgestaltete Komposition handeln kann, wie vielfach behauptet wird. Vielmehr wird schon in den Kyros-Texten eine literarische Schichtung wahrgenommen, die sich auf verschiedenen Ebenen durch das ganze Buch hindurch verfolgen läßt.

Die Spannung von Einheitlichkeit und Komplexität im Dtjes-Buch findet so in dem Modell der kontextgebundenen Fortschreibungs- und Auslegungsgeschichte eine neuartige Erklärung. Außer der Analyse der Kyros-Texte möchte die Arbeit auf diesem Wege Einsichten in das Werden des ganzen Buches, speziell noch in die Götzen-, die Ebed-Texte und ihre buchinterne Auslegung sowie in den Vorgang der Fortschreibung an sich vermitteln, in dem sich die Entwicklung und Entfaltung der ›deuterocesajanischen‹ Theologie(n) vollzogen hat.

1991. X, 254 Seiten (Forschungen zum Alten Testament 1). Leinen.



J. C. B. (Paul Siebeck) Tübingen

