

JULIA RHYDER

Centralizing the Cult

*Forschungen
zum Alten Testament*

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament

Edited by

Konrad Schmid (Zürich) · Mark S. Smith (Princeton)
Hermann Spieckermann (Göttingen) · Andrew Teeter (Harvard)

134



Julia Rhyder

Centralizing the Cult

The Holiness Legislation in Leviticus 17–26

Mohr Siebeck

Julia Rhyder, born 1987; studied Liberal Arts at the University of Melbourne, and Theology at the University of Divinity, Melbourne, Australia; 2018 Dr. theol. from the University of Lausanne, Switzerland; currently Swiss National Science Foundation senior researcher (Hebrew Bible) at the University of Basel, Switzerland.
orcid.org/0000-0002-3146-0662

ISBN 978-3-16-157685-0 / eISBN 978-3-16-157686-7

DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-157686-7

ISSN 0940-4155 / eISSN 2568-8359 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

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 and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper by Gulde Druck in Tübingen, and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Preface

The present study is a revised version of my PhD dissertation, completed at the Faculty of Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Lausanne under the direction of Christophe Nihan. It was conducted as part of the Swiss National Science Foundation Project no. 153029, and examined in June 2018 by a panel consisting of Thomas Römer (chair), Christian Frevel, Sarianna Metso, Christophe Nihan (director), and James W. Watts.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Nihan for his role as my doctoral supervisor. He provided me with an exceptional training environment at Lausanne, which enabled me to gain knowledge and competencies in a variety of new areas. I have benefited greatly from our many discussions over the years, as well as from Prof. Nihan's comments on various drafts of my dissertation. I wish also to express my particular thanks to Prof. Nihan for his assistance during my relocation from Australia to Switzerland with my husband, Timothy Rhyder, and for all that he did to make us feel welcome in Lausanne.

Special thanks are also due to the members of my doctoral panel, who provided me with many valuable comments on various aspects of my research, as well as suggestions for improving the thesis for publication. I am particularly grateful for their willingness to travel to Lausanne for the public defense of my dissertation, which enabled me to benefit from a dynamic, face-to-face discussion. I also wish to thank Konrad Schmid, Mark S. Smith, Hermann Spieckermann, and David Andrew Teeter for accepting the present study into the series *Forschungen zum Alten Testament*.

Several sections of this study were initially presented as papers at various academic meetings. The discussions of ritual and temporal standardization in chapters 4 and 6 were presented in different forms at the graduate student meeting of the Faculties of Theology of Berlin, Göttingen, and Lausanne held in Lausanne in May 2016, at an international conference organized by the Faculty of Theology in Lausanne that same month, and at the European Association of Biblical Studies (EABS) Annual Meeting held in Helsinki in August 2018. The issue of Judean bias in the priestly traditions, addressed in chapter 4, was presented in a different form at an international conference hosted by the Protestant Institute of Theology at Montpellier in December 2018. The discussion of the high priest's vestments in chapter 4 also builds on research undertaken for a coauthored paper (with Christophe Nihan) presented at the EABS

Annual Meeting held in Leuven in July 2016. Certain elements of chapter 5 were presented at an international conference hosted by the Faculty of Arts at the University of Geneva in May 2014, at a colloquium hosted by the Collège de France in May 2018, and at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Denver in November 2018. My research on the 4QReworked Pentateuch C manuscript, presented in chapter 6, was also delivered in a different version at the EABS graduate student meeting held in Leuven in March 2015. Finally, the discussion of the sabbath in chapter 7 was presented in modified form at the graduate student meeting of the Faculties of Theology of Basel, Göttingen, and Lausanne held in Basel in May 2018. I received many valuable comments at these various conferences and workshops, which were of great benefit to the present study.

This book could not have been completed without the support of colleagues, friends, and family members. I revised the manuscript while working as a post-doctoral researcher in a team led by Sonja Ammann at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Basel. I am grateful to Prof. Ammann for her support, advice, and kindness throughout this process, as well as for the friendship of my colleagues Helge Bezold and Stephen Germany at the University of Basel. I am also grateful to the various members of the Biblical Studies Institute at the University of Lausanne for their support during my doctoral studies, especially to my colleagues Anna Angelini, Aurélie Bischofberger, Hervé Gonzalez, Priscille Marshall, and Katharina Pyschny. I wish also to thank Anna Angelini, Mark Brett, Jordan Davis, and Benedikt Hensel for their feedback on drafts of select chapters of the study, Angela Roskop Erisman for her careful copyedit of the manuscript, and Joan Beaumont, Anita Dirnberger, Timothy Rhyder, and Garry Tongs, who provided valuable assistance with matters of indexing and proof reading. Special mention should be made of Rotem Avneri Meir, who proof read the entire manuscript and also assisted me in navigating the Modern Hebrew of certain secondary sources that were important for this study. Any remaining mistakes in the manuscript are my sole responsibility.

This study involved the particular challenge of relocating from Australia to Switzerland. I am grateful to my family and friends in Australia for their support and encouragement during this process. I wish to particularly mention my parents, Joan Beaumont and Oliver Beaumont, my stepmother, Pamela Bowen, and my sisters, Diana Beaumont and Caroline Beaumont, for their continued love and support. My mother, Joan, deserves a particular word of thanks for the model of academic excellence that she has always demonstrated in her work as a historian, and for her encouragement as I pursued my own academic interests. Finally, I am, above all, thankful to my husband, Tim, whose support during the writing of this book has known no limits. I dedicate this study to him with gratitude and affection.

Table of Contents

Preface	V
List of Tables and Figures	XIII
List of Abbreviations	XV

Chapter 1

Introduction: The Holiness Legislation and Cultic

Centralization..... 1

1.1 Methodology	4
1.2 Key Concepts	6
1.2.1 Centralization	8
1.2.2 Center and Periphery	11
1.2.3 Discourse	15
1.2.4 Social Memory	17
1.3 Outline of the Study	22

Chapter 2

The Holiness Legislation in Context..... 25

2.1 Recent Trends and Debated Issues	25
2.2 Structure, Scope, and Dating of the Holiness Legislation	36
2.2.1 Leviticus 17–26(27) as a Structural Unit	36
2.2.2 H as a Late Priestly Stratum	45
2.2.3 H as a Persian Period Composition	59
2.3 Conclusion	64

*Chapter 3**The History of Cultic Centralization and the Priestly**Traditions* 65

3.1 Centralization in the Persian Period	66
3.1.1 Questioning the Classical Account of Cultic Centralization	67
3.1.2 Central Sanctuaries at Gerizim and Jerusalem	70
Excursus: Imperial Funding of the Jerusalem Temple?	75
3.1.3 Evidence of Cultic Diversity	81
3.1.4 Toward a New Appraisal of Centralization and Persian Period Biblical Traditions.....	87
3.2 Centralization and the Priestly Traditions	90
3.2.1 Classical Approaches to the Priestly Traditions and Centralization	90
3.2.2 Challenges to the Classical Approaches.....	93
3.3 H and Centralization in the History of Research	101
3.3.1 The Laws of Slaughter and Sacrifice in Lev 17	101
3.3.2 The Festal Calendar of Lev 23	104
3.3.3 Other Legislative Themes	108
3.4 Conclusion.....	111

*Chapter 4**Centralizing Discourse in P: Sanctuary, Ritual, and**Priesthood* 112

4.1 Unifying Sanctuary Space	113
4.1.1 Central Shrine and Communal Unity	114
4.1.2 Hierarchies in the Construction of the Central Sanctuary	124
4.1.3 A Nonmonarchic Space.....	129
4.2 Standardized Ritual Practice.....	136
4.2.1 Setting a Ritual Standard in Lev 1–16.....	137
4.2.2 Guarding and Maintaining the Centralized Cult: Reconfiguring Royal Roles	148
4.3 Centralized Priestly Competence.....	152
4.3.1 The Priestly Garments and the Centralized Priesthood	153
4.3.1.1 Monopolizing the Sanctuary	154
4.3.1.2 Manifesting the Deity to the Community.....	157
4.3.1.3 Representing a Unified Israel.....	159
4.3.1.4 Establishing an Aaronide Priesthood	161
4.3.2 Aaron and the Tribe of Judah in Late Priestly Materials.....	163

4.4 The Priestly Discourse of Centralization in Historical Context.....	166
4.4.1 The Central Sanctuary: Place and Cultic Compromise.....	168
4.4.1.1 Accommodating Cultic Diversity in Early Texts?	170
4.4.1.2 Later Strata within the Priestly Traditions: The Issue of Judean Bias.....	174
4.4.1.3 Reimagining Central Sanctuary Space for a Postmonarchic Context	175
4.4.2 Ritual Standardization: Discourse and Practice.....	177
4.4.3 The Priesthood and Cultic Legitimacy	182
4.5 Conclusion.....	188

Chapter 5

The Centralization of Slaughter and Sacrifice in Lev 17.....

5.1 The Structure of Lev 17 and the Importance of Blood Disposal.....	193
5.2 The Centralizing Discourse of Lev 17	203
5.2.1 Leviticus 17:3–7 and the Prohibition of Local Slaughter	203
5.2.1.1 Interpreting the Scope of the Law in vv. 3–4	203
5.2.1.2 Wild Goats and the Rationale in vv. 5–7	205
5.2.2 Leviticus 17:8–9 and the Centralization of Blood Sacrifice	214
5.2.3 The Blood Prohibition and Sanctuary Monopolies.....	218
5.3 Situating Lev 17 among the Pentateuchal Traditions	223
5.3.1 Leviticus 17 and Deut 12	224
5.3.2 Leviticus 17 and P.....	238
5.4 Discourse and Practice	249
5.4.1 The Issue of Practicability.....	250
5.4.2 Leviticus 17 and Its Possible Context	254
5.5 Conclusion.....	258

Chapter 6

Temporal Symmetry: Centralized Time in the Festal

Calendar and Laws for Regular Offerings (Lev 23:1–24:9)

6.1 Centralized Time in the Festal Calendar of Lev 23	263
6.1.1 Structure and Theme	266
6.1.2 Questions of Coherence in the Festal Calendar.....	271
6.1.3 Leviticus 23 and the Standardization of Festal Programs.....	277
6.1.4 Standardization and Centralization in Lev 23	290

6.2 A Shared Calendar in “All Your Settlements”	293
6.2.1 References to the Settlements in Lev 23	294
6.2.2 The Settlements in H-Like Texts outside Lev 23	298
6.3 Shared Time and the Central Sanctuary in Lev 24:1–9	304
6.3.1 Sanctuary Time and Ritual Centralization	304
6.3.2 New Insights from 4QRevised Pentateuch C 23	314
6.4 Strategies of Centralization in the Persian Period: Fixed Festal Dates and the Evidence from Elephantine	320
6.5 Conclusion	328

Chapter 7

Holiness as Hegemony: The Centralizing Logic of Communal Sanctification

7.1 The Distinctive Concept of Holiness in H	333
7.1.1 Comparing Holiness in P and H	335
7.1.2 Holiness, Obedience, and Centralization	340
7.2 Holiness and Soliciting Consent	345
7.2.1 Hierarchies of Holiness	346
7.2.2 The Parenetic Framework of Lev 18–22	350
7.2.2.1 Othering and Standardization	351
7.2.2.2 Collective Loyalty	356
7.2.2.3 Protecting the Central Shrine	359
7.2.3 Sabbath and Sanctification	364
Excursus: Exodus 31:12–17 and 35:1–3	369
7.3 Holiness and Land	371
7.3.1 Slaves on the God’s Temple Estate	371
7.3.2 Economics and Centralization in the Persian Period: Generating Consent	380
7.4 Conclusion	385

Chapter 8

Conclusion: Reframing Cultic Centralization

8.1 Summary	388
8.2 Key Findings and Implications	398
8.2.1 Centralization and the Pentateuchal Traditions	398
8.2.2 Strategies of Centralization in the Persian Period	401
8.2.3 Conceptualizing Centralization	405

Bibliography	409
Index of Ancient Sources.....	451
Index of Modern Authors	471
Index of Subjects	479

List of Tables and Figures

<i>Table 4.1:</i> Divine Promises in Gen 17:7, Exod 6:7, and Exod 29:45–46.....	118
<i>Table 4.2:</i> Comparing Exod 28:12 and 28:29	159
<i>Table 5.1:</i> Correspondences between Lev 17:11 and 17:14.....	201
<i>Table 5.2:</i> Blood Prohibitions in Gen 9:4; Lev 17:11, 14; Deut 12:23	228
<i>Table 5.3:</i> Items to Be Brought to the מקום: Deut 12:6, 11b, 17, 26.....	237
<i>Table 6.1:</i> The Expression יהוה מועדי יהוה in Lev 23	267
<i>Table 6.2:</i> Comparing Lev 2:14–16 and Lev 23:10aβ–b, 13–14a	288
<i>Table 6.3:</i> References to the Settlements in Lev 23.....	295
<i>Table 6.4:</i> Occurrences of the Expression מושבתיכם בכל outside Lev 23	299
<i>Table 6.5:</i> Similar Language in Exod 12:16 and Lev 23:7–8.....	301
 <i>Figure 2.1:</i> Lev 17–22: Communal Holiness.....	40
<i>Figure 2.2:</i> Lev 23–25: Temporal Holiness.....	42
<i>Figure 4.1:</i> The Organization of the Tribes around the Tent of Meeting	127
<i>Figure 4.2:</i> The Genealogy of Phinehas in Exod 6:13–27	165
<i>Figure 5:</i> The Structure of Lev 17	202
<i>Figure 6.1:</i> The Structure of Lev 23	270
<i>Figure 6.2:</i> The Standardized Festal Scheme of Lev 23	284
<i>Figure 7:</i> The יהוה אני + מקדש Formula in Lev 21–22	362

List of Abbreviations

The titles of biblical books and ancient sources are abbreviated according to *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2014). Unless otherwise stated, all translations of the biblical text and secondary sources in this book are my own.

ÄAT	Ägypten und Altes Testament
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York, NY: Doubleday, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ABS	Archaeology and Biblical Studies
AcBib	Academia Biblica
ADPV	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins
AHw	<i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i> . Wolfram von Soden. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1965–1981
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANE	Ancient Near East
AnOr	Analecta Orientalia
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AOS	American Oriental Series
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Edited by James B. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969
AsJT	Asia Journal of Theology
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
BARIS	BAR (British Archaeological Reports) International Series
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie

<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de correspondance hellénique</i>
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentums
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>BibInt</i>	<i>Biblical Interpretation</i>
BibSem	The Biblical Seminar
BJSUCSD	Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BM	British Museum
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BWA(N)T	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten (und Neuen) Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZABR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für altorientalische und bibli- sche Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wis- senschaft
<i>CAD</i>	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago, IL: The Oriental In- stitute of the University of Chicago, 1956–2006
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CAP	Cowley, Arthur E. <i>Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Cen- tury B.C.</i> Oxford: Clarendon, 1923
CAT	Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CC	Covenant Code
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
ConBOT	Coniectanea Biblica: Old Testament Series
<i>COS</i>	<i>The Context of Scripture</i> . Edited by William W. Hallo. 3 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–2002
CSHJ	Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism

CUSAS	Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology
D	Deuteronomic Code
DBAT	Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche
<i>DCH</i>	<i>Dictionary of Classical Hebrew</i> . Edited by David J. A. Clines. 9 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 1993–2014
<i>DDD</i>	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> . Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1995. 2nd rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DMOA	Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
Dtr	Deuteronomistic
EA	El-Amarna tablets. According to the edition of Jørgen A. Knudtzon. <i>Die el-Amarna-Tafeln</i> . Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908–1915. Repr., Aalen: Zeller, 1964. Continued in Anson F. Rainey, <i>El-Amarna Tablets, 359–379</i> . 2nd rev. ed. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1978
<i>EBR</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception</i> . Edited by Hans-Josef Klauck et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009–
ETR	Etudes théologiques et religieuses
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>GELS</i>	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint</i> . Takamitsu Muraoka. Leuven: Peeters, 2009
GMTR	Guides to the Mesopotamian Textual Record
H	Holiness legislation
<i>HALOT</i>	<i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBAI	Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel
HCOT	Historical Commentary on the Old Testament
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament

HR	History of Religions
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>IBC</i>	<i>Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ITC	International Theological Commentary
<i>JA</i>	<i>Journal Asiatique</i>
<i>JAJ</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
<i>JANESCU</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JESHO</i>	<i>Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient</i>
<i>JGRChJ</i>	<i>Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>JHebS</i>	<i>Journal of Hebrew Scriptures</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>KAR</i>	<i>Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts</i> . Edited by Erich Ebeling. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1919–1923
KHAT	Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
<i>KTU</i>	<i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i> . Edited by Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2013. 3rd enl. ed. of <i>KTU: The Cuneiform Alphabetic Texts from Ugarit, Ras Ibn Hani, and Other Places</i> . Edited by Manfred Dietrich, Oswald Loretz, and Joaquín Sanmartín. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 1995

LD	Lectio Divina
LHBOTS	The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MdB	Le Monde de la Bible
MT	Masoretic Text
MTZ	Münchener theologische Zeitschrift
MUSJ	Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NovT	Novum Testamentum
<i>NRTh</i>	<i>La nouvelle revue théologique</i>
NSKAT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar, Altes Testament
<i>Numen</i>	<i>Numen: International Review for the History of Religions</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OCM	Oxford Classical Monographs
Or	Orientalia (NS)
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Old Testament Message
OTR	Old Testament Readings
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OS	Oudtestamentische Studiën
P	Priestly source
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>Qad</i>	<i>Qadmoniot</i>
<i>QC</i>	<i>Qumran Chronicle</i>
QD	Quaestiones Disputatae
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RevScRel</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i> . Edited by Hans Dieter Betz et al. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998–2007
<i>RTC</i>	<i>Recueil des tablettes chaldéennes</i> . François Thureau-Dangin. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1903
<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
<i>SAAB</i>	<i>State Archives of Assyria Bulletin</i>
SAACT	State Archives of Assyria Cuneiform Texts

SBAB	Stuttgarter biblische Aufsatzbände
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<i>Sem</i>	<i>Semitica</i>
SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SR	Studies in Religion
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPohl	Studia Pohl
SWBA	Social World of Biblical Antiquity
<i>TAD</i>	<i>Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: Newly Copied, Edited, and Translated into Hebrew and English.</i> Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni. 4 vols. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986–1999
<i>TDOT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.</i> Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 8 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974–2006
ThT	Theologisch tijdschrift
ThW	Theologische Wissenschaft
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>Transeu</i>	<i>Transeuphratène</i>
TRu	Theologische Rundschau
<i>TS</i>	<i>Texts and Studies</i>
TSAJ	Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UCPNES	University of California Publications, Near Eastern Studies
VF	Verkündigung und Forschung
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
Vulg.	Vulgate
WAW	Writings from the Ancient World
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WC	Westminster Commentaries
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament

<i>WO</i>	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
<i>ZABR</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZBK</i>	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
<i>ZDPV</i>	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Chapter 1

Introduction: The Holiness Legislation and Cultic Centralization

Few issues have attracted more attention in scholarship on the Hebrew Bible than cultic centralization. The topic has generated a wealth of literature from Wilhelm M. L. de Wette's 1805 doctoral thesis, to the seminal 1878 treatise by Julius Wellhausen, until today.¹ Cultic centralization has typically been understood as restriction of the sacrificial cult of the god Yhwh to a very small number of sanctuaries in ancient Israel. By the Hellenistic period at the latest, two main cultic centers are thought to have been operating. For Judeans, the temple in Jerusalem was identified as Yhwh's chosen cultic center. For Samaritans, by contrast, the temple on Mount Gerizim served as the central cultic institution prior to its destruction by John Hyrcanus in the late second century BCE. Scholars do not imagine that these two temples exerted a totalizing cultic monopoly; it is known that a small number of shrines operated in the diaspora, such as the second-century temple at Leontopolis mentioned by Josephus.² However, the majority view is that the number of local Yahwistic shrines radically decreased by the end of the first millennium; by this time, control over the sacrificial cult was largely concentrated in a limited number of temple institutions.

¹ Wilhelm M. L. de Wette, "Dissertatio critica-exegetica qua Deuteronomium a prioribus Pentateuchi libris diversum alius cuiusdam recentioris auctoris opus esse monstratur" (PhD diss., University of Jena, 1805) did not employ the term "centralization." So far as I am aware, the first publication in biblical studies to employ the term "centralization" was J. Orth, "La centralisation du cult du Jéhovah," *NRTh* 4 (1859): 350–60 (see further §3.2.1). Several recent monographs have been devoted to the topic of cultic centralization, or the idea of the "chosen place"; see Eleonore Reuter, *Kultzentralisation. Entstehung und Theologie von Dtn 12*, BBB 87 (Frankfurt am Main: Hain, 1993); Pekka Pitkänen, *Central Sanctuary and Centralization of Worship in Ancient Israel: From the Settlement to the Building of Solomon's Temple* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2003); Melody D. Knowles, *Centrality Practiced: Jerusalem in the Religious Practice of Yehud and the Diaspora in the Persian Period*, ABS 16 (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2006); Rannfrid Irene Thelle, *Approaches to the "Chosen Place": Accessing a Biblical Concept*, LHBOTS 564 (London: T&T Clark, 2012); and Jeffrey G. Audirsch, *The Legislative Themes of Centralization: From Mandate to Demise* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2014).

² *J.W.* 1.33; 7.426–36; *Ant.* 12.388; 13.62–73, 285. See further §3.1.3.

A question of enduring scholarly interest is how these processes of cultic centralization might have taken root in earlier periods. Biblical researchers have long held that the establishment of the centralized cult was strongly connected to the composition of the Pentateuch. Much of past scholarship focused on the origins of the book of Deuteronomy, particularly on the obligation to perform sociocultic duties at a central מקום 'place'. The first version of this book is classically dated to the reign of the Judean king Josiah (ca. 640–609 BCE). According to the account of 2 Kgs 22–23, Josiah found a ספר התורה 'book of the law' in the temple and used this to justify establishing the temple in Jerusalem as the only sanctuary in Judah. In his thesis, de Wette identified this book of the law with a first version of Deuteronomy, which, he suggested, was written to provide the legislative foundations of Josiah's policies of cultic centralization.³ Today, many scholars would question whether we can draw such a direct link between Deuteronomy and the book of the law mentioned in 2 Kgs 22–23 (see §3.1.1). The date of the core Deuteronomic Code (Deut 12–26 + 28 [D]) is also a matter of debate, although most scholars would still support a Neo-Assyrian core of the legislation.⁴ However, despite these qualifications, almost all scholars would agree that the composition of Deuteronomy was a watershed in the transition to a centralized cult, insofar as it provided the conceptual underpinning for restricting key sociocultic practices to a central place in ancient Israel.

In this study, I do not deny the importance of Deuteronomy in the history of centralization. However, I query why the strong focus on Deuteronomy in previous research has not been matched by an appropriate interest in how *other* pentateuchal traditions might also have advanced the case for a centralized cult. Most notably, the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch have so far received remarkably few detailed treatments from the perspective of cultic centralization. The prevailing assumption since Wellhausen has been that the priestly traditions inherit Deuteronomy's concept of centralization rather than articulate their own case for how the Israelite cult and community should be unified and centralized (see §3.2.1). They therefore are assumed to have little to contribute to the study of cultic centralization, because they simply tease out the consequences of Deuteronomy's mandate of centralization for the organization of the cult and its associated priestly hierarchies. This view has occasionally faced

³ de Wette, "Dissertatio," 164–65 n. 5.

⁴ On the debates concerning the date of D, see the histories of scholarship offered by Peter Altmann, *Festive Meals in Ancient Israel: Deuteronomy's Identity Politics in Their Ancient Near Eastern Context*, BZAW 424 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 8–36 and Eckart Otto, *Deuteronomium 1–11*, HThKAT (Freiburg: Herder, 2012), 62–230, esp. 146–230. They both confirm the ongoing support that a Neo-Assyrian date of a core version of D continues to enjoy among the majority of researchers. For a noteworthy challenge to this view, in favor of a later date for D, see esp. Juhla Pakkala, "The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy," *ZAW* 121 (2009): 388–401.

critique but has so far not been the subject of a dedicated study (see §3.2.2). To rectify this imbalance in the history of research, this book offers a detailed analysis of cultic centralization in one of the key priestly traditions; namely, the Holiness legislation of Lev 17–26 (H).⁵

The Holiness legislation is an excellent entry point for research on centralization and the priestly traditions. As will be discussed in greater detail below, the study of H has been invigorated by the recognition that Lev 17–26 were not transmitted as a discrete legal code but are part of a compositional stratum that supplemented the Priestly narrative of origins (see §2.1). In addition, there is a growing recognition that the scribes who produced H coordinated diverse traditions, including not only the earlier Priestly materials but also D, the Covenant Code of Exod 21–23 (CC), and various prophetic materials when crafting their legal rulings (see §2.2.2). H therefore has a heightened potential to illuminate the ways in which earlier literary materials, especially Deuteronomy, might have been considered determinative in shaping how cult centralization was conceived in the priestly traditions.

The focus on H also has the potential to advance our understanding of the importance of the Persian period (ca. 538–333 BCE) in the emergence of a centralized cult in Yehud and Samaria. While the traditional focus of scholars of centralization has been on the monarchic era, especially in relation to the reign of Josiah in the seventh century BCE, various studies in recent decades have begun to explore processes of cult centralization during the Persian period (see §3.1.4). Yet, despite this growing scholarly interest, studies of centralization in the Persian period have rarely considered the role that the writing of *ritual legislation*, such as that found in H, might have played in negotiating these processes. The date of H has been a matter of debate, but I maintain, with the majority of scholars, that there are strong grounds to situate the composition of Lev 17–26 sometime during the early to mid-Persian period (see §2.2.3). These chapters therefore provide a rich source for exploring the ways in which the promotion of normative ritual practice and its associated priestly hierarchies might have assisted in the concentration of sociocultic power and authority during the Persian period.

By adopting this focus, this study offers a more critical conceptualization of the very idea of centralization for the study of the Pentateuch and for the history of ancient Israel. Surprisingly, given the widespread recognition that centralization is an important legislative theme in biblical studies, few attempts have been made to articulate a conceptual framework for understanding the

⁵ The term *Heiligkeitgesetz* was coined by August Klostermann, “Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz,” in *Der Pentateuch. Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1893). It reflects the particular interest in holiness which characterizes the laws of Lev 17–26, and especially their focus on the sanctification of the Israelite community; see Lev 19:2; 20:7, 26.

dynamics of this concept. This omission can be attributed at least in part to the tendency of scholars to adopt a fairly wooden understanding of centralization in Deuteronomy – as the concentration of sociocultic practices and resources to a chosen *מקום* – as the core definition of the centralized cult in ancient Israel. However, while the issue of *where* the Israelites worshipped is of undeniable importance, it is too limiting to understand centralization exclusively in terms of the choice of a central place. If we are open to reconceptualizing the term “centralization,” it becomes clear that other factors assisted in normalizing the concentration of resources and power that is inherent in centralization. This study employs the insights of contemporary social theorists about “center” and “centralization” in order to argue that cultic centralization in ancient Israel should not be understood narrowly as a process of limiting certain behaviors to a particular locale. On the contrary, centralization can be reconceptualized as a dynamic and multifaceted network of processes that includes activities such as standardizing ritual practice, restricting cultic authority to a monopolistic priesthood, funneling economic resources to a central sanctuary institution, and reconceptualizing central authority in the wake of the ideological crisis that followed the downfall of the Judean monarchy.

1.1 Methodology

This study employs a range of approaches in its analysis of H and its discourse of centralization. The methodology consists primarily of a detailed analysis of relevant texts of Lev 17–26 using the classical methods of historical-critical exegesis. In addition to philological analysis, particular emphasis is placed on textual criticism; the study thus reviews select evidence of the Reworked Pentateuch manuscripts found at Qumran, especially the lengthy addition to Lev 23:1–24:9 in 4QRP C frg. 23 (4Q365 23). The attention paid to textual criticism stems from the conviction that the transmission of Lev 17–26, as well as that of the texts on which their authors relied, provides valuable insights into how H’s discourse of centralization was understood in antiquity, and how it was developed to serve new discursive aims. When relevant, evidence of the reception of H’s centralizing discourse in Second Temple traditions such as the Temple Scroll will be considered.

The study will also include a literary-critical investigation of the place of Lev 17–26 within priestly tradition. In particular, it will offer a detailed discussion of the likely scope of P at the time H was composed, an issue of particular importance for determining the extent to which H builds on a discourse of centralization already established by P and the extent to which it moves beyond these earlier materials in articulating a new centralizing logic. The analysis of H will also employ source and redaction criticism in order to justify treating the ideas about centralization found in Lev 17–26 as part of an

intentional compositional strategy rather than the haphazard result of multiple literary stages. The issue of texts outside Lev 17–26 that share strong phraseological and thematic correspondences with these chapters – what I refer to as “H-like” materials – will also be addressed when such texts are relevant.

Furthermore, this study will explore H’s reliance on other pentateuchal traditions by means of innerscriptural exegesis. This method, although conceived in different ways by different scholars, will here be treated as the identification of lexical, syntactic, and sequential correspondences between two or more texts, correspondences that might be interpreted as evidence of the reception of one text by the other.⁶ This study will apply rigorous standards when assessing what might constitute a suitably strong correspondence as to warrant postulating that H is dependent on an earlier tradition. These standards will be discussed in particular detail when assessing the degree to which H’s discourse of centralization borrows from D or draws primarily on the earlier P materials.

I also position the analysis of Lev 17–26 within a comparative approach in which H’s discourse of centralization is understood against a broader background of relevant ANE textual sources. This will be particularly relevant when assessing the significance of the absence of a royal figure from P and H, as well as their depictions of the centralized cult; the emphasis in Lev 23 on a fixed calendar for the entire community; and the image in Lev 25 of the land as Yhwh’s estate and the Israelites as his slaves. In addition, the centralizing discourse of Lev 17–26 will be considered in light of historical evidence pertaining to the social, political, economic, and cultic situation of Yehud and Samaria in the Persian period, as well as the Judean diaspora at Elephantine and other locales. For this purpose, I also draw on archaeological, epigraphic, and textual documentation when relevant for illuminating H’s discursive strategies and how these might be situated historically.

Finally, as already mentioned, my reading of H’s discourse will draw on a range of social science methodologies that can assist us in the task of conceptualizing centralization. Social theories are employed as a supplement to the close reading of Lev 17–26 which is the focus of this book; they are introduced only when their different conceptual lenses enhance our understanding of the issues raised by the text itself. Discourses about centralization are widely recognized to be inherently about power dynamics and the attachment of significance and meaning to sociocultural practices in order to affirm a particular sociopolitical order (see below §1.2.1). The H materials thus share many fundamental similarities to more recent textual and oral traditions in which centralizing values and behaviors are promoted. Hence, it is appropriate to be sensitive to the arguments of many social theorists that discourse in social

⁶ See Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

domains, including ancient ones, is never value-free, and to integrate such theories of power relations into the study of centralization and H.

These various methodologies and theoretical insights, then, will be combined to provide a multimodal approach to the analysis of the Holiness legislation and its discourse of centralization. The term “multimodal” refers to the decision taken in this study to avoid employing any one of the methodologies described above in isolation, or to confine a particular approach to a specific chapter in the analysis of Lev 17–26 and their literary and historical context. It is only in combination that these methodologies and theories work most effectively to help untangle the complex issues of interpretation inherent in the issue of centralization.

1.2 Key Concepts

Any study of centralization and the pentateuchal traditions immediately encounters the question of definition. This relates, in the first instance, to the scribal and authorial categories that scholars routinely employ. The terms “priestly,” “P,” and “H” are constructs of modern scholarship, and the composition of each raises interpretative issues concerning profile, scope, date, sequence, and intersection with other traditions. These issues will be explored in detail in chapter 2, but some initial words of clarification are in order.

In the analysis that follows, I employ the adjective “priestly” when referring to the texts in Genesis–Numbers that were first identified by Theodor Nöldeke and are still affirmed (with adjustments) by the majority of scholars today as sharing a distinctive stylistic, narrative, and thematic profile that distinguishes them from other materials in these books.⁷ These shared characteristics and concerns suggest that the priestly texts stemmed from closely related traditions that might have originated within a common institutional setting; namely, the priesthood in Jerusalem (see §4.4, §5.4.2, §6.4, §7.3.2). I do not consider all

⁷ Theodor Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel: Schwerts'sche Buchhandlung, 1869), 7–93. Nöldeke's list of priestly texts in Genesis–Numbers includes Gen 1:1–2:4; 5:1–29a, 30–32; 6:9–22; 7:6–7, 11, 13–16a, 18–21, 24; 8:1–2a, 3b–5*, 13a, 14–19; 9:1–17, 28–29; 10:1–7*, 20, 22–23*, 31–32; 11:10–27, 31–32; 12:4b–5; 13:6, 11b–12*; 16:1a, 3, 15–16; 17:1–27; 19:29; 21:1b–5; 23:1–20; 25:7–11a, 12–17, 19–20, 26b; 26:34–35; 27:46; 28:1–9; 31:18*; 33:18; 35:6a, 9–13, 15, 22b–29; 36:1–14; 37:1–2; 41:46a; 46:6–7; 47:27b–28; 48:3–6; 49:1a, 28b–33; 50:12–13; Exod 1:1–5, 7, 13–14; 2:23–25; 6:2–15 (16–27), 29–30; 7:1–13, 19–20a*, 22; 8:1–3, 11–15; 9:8–12; 11:9–10; 12:1–23 (24–27), 28, 37a, 40–51; 13:1–2, 20; 14:1–4, 8–9, 10*, 15–18, 21*, 22–23, 26, 27*, 28–29; 15:27; 16; 17:1; 19:2a; 24:15–18b; 25–31; 35–40; Lev 1–27; Num 1:1–10:28; 13:1–17a, 21, 25, 32*; 14:1–10, 26–38; 15; 16:3–11, 16–24, 35; 17–19; 20:6–11, 22–29; 21:10–11; 22:1; 25–27 (28–29); 30–31; 32:2–6*, 16–32; 33:1–49; 34–36. In present research, the issue of priestly materials in Deuteronomy is controversial. See §2.2.2.

the priestly traditions to form part of a single source, redaction, or layer. However, I do subscribe to the majority view that a core set of priestly materials originally circulated as a discrete document, which was only later combined with the non-priestly traditions (see §2.2.2). When I refer specifically to the Priestly document or source, I will employ the uppercase term “Priestly.” The earliest core of this document will be referred to as “Pg” (short for *Priestergrundschrift*). I will generally refrain from entering into the complex debates about the scope of Pg and the thorny issue of how to locate its original ending.⁸ The focus of this study is on the priestly texts that can be said with some confidence to have existed at the time Lev 17–26 were written rather than what might have been the shape of the Priestly narrative at the time of its inception.

Use of the term “P” is limited in this study to the Priestly source materials in the books of Genesis, Exodus, and Leviticus that are presupposed in Lev 17–26 (see §2.2.2). Other scholars have defined P in different ways and may question my comparatively limited focus on Numbers. However, I argue that the vast majority of the priestly texts in Numbers can be reasonably assumed to postdate the composition of Lev 17–26 and are therefore unlikely to have informed the legislation within these chapters (see §2.2.2). Selected priestly traditions in Numbers (e.g., Num 1–10; 28–29) are of interest in this study primarily for the evidence they provide as to how the priestly logic of centralization developed in later materials. The same pertains to other texts, such as Exod 6:13–27 and Lev 10, that likely postdated the composition of Lev 17–26.

I use the term “H” (the common shorthand for “Holiness legislation”) only when referring to Lev 17–26. When discussing texts outside these chapters that share with them strong linguistic, stylistic, and thematic parallels, I adopt the term “H-like.” This term leaves open the possibility that, although these texts evince a strong dependence on Lev 17–26, they might not have stemmed from precisely the same compositional stage as the core H materials (see §2.2.2). Although Lev 17–26 do contain late additions and supplements, as well as traces of earlier source materials, they are characterized by a high degree of structural integrity, thematic coherence, and linguistic distinctiveness that justifies treating them as a discrete subsection of legislative materials, with the descriptor H (see §2.2.1).

Beyond these matters of terminology, a second problem besets the study of centralization; namely, what is meant by the term “centralization” and how might it be applied to the study of ancient texts such as the pentateuchal traditions. In the case of Deuteronomy, the concept of the chosen *מקום* is an important anchor for the study of its centralizing discourse. However, for the priestly traditions – including Lev 17–26, the subject of this study – there is no comparable term or expression that so distinctly frames its centralizing discourse. This absence adds a further layer of complexity to the consideration of

⁸ On these debates, see §2.2.2.

which legislative themes within these materials might shed light on their discourse of centralization.

Social theories developed by scholars in other disciplines are thus particularly valuable in framing this study of centralization and H. Such theory should not be employed in a procrustean fashion to impose externally generated conclusions upon the text. The text must determine the utility of theoretical insights, rather than the reverse. However, used with appropriate care, social theories can provide a necessary and illuminating conceptual framework for a more nuanced and multidimensional understanding of centralization, and especially the critical relationship between textual discourses and historical processes of centralization. I therefore turn now to a description of how social theories shape my understanding of the key terms and concepts that will inform the analysis that follows; namely, centralization, center and periphery, discourse, and social memory.

1.2.1 Centralization

“Centralization” can be defined as simply the process of bringing activities together but, as social theorists have argued, these processes are rarely without some political and ideological underpinning. Centralization is therefore better understood as the structuring of power relations and social processes so that authority, decision making, and material resources are concentrated rather than dispersed.⁹ Inherent in the process of centralization is the “progressive subordination” to central loci of power.¹⁰ Such subordination, of course, is rarely, if ever, absolute. The manner and extent to which power is concentrated or dispersed within a given group or society is always a matter of contestation and fluctuation; even if a center attains control over certain procedures or resources, control does not always entail monopolistic action. Centralization involves “a variety of mechanisms of control.”¹¹ Some of these may even

⁹ Royston Greenwood and C. R. (Bob) Hinings, “Centralization Revisited,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21, no. 1 (1976): 151; Joseph Rogers Hollingsworth and Robert Han-neman, *Centralization and Power in Social Service Delivery Systems: The Cases of England, Wales, and the United States*, International Series in Social Welfare 3 (Boston, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff, 1984), 8; and Vivien Ann Schmidt, *Democratizing France: The Political and Administrative History of Decentralization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 12.

¹⁰ Humberto González Chávez, “The Centralization of Education in Mexico: Subordination and Autonomy,” in *State and Society: The Emergence and Development of Social Hierarchy and Political Centralization*, ed. John Gledhill, Barbara Bender, and Mogens Trolle Larsen; trans. Victoria Forbes Adam; *One World Archaeology* 4 (London: Routledge, 2005), 316.

¹¹ Karen Barkey, *Bandits and Bureaucrats: The Ottoman Route to State Centralization*, The Wilder House Series in Politics, History, and Culture (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994), 231.

concede a degree of autonomy to peripheral groups in order to ensure long-term compliance with central authority. Overlapping processes of centralization and decentralization can simultaneously cohabit within different sectors of society.¹²

Archaeologists and historians have taken particular interest in the connection between centralization and processes of state formation, including in ancient Israel.¹³ The emergence of the state is widely understood as characterized by the organization of populations into consolidated territories and the integration of military, economic, and bureaucratic powers into a central government. Such processes typically produce or consolidate new centralized institutions and, with them, new elites who control these institutions and the procedures of governance. However, processes of state formation are far from linear or monolithic; many states remain tolerant of regional diversity and discretion or may place little emphasis on the need for central powers to exert control over the whole population. Nevertheless, the political and economic benefits that centralization can bestow through processes such as taxation or military service

¹² Alberto Diaz-Cayeros, *Federalism, Fiscal Authority, and Centralization in Latin America* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 10 n. 9.

¹³ The literature on centralization and state formation is vast; see, with further studies, Max Weber, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, trans. Ephraim Fischhoff et al. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978); David Nugent, "Building the State, Making the Nation: The Bases and Limits of State Centralization in 'Modern' Peru," *American Anthropologist* 96, no. 2 (1994): 333–69; Marcella Frangipane, "The Development of Administration from Collective to Centralized Economies in the Mesopotamian World," in *Cultural Evolution: Contemporary Viewpoints*, ed. Gary M. Feinman and Linda Manzanilla (New York, NY: Kluwer Academic, 2000), 215–32; Frangipane, "Centralization Processes in Greater Mesopotamia: Uruk 'Expansion' as the Climax of Systemic Interactions among Areas of the Greater Mesopotamian Region," in *Uruk Mesopotamia and Its Neighbors: Cross-Cultural Interactions in the Era of State Formation*, Advanced Seminar (Oxford: School of American Research, 2001), 307–48; John Gledhill, Barbara Bender, and Mogens Trolle Larsen, eds., *State and Society: The Emergence and Development of Social Hierarchy and Political Centralization*; *One World Archaeology* 4 (London: Routledge, 2005); Michael Mann, *A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*, vol. 1 of *The Sources of Social Power*, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012); and Scott F. Abramson, "The Economic Origins of the Territorial State," *International Organization* 71, no. 1 (2017): 97–130. On state formation in ancient Israel, see, among others, Frank S. Frick, *The Formation of the State in Ancient Israel: A Survey of Models and Theories*, SWBA 4 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1985); John S. Holladay, "The Kingdoms of Israel and Judah: Political and Economic Centralization in the Iron IIA–B (ca. 1000–750 BCE)," in *The Archaeology of Society in the Holy Land*, ed. Thomas Evan Levy (London: Leicester University Press, 1998), 368–98; Daniel M. Master, "State Formation Theory and the Kingdom of Ancient Israel," *JNES* 60, no. 2 (2001): 117–31; and Israel Finkelstein and Neil Asher Silberman, "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology," *JSOT* 30, no. 3 (2006): 259–85.

mean that it is a strategy employed by a great variety of states to consolidate power and resources.

The interest of other social scientists in centralization, meanwhile, has commonly been at the substate level. This interest ranges from the study of systems that are small – such as the family, the business, or communities – to larger organizational structures, including the welfare state. The focus of these studies, which need not be rehearsed in detail here, has reflected the disciplinary interests of scholars; economists, for example, are concerned with the causes and impact of the centralization of economic resources, political scientists with the political concentration of power, and sociologists with the inequalities associated with particular forms of centralization. All, however, recognize that centralization as a process is rarely, if ever, value-free or dissociated from power structures.

One of the strategies employed in centralization, one that we will encounter often in this study focused on the centralization of cultic practice, is standardization. Like “centralization,” “standardization” can be defined with a limited technical meaning, as the process of implementing and developing technical standards that maximize compatibility, interoperability, safety, repeatability, or quality. But standardization also has associations with societal control and power dynamics. Standardization is by nature inimical to diversity – that is, it reduces individual discretion in favor of conformity. Hence, as the Flemish sociologist Mark Elchardus puts it, processes of standardization “are always closely related to issues of inequality and power,” because they aim to produce “a standard by which people can be compared, discriminated, classified in a hierarchical way.”¹⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, using elements of Marxist sociology, also notes the extent to which issues of diversity and standardization are intertwined with issues of power, inequality, and class.¹⁵ He focuses on the centralizing effect of standardization when used to define official forms of knowledge or customs – in the specific case of his research, the establishment of a “standard” French language (see further §4.4.2). By setting sociocultural standards that align with particular sets of expertise, cultural elites reinforce their privileged position within society, while marginalizing those who operate according to different norms or customs.

Standardization, then, is much more than a technical process. As later chapters in this study will show, it can also be a device for developing norms and scripts which regulate behavior within a community for which the standardized

¹⁴ Mark Elchardus, “Diversity and Standardization: Concepts, Issues, and Approaches,” in *Diversity, Standardization, and Social Transformation: Gender, Ethnicity, and Inequality in Europe*, ed. Max Koch, Lesley McMillan, and Bram Peper (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2011), 19.

¹⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, trans. Gino Raymon and Matthew Adamson (Oxford: Polity, 1991).

phenomena become “not only predictable, but also understandable.”¹⁶ Recognizing the importance of standardization for the normalization of centralized systems proves especially relevant to the study of cultic centralization and the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch. The priestly discourse, as we shall see, manifestly standardizes ritual practice as a strategy of focusing communal attention on a central authority. In effect, P, and later H, elevates its preferred set of prescribed practices and processes to a position of discursive superiority in the hope of securing the Israelites’ compliance with and acceptance of a centralized standard for how the Yahwistic cult must operate. In this way, collective deference to the central authorities who control that standard and rejection of the local differentiation that is inherent to decentralization, is promoted and normalized. In the case of H, this form of standardization moves beyond ritual practices to the manner in which the Israelites conceive their daily lives in all manner of social, agricultural, and economic settings, and therefore calls on the community to conceptualize its obligations both within and outside the central shrine in an essentially centralized way.

1.2.2 Center and Periphery

The term “centralization,” of course, assumes the existence of a “center,” a concept that itself raises important issues of definition. So, too, does its opposite, “periphery.” Relations between center and periphery have been the subject of growing interest in the study of the Hebrew Bible, as signaled by the recent volume edited by Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period*.¹⁷ Studies like this one have explored how scholars might move beyond physical interpretations of center and periphery – interpretations that have commonly infused traditional discussions of centrality and place in biblical texts – to view them as elements within a social system in which power is distributed unequally. From such a perspective, a center becomes a focal point that receives more attention, deference, or resources than other elements in a given society, while a periphery receives significantly less attention, deference, or resources. It is important to note that periphery, as the Latinist Alessandro Barchiesi points out, is not the same as a boundary, which marks the beginning of what is considered to be outside the norms of a given group, or what is considered to lie beyond a group’s territory.¹⁸ Rather, the

¹⁶ Elchardus, “Diversity,” 14.

¹⁷ Ehud Ben Zvi and Christoph Levin, eds., *Centres and Peripheries in the Early Second Temple Period*, FAT 1/108 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016).

¹⁸ Alessandro Barchiesi, “Centre and Periphery,” in *A Companion to Latin Literature*, ed. Stephen Harrison (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 395.

periphery remains an integral part of the social collective.¹⁹ Even while it occupies a position that has reduced authority or fewer resources than those enjoyed by the center, the periphery is by no means devoid of power or agency.²⁰ Moreover, while peripheral social agents may not always be able to deny the legitimacy of central institutions or resist the concentration of resources and authorities in the latter's hands, they can generate a climate of social unrest that may lead the structures of central power to be reorganized or replaced. "Center" and "periphery" are therefore relative categories and are in a constant state of flux and contestation.

How the center and the periphery are each ascribed its status varies from context to context, but notions of center and periphery very often come to be associated with space and place. The spatial dimension of center and periphery is the focus of certain strands of sociology, and, of course, of geography, a discipline for which place remains a foundational concept.²¹ German geographer Walter Christaller developed "central place theory," which seeks to explain the distribution – number, size, and location – of human settlements in a residential system and views "central places" as providing services to surrounding areas.²²

However, this functional geographical understanding of place is too limiting for the purposes of this study. Rather, we need, with French sociologist Henri Lefebvre, to consider center and periphery as particular types of spaces, and thus as inherently "political and ideological" – that is, as means of organizing the way social actors experience the world, and as devices by which particular individuals, groups, processes, and activities come to be seen to be more important than others.²³ In the words of human geographer Tim Cresswell, space is implicated in the creation and maintenance of the ideologies that sustain centers because it "is both a socially constructed arrangement of things and the

¹⁹ Liah Greenfeld and Michel L. Martin, "The Idea of the 'Center': An Introduction," in *Center: Ideas and Institutions*, ed. Liah Greenfeld and Michel L. Martin (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988), viii–xxii.

²⁰ David Martin, "The Religious Politics of Two Rival Peripheries: Preliminary Excursus on Center and Periphery," in *Center: Ideas and Institutions*, ed. Liah Greenfeld and Michel L. Martin (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988), 29–42 and Joel S. Migdal, *State in Society: Studying How States and Societies Transform and Constitute One Another* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 45.

²¹ On sociology, see, e.g., Robert E. Park, Ernest W. Burgess, and Roderick D. McKenzie, eds., *The City, Heritage of Sociology* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968).

²² Walter Christaller, *Central Places in Southern Germany*, trans. Carlisle W. Baskin (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966); see further Keith S. O. Beavon, *Central Place Theory: A Reinterpretation* (London: Longman, 1977) and James H. Bird, *Centrality and Cities* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977).

²³ Henri Lefebvre, "Reflections on the Politics of Space," in *Radical Geography: Alternative Viewpoints on Contemporary Social Issues*, ed. Richard Peet, trans. Michael J. Enders (Chicago, IL: Maaroufa Press, 1977), 341.

medium of all these historical arrangements.”²⁴ The control of space and the way in which individuals access, use, conceptualize, and imagine the spaces that surround them therefore has a major impact on the way in which the social order is itself conceived, as well as the position of individual actors within that social order.²⁵

Space also assists in the maintenance of ideologies that sustain the unequal distribution of power and resources, as well as in the practice of deferring to collective centers. Apart from differentiating the elements that make up a society, it makes those differences appear neutral and objective. This is what Lefebvre termed “the realistic illusion” of space.²⁶ By appearing externally determined, spaces naturalize the social relations that they in fact engender and embody, allowing certain interpretations of what is central to the world to be perceived as inherently privileged.²⁷ As Cresswell explains, spaces “appear to have their own rules, not the rules constructed for them.”²⁸ Sacred space is a particularly striking example of this phenomenon, because the sanctity of a given space can appear to have been decreed and sanctioned not just by political or social elites but also by external, transcendent forces. Masked as standing somehow beyond human activity, sacred space appears as an absolute category, full of ultimate significance.²⁹ Consequently, those who enjoy privileged access to these spaces, or whose participation in the space is claimed to be necessary to its sacred status, themselves come to function as a kind of “exemplary center.”³⁰ The privileged position, for example, of priests is itself perceived as essential to the order of the world despite its inherently constructed character.

Closely related to this understanding of space is the role that ritual process plays in the formation of centers and peripheries. While there are many ways

²⁴ Tim Cresswell, *In Place – Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 152.

²⁵ David Chidester and Edward Tabor Linenthal, introduction to *American Sacred Space*, ed. David Chidester and Edward Tabor Linenthal, Religion in North America (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995), 10.

²⁶ Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991), 29.

²⁷ See Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*, ed. Colin Gordon; trans. Colin Gordon, et al. (New York, NY: Pantheon, 1980), 149.

²⁸ Cresswell, *In Place*, 159.

²⁹ As argued by Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, NY: Harper Torchbook, 1961); Eliade, *Images and Symbols: Studies in Religious Symbolism*, trans. Philip Mairet (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991); and Gerardus van der Leeuw, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, trans. Ninian Smart and John Evan Turner (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986).

³⁰ Clifford Geertz, *Islam Observed: Religious Development in Morocco and Indonesia* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1971), 36; see further Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1973), 220–29.

to define the term “ritual,” it is arguably most helpful to view it primarily as a particular type of spatial practice. “Ritualization,” as Catherine Bell terms it, creates a space in which the distinctions and hierarchies by which certain roles, personnel, and the ideas that inform them might be set apart as central and others as peripheral.³¹ It does this by creating contrasts, which allow ritual participants to internalize the hierarchies that are intrinsic to the authorized construction of center/periphery. Because ritual participation enables reality to be conceptually organized in a manner that privileges those elements that are most dominant in the ritual, the ritual actor comes to perform in his or her body the oppositions and hierarchies that enable certain spaces, groups, activities, and ideas to be deemed deserving of attention and deference. Ritual performance is thus described by the historian of religions Jonathan Z. Smith as a “focusing lens,” which directs attention to and marks particular acts, objects, gestures, and personnel as being of central significance.³²

Centers and peripheries, in the sense just described, are therefore testament to the broader power dynamics by which social groups are constituted and negotiated. Notions of what is central and peripheral within a given society and their mappings in spatial practice play a key role in legitimating societal and political propositions about how benefits should be distributed, and about the value of those institutions of authority which will then occupy the dominant position.³³ As we shall see in the analysis of H, and the earlier P materials on which it depends, such interpretations of center and periphery facilitate a more multifaceted and intellectually compelling understanding of how such materials direct ancient readers to sociocultic centers in ancient Israel. The detailed description of the sanctuary space in the priestly traditions should be read not merely in terms of what it might reveal about the number of cultic sites deemed permissible in the ancient Israelite cult, but also in terms of how the priestly scribes use the description of space to solicit support for the cultic elites who claim an exclusive right to officiate within Yhwh’s sacred sanctuary, as well as for the ritual practices they consider legitimate within the Yahwistic cult. Moreover, the detailed ritual prescriptions in the priestly materials, even when not directly addressing the issue of where the Israelites must worship, are integral to constructing notions of what is central and peripheral to the Israelite cult and community, and to normalizing the hierarchies that are essential to negotiating centralization.

³¹ Catherine Bell, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), xv.

³² Jonathan Z. Smith, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 54.

³³ Edward Shils, *The Constitution of Society* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 95.

1.2.3 Discourse

At the core of my analysis of centers, peripheries, and centralization is the text of Lev 17–26 itself. Although I will consider the historical implications of this text for ancient Israel as far as this can be ascertained from the limited sources, this study is fundamentally a critical analysis of discourse, that is, of the manner in which the H materials create a case for a centralized cult that arises from their own inherent logic, and of what we can conclude from these materials about the ideological motivations of the scribes who compiled them, their idealized vision of the cult and community, and the power structures and collective behaviors they sought to promote.

At one level, the study of discourse attempts to explain how language and thought are given structure, in terms of internal organization, argumentation, and language choice.³⁴ Again, however, the present study of H's discourse requires a definition that goes beyond this. Discourse concerns not only the rules for structuring thoughts or statements, but also the social production and circulation of knowledge. To cite the linguist Norman Fairclough, we need to see discursive practices within "wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices...arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power."³⁵ Or, in the words of discourse theorist Reiner Keller, we need "to 'liberate' discourse analysis from the specific linguistic issues" to examine discourse within the "social relations and politics of knowledge" that construct and define social reality.³⁶

This interpretation of discourse as a form of power is closely associated with the work of the influential French philosopher and social theorist Michel Foucault.³⁷ To Foucault, discourse is a way of mediating meanings and dictating practices in order to define the reality of the social world, as well as the people, ideas, and objects that inhabit it. Discourse typically emerges from institutions that seek, by defining what can be reasonably thought and said about the world, to determine which thoughts and actions are truthful or right for society, and which are threatening or deviant. As Foucault understands it, discourse is a

³⁴ Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London: Longman, 1995); Teun A. van Dijk, ed., *Discourse as Structure and Process, Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, 2 vols. (London: Sage, 1997); and Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak, *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003).

³⁵ Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, 132.

³⁶ Reiner Keller, "The Sociology of Knowledge Approach to Discourse (SKAD)," *Human Studies* 34, no. 1 (2011): 46 and 43, respectively.

³⁷ On the significance of Foucault's work for subsequent studies of discourse, see Reiner Keller, "Analysing Discourse: An Approach from the Sociology of Knowledge," *Forum: Qualitative Sozialforschung* 6, no. 3 (2005), doi:10.17169/fqs-6.3.19.

practice of “normalizing judgment.”³⁸ It provides the mechanisms through which certain groups and individuals are imagined as having a right to greater authority, resources, or privilege, and others as requiring discipline and punishment. In this way, discourse becomes essential to the circulation of power; rather than asserting power in a vertical, or top-down, manner, discourse ensures that social agents will continue to reproduce the power dynamics that maintain the social system, because such dynamics are accepted as right and proper.³⁹

Foucault’s analysis of discourse resonates with aspects of the notion of “hegemony” as developed by the Italian communist intellectual Antonio Gramsci. Gramsci argues that there is a foundational distinction between force and consent as mechanisms of social power and insists that coercion is not enough to ensure a viable form of society. Instead, the social system must be consolidated around ideas, values, and beliefs that normalize power relations in order to solicit “consent.”⁴⁰ This consent is what Gramsci calls “hegemony”; namely, the willingness of social actors to conform to the norms of a social system in which power is distributed unequally. This consenting behavior is secured, in Gramsci’s view, when social agents subscribe to certain core elements of the social system and thereby consider the demand for conformity to be “more or less justified and proper.”⁴¹ Hegemony thus manifests itself as “common sense”; it is the set of foundational assumptions that guides our expectations of the world, and that produces the kind of “moral and political passivity” that ensures collective participation in social systems which distribute resources in unequal ways.⁴² Hegemony thus ensures that social actors view their place within the social hierarchy, along with all its associated rites and responsibilities, as natural and appropriate. At the same time, hegemony normalizes the collective attention and deference that central institutions receive, and thus their right to control the distribution of resources.

For the purposes of this study, it is particularly important to note that, for both Gramsci and Foucault, a key role in constructing and defining the world, and thereby producing and sustaining power relationships, is played by media, including texts and other expressions of language. Discourse does not simply reproduce or mirror the power relations which are endemic in a given society;

³⁸ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Pantheon, 1995), 177.

³⁹ Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*, 98.

⁴⁰ Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, trans. Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (New York, NY: International, 1971), 12.

⁴¹ Joseph V. Femia, *Gramsci’s Political Thought: Hegemony, Consciousness, and the Revolutionary Process* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 38. See also Mark C. J. Stoddart, “Ideology, Hegemony, Discourse: A Critical Review of Theories of Knowledge and Power,” *Social Thought & Research* 28 (2007): 201.

⁴² Gramsci, *Selections*, 325 and 333, respectively.

it enables such relations to emerge. In the case of an ancient text like H, our ability to understand the function of such discursive dynamics is constrained by our hazy knowledge of the institutional powers that might have stood behind the authors, as well as the scope of their ancient audience. As will be discussed in greater detail below, scholars continue to debate whether H promotes the interests of a central institution such as the temple in Jerusalem, or perhaps both Jerusalem and Gerizim, or the more marginal interests of rural communities or local shrines (see §3.3). Such debates stem in part from disagreements about how to interpret the concern in H to legislate activities that take place in everyday contexts, away from the sanctuary center. The concept of communal holiness, which is perhaps the most distinctive theme of Lev 17–26, has also been read as suggesting a potentially “democratic” thrust of the H materials, an impulse that would not align with a drive towards hegemonic power.⁴³

However, it will be argued that, when viewed from the perspective of Foucauldian discourse analysis or Gramsci’s theory of hegemony, an interest in everyday actions and behavior of the community writ large does not signal a concern to undermine the power of central elites or a centralized sociocultic system. To the contrary, this study contends that what makes H’s discourse of centralization so powerful is its dual focus on the activities of the center and the periphery: H normalizes the concentration of sociocultic authority in a central shrine, its priesthood, and ritual and legal standards by stipulating several ways in which the Israelites’ everyday experience must refer to these central authorities. H’s discourse of centralization thereby normalizes the values of a centralized cult by presenting deference to central spaces, processes, personnel, and authorities as essential to all aspects of the daily life of the imagined community of Israel.

1.2.4 Social Memory

When seeking to analyze the discursive strategies of Lev 17–26, this study begins by recognizing that these chapters describe the cult and community of an idealized *past*. They form part of a priestly account of origins, which stretches from the creation of the world to the establishment of Yhwh’s sanctuary dwelling among his chosen community.⁴⁴ Yet this priestly “history” cannot be seen

⁴³ Robert A. Kugler, “Holiness, Purity, the Body, and Society: The Evidence for Theological Conflict in Leviticus,” *JSOT* 76 (1997): 25 n. 50; Robert A. Kugler and Patrick Har- tin, *An Introduction to the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 86; and Bryan D. Bibb, *Ritual Words and Narrative Worlds in the Book of Leviticus*, LHBOTS 480 (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2009), 2.

⁴⁴ On P as a history of origins, see Karl Elliger, “Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung,” *ZTK* 49, no. 2 (1952): 121–43; Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, BZAW 189 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990), 331; Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2/25

as “history” in the sense that professional historians would define that form of scholarship today. The priestly history of origins is not the result of an empirically researched analysis that, while necessarily informed by the historian’s interpretation and subjectivity, aspires to be as accurate a record of past events as the surviving evidence allows. Nor is it a simple chronicle that lists a sequence of important or historical events in the order of their occurrence. Instead, it is more usefully understood as a form of social memory. The narrative constructs a shared past for the imagined ethnic group “Israel,” which in turn defines the core characteristics or identity of the members of that group, the “Israelites.”

To appreciate the discursive potential of this type of text, it is fruitful to employ the now rich field of memory studies, in particular those theories developed by Barry Schwartz, Jeffrey Olick, and Barbara Misztal.⁴⁵ Central concerns in this field of scholarship are the role that collective or social memory plays in the formation of group identity and the processes by which these constructions of the past are formed. It is axiomatic among contemporary memory theorists that all memories, but particularly those at the collective level, are “highly selective, inscriptive rather than descriptive, serving particular

(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 20; Konrad Schmid, “Genesis and Exodus as Two Formerly Independent Traditions of Origins for Ancient Israel,” *Bib* 93, no. 2 (2012): 187–208; and Simeon Chavel, *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah*, FAT 2/71 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

⁴⁵ Barry Schwartz, “The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory,” *Social Forces* 61, no. 2 (1982): 374–402; Schwartz, “Memory as a Cultural System: Abraham Lincoln and World War II,” *American Sociological Review* 61 (1996): 908–27; Schwartz, *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Jeffrey K. Olick and Joyce Robbins, “Social Memory Studies: From ‘Collective Memory’ to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices,” *Annual Review of Sociology* 24, no. 1 (1998): 105–40; Jeffrey K. Olick, *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2007); Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, “Introduction,” in *The Collective Memory Reader*, ed. Jeffrey K. Olick, Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2011), 3–62; and Barbara A. Misztal, *Theories of Social Remembering* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2003). See further, e.g., Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); Neil Jarman, *Material Conflicts: Parades and Visual Displays in Northern Ireland* (Oxford: Berg, 1997). See also Jan-Werner Müller ed., *Memory and Power in Post-War Europe: Studies in the Presence of the Past* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); Eviatar Zerubavel, *Time Maps: Collective Memory and the Social Shape of the Past* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2003); Jan Assmann, *Religion and Cultural Memory*, trans. Rodney Livingstone (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006); Astrid Erill, “Literature, Film, and the Mediality of Cultural Memory,” in *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook*, ed. Astrid Erill and Ansgar Nünning, *Memory and Cultural Memory* 8 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 389–99.

interests and ideological positions.”⁴⁶ The choice of what is remembered, or alternatively forgotten or deselected, is shaped not so much by what happened in the past as by the values and norms of the particular social context in which the agents of memory are operating. The construction of a shared imagination of communal origins can therefore serve to normalize the values of elites such that not only these values but also the institutions, spaces, and practices that embody them are seen as essential for the ongoing survival of the social group. In this way, images of the past play a key role in the mnemonic legitimation of the present social order and its associated hierarchies and power constellations.

In these processes of memory formation, it is common for particular sites or episodes of the past to become focal points of collective attention. These “sites of memory” (*lieux de mémoire*, to use Pierre Nora’s now classic term) are recognized by memory theorists to be often physical – a geographical space such as a temple, battlefield, or site of political agitation or massacre – but also constructs of the cultural life of a community.⁴⁷ Figures such as Moses, David, or Isaiah, for example, are widely recognized to be instances of such sites of memory in the Second Temple period; they seemed to have been regularly recalled at that time as part of the construction of a shared sense of ancient Israelite identity.⁴⁸ Moreover, even when physical sites of memory cease for whatever reason to have this presence, their symbolic and cultural mnemonic dimensions can continue to be powerful, thanks to the narratives constructed around them, the ritual practices associated with them, and the commemorative behaviors of those collectives and elites whose authority is associated with them.

So it is with the priestly traditions. Their description of the past serves to promote a collective social memory in which central figures, spaces, institutions, and practices are considered core to the identity of the Israelite community and thus as deserving of mnemonic attention from all its members. The priestly traditions present a constellation of sites of memory – figures such as Abraham and Moses, and spaces such as the wilderness sanctuary and Sinai –

⁴⁶ John R. Gillis, introduction to *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 4.

⁴⁷ Pierre Nora, ed., *La République*, vol. 1 of *Les Lieux de mémoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984).

⁴⁸ For Moses, see Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997). For David, see Diana Edelman, “David in Israelite Social Memory,” in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*, ed. Diana Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 141–57. For Isaiah, see Ehud Ben Zvi, “Isaiah, a Memorable Prophet: Why Was Isaiah so Memorable in the Late Persian/Early Hellenistic Periods? Some Observations,” in *Remembering Biblical Figures in the Late Persian and Early Hellenistic Periods: Social Memory and Imagination*, ed. Diana Edelman and Ehud Ben Zvi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 365–83.

as the “main characters and central places” in the formation of “Israel” and its patron-client relationship with its national god, Yhwh.⁴⁹ These various sites of memory are interdependent and mutually reinforcing. Together, they function as what Ben Zvi terms “mnemonic nodes,” in that they serve “as magnets that attract and eventually embody that which was considered central to the community.”⁵⁰

In this social memory of the foundations of Israel, the wilderness sanctuary and its associated ritual cult and priestly personnel are positioned as particularly important mnemonic nodes. The narrative of Yhwh’s creation of the world and the choice of Israel as his client reaches a “highpoint” with the arrival of the Israelites at Mount Sinai and the establishment of Yhwh’s habitation, the wilderness sanctuary, in the midst of the Israelites.⁵¹ The climactic nature of this event is signaled by a number of verbal allusions to Gen 1:1–2:4 in the account of the revelation of the sanctuary’s design to Moses (Exod 24:16–18) and the completion of the construction project by the Israelites (Exod 39–40).⁵² As a result of these terminological overlaps, the priestly traditions build a large inclusion around Gen 1–Exod 40, such that the construction of the sanctuary is construed as a fitting complement to the deity’s creative works initiated during

⁴⁹ Ehud Ben Zvi, “Chronicles and Social Memory,” *Studia Theologica – Nordic Journal of Theology* 71, no. 1 (2017): 75.

⁵⁰ Ben Zvi, “Chronicles,” 73 and 75, respectively.

⁵¹ Jeffrey Stackert, “Holiness Code and Writings,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Bible and Law*, ed. Brent Strawn (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2015), 389.

⁵² Notably, Exod 24:16–18 state that the cloud of Yhwh’s כבוד ‘glory’ settled on Mount Sinai for six days, and then, ביום השביעי ‘on the seventh day’, Yhwh called out to Moses and told him to ascend the mountain and receive the תבנית ‘pattern’ (Exod 25:9, 40) for the sanctuary and its furniture. As has long been noted by scholars, the timing of the appearance of Yhwh’s כבוד on the mountain and the revelation of the sanctuary תבנית to Moses echoes the pattern observed in the creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4; see Alan Hugh McNeile, *The Book of Exodus*, WC (London: Methuen, 1908), 155 and Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Josua, Richter, I. u. II. Samuelis*, vol. 3 of *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*, 7 vols. (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909), 365. In the latter passage, the god is said to undertake the works of creation across six days, before ceasing (שבת) work ביום השביעי ‘on the seventh day’ and sanctifying it. Further links between Gen 1:31–2:4 and the sanctuary building account can be observed in Exod 39:32, 43, and 40:33. Note in particular the references to the completion (קלל qal in Exod 39:43; קלל piel in Exod 40:33) of the sanctuary construction work (עבדה in Exod 39:32; מלאכה in Exod 39:43; 40:33) by Moses and the Israelites, which echoes the description of the completion (קלל piel) of the work (עבדה) of creation in Gen 1:39–2:4. See also the mention in Exod 39:43 of how Moses saw (קלל qal) the completed works and blessed (ברך piel) them, which bears striking resemblance to the report in Gen 1:31 that the god saw (קלל qal) everything he had created, and to the report in Gen 2:3 that he blessed (ברך piel) the seventh day.

the time of creation.⁵³ The sanctuary is thereby affirmed in the priestly materials as being of paradigmatic importance in Yhwh's plan for his created world.

This social memory, it will be argued in this study, infuses the discourse of centralization developed within the priestly materials, including Lev 17–26. The core elements of the foundational narrative – the unity displayed by the Israelites in their worship at the wilderness sanctuary, the monopolistic authority of the Aaronide priesthood that serves there, and the legislative conformity displayed by the community as individuals contribute to its ritual cult – all provide the discursive context within which the concentration of resources and standardization of ritual practice is justified. By invoking the imagined past, the priestly materials can legitimate an intense centrality for the sanctuary cult, an ideal collective unity of the Israelites, and a communal life shaped by legislative standards set by the sanctuary.

Like all social memory, the priestly traditions speak to contemporary issues and imperatives as much as to the past. It is difficult, given the paucity of historical sources, to be confident about the precise context in which this social memory was constructed. However, this study will contend that there are compelling reasons to assume it was primarily the Jerusalem temple in the Persian period, although without necessarily excluding the perspective of the central temple at Gerizim. As will be argued in detail, the memory established by P and further developed by H normalizes the idea of all Israel worshipping together as a united community, singular in its purpose to serve a central sanctuary and willing to devote the materials necessary for the ongoing survival of a sanctuary in which Judean interests are subtly positioned as predominant (see esp. §4.4). Such a memory arguably says little about the actual dominance of Judean cultic authorities at the time of writing, but it speaks to a perceived need on the part of priestly scribes to use the powerful medium of discourse to promote a logic whereby the Jerusalem temple could assert its *claim* to significance: its claim to lead the unified community of Israel in centralized worship, and to gain a degree of control over economic resources that would be warranted only by its sociocultic authority.

⁵³ As noted, e.g., by Joseph Blenkinsopp, "The Structure of P," *CBQ* 38 (1976): 280–81; Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*, ABRL (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1992), 218; Erich Zenger, *Gottes Bogen in den Wolken. Untersuchungen zu Komposition und Theologie der priesterschriftlichen Urgeschichte*, SBS 112 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983), 171; Bernd Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption," in *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel*, ed. Bernd Janowski, Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993), 223–24; Benjamin D. Sommer, "Conflicting Constructions of Divine Presence in the Priestly Tabernacle," *BibInt* 9 (2001): 43; William H. C. Propp, *Exodus 19–40: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 2B (New York, NY: Doubleday, 2006), 675–76; and Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 54–55.

1.3 Outline of the Study

Working within the methodological and theoretical framework described above, this study examines the discursive strategies of centralization in Lev 17–26 whereby H compels the Israelites to unify in service to their patron god Yhwh by deferring to central spaces, processes, and authorities. It begins in chapter 2 by examining the current state of research on H. It reviews and accepts the evidence that Lev 17–26 are relatively late legislative materials within the priestly traditions, which were composed most probably in the Persian period when these traditions had already reached a fairly advanced state of composition. Chapter 3 goes on to review current scholarly research on the importance of the Persian period in the negotiation of cultic centralization, the relationship between the central sanctuaries at Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim, and the evidence of continued cultic diversity, both within Yehud and Samaria and in the diaspora. It then turns to explore why the priestly traditions of the Pentateuch remain marginal in the discussion of centralizing discourse stemming from that period. It provides a comprehensive overview of the dominant view that H, like P before it, assumes the centralizing mandate of D, while also reviewing those studies that have challenged this view of P and/or H in the research on centralization.

Chapter 4 contextualizes the study of H that follows by considering the question of centralization in P. In contrast to much of the current scholarship on P, the chapter demonstrates that these traditions promote their own discourse of centralization that goes far beyond simply presuming D's centralizing mandate. While not ruling out the possibility that P was written after a core version of Deuteronomy, this chapter argues that P promotes a social memory of the foundation of the cult and community that is distinctive in its centralizing logic. In particular, the chapter analyzes the construction account in Exod 25–31, 35–40 and Lev 8–9 (cf. Num 7), the ritual legislation of Lev 1–16, and the depiction of the Aaronide priesthood in Exod 28–29 and related passages in order to argue that P advances a three-pronged discourse of centralization: collective unity in constructing and maintaining a shared sanctuary space, standardization of ritual practice in accordance with Yhwh's revelation to Moses, and the concentration of priestly competence in the hands of a monopolistic priesthood. The chapter also explores how this priestly discourse of centralization might have negotiated processes of cultic centralization in the Persian period by convincing those who considered themselves part of "Israel" to assume the role of chief sponsors of a central sanctuary in lieu of a royal patron, to defer to a central set of ritual norms as a sign of sociocultural unity, and to restrict their attention to a centralized priestly institution led by a single high priest.

The core of the study comprises chapters 5, 6, and 7, each of which considers one aspect of H's discourse of centralization. Chapter 5 offers a close reading of the laws of Lev 17 dealing with the proper disposal of blood. The chapter

argues that the impracticability of the prohibition of local slaughter in Lev 17:3–9 does not undermine a centralized reading of H but reveals H's strategic intent to express a ritualized ideal in which all pragmatic considerations are displaced and ritual hierarchies ideally configured in favor of the total centralization of the handling of livestock. Contrary to the classical view, this ideal shows little influence from Deut 12 on H's thinking; the focus on blood disposal has little resonance with D's program of centralization, and the evidence of verbal and conceptual borrowings from Deut 12 in Lev 17 is too scant to establish the latter as the key source of inspiration for H's centralizing mandate. Instead, the phraseology and thematic continuities with the earlier P materials in this chapter suggest that H's discourse is dependent on P rather than D, even as H moves beyond P by explicitly forbidding extrasanctuary slaughter and sacrifice and introducing harsh sanctions for those Israelites who fail to defer to the central sanctuary. Chapter 5 also explores the possible historical context of such a focus on blood sacrifice in the centralized cult, and the benefits which such a ritualized ideal might have afforded the temple in Jerusalem by claiming the exclusive right to butcher Israelite livestock. In addition, it explores the possibility that a similar logic might inform the Elephantine correspondence (*TAD* A4.8, 9, 10), that both Lev 17 and the Elephantine correspondence might be read to indicate a narrowing focus on the centralization of sacrifices involving *blood*, while nonblood sacrifices, such as the מנחה 'cereal offering', are considered less controversial.

Chapter 6 discusses the contribution to H's discourse of centralization of its calendar in Lev 23 and its laws regarding regular rites at the shrine in Lev 24:1–9. Drawing on historical analyses of fixed calendars in antiquity, I explore whether H's concern to devise a fixed, immutable program for the Israelite festal year, singular in its normativity and authority מושבתכם 'in all your settlements', might be read as a means to ensure conformity to stipulated ritual practice through a centralized means of time reckoning, and to assert the right of central sanctuary authorities to dictate practices in the periphery. In addition, by assigning to the local settlements new domestic activities that can be performed without requiring a shrine, H's festal calendar has the effect of denying the need for local sanctuaries and prohibiting the decentralized worship and splintering that such sites entail. Chapter 6 then discusses the appendix to the festal calendar in Lev 24:1–9 and argues that these verses, with their focus on fixed rituals at the central shrine at daily and weekly intervals, reveal the linkage between the standardization of time and the concentration of material resources and cultic authority to the central shrine and its exclusive priesthood. These ideas are given fresh expression in a ritual addition, preserved in 4Q365 23, which effectively merges the interests of Lev 23 and 24:1–9 by adding two new festivals in which all twelve tribes must travel to a central בית 'temple' in the land to present the raw materials needed for its upkeep. The chapter then concludes by exploring how H's interest in centralized time might have been a

strategy to achieve temporal symmetry across a geographically dispersed diaspora in the Persian era: it integrates all the Israelites, regardless of location, into a centrally managed temporal system, while asserting the rights of the central shrine and its priesthood to receive donations from the entire community.

Chapter 7 broadens the scope to address the significance of the concept of holiness for H's centralizing discourse. Unlike P, which restricts holiness to the sanctuary, its paraphernalia, and priesthood, H extends it to the community as a whole, and even to their activities outside the sanctuary precinct. The chapter argues that this extension reveals H's attempt to align everyday practice with central norms associated with the sanctuary. It thus explores how holiness reinforces a hegemonic discourse of centralization that is aimed at normalizing the reach of the temple into extrasanctuary domains through the aid of the law, and that seeks to solicit the Israelites' conformity with the law not just through coercion but also through consent. The chapter also explores how H's interest in the sabbath and in the Israelites' life on the land furthers this attempt to construct all activities – in social, agricultural, and economic domains – as integral to the Israelites' shared obligations to defer to central sanctuary authorities. It concludes by assessing how this might have bolstered the claims of temple authorities to economic centrality in the Persian period, in that they required not only ongoing, material support in the form of offerings and donations, but also recognition as an authority in agricultural and socioeconomic domains.

The study then closes with a brief discussion summarizing the main conclusions and findings, as well as their broader relevance for the study of centralization and the pentateuchal traditions.

Chapter 2

The Holiness Legislation in Context

Over the past two decades, the study of the Holiness legislation has experienced substantial renewal. Once considered “a peculiar little collection of laws,” haphazardly assembled and later attached to the Priestly source, Lev 17–26 spent much of the twentieth century in the wings of pentateuchal scholarship.¹ This situation has now changed almost completely. The 1995 landmark study by Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, was a catalyst for H’s reentry onto the stage as a major topic in the study of the priestly traditions and the formation of the Pentateuch more generally.² Reviewing key issues in current debates (§2.1), this chapter will highlight those aspects of recent research on H that inform my approach to Lev 17–26 in the chapters that follow: the nature of Lev 17–26 as a subunit of priestly legislation (§2.2.1); the arguments in favor of viewing H as presupposing a well-developed set of priestly narrative and legislative materials (§2.2.2); and the probable Persian period date of the H materials (§2.2.3).

2.1 Recent Trends and Debated Issues

It has long been argued in pentateuchal research that the legal materials found in Lev 17–26 have a different profile from Lev 1–16, and from the Priestly source more generally. This idea was first proposed in 1886 by Karl Heinrich Graf in *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments*. Here Graf observed that Lev 18–26 seem to have a different linguistic profile to the rest of the Priestly source.³ For instance, these chapters are formulated as direct address by Yhwh to Moses that includes first person statements by Yhwh rarely found outside these chapters. There is frequent repetition of the closing formulae אֲנִי יְהוָה ‘I am Yhwh’, אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם ‘I am Yhwh your god’, and אֲנִי יְהוָה מְקַדְּשְׁכֶם/מְקַדְּשְׁכֶם ‘I am Yhwh who sanctifies you/them’. Other nineteenth-

¹ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*, trans. John Sutherland and Allan Menzies (New York, NY: Meridian, 1957), 51.

² Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995).

³ Karl Heinrich Graf, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments. Zwei historisch-kritische Untersuchungen* (Leipzig: T. O. Weigel, 1866), 75–83.

century scholars added to Graf's observations by noting the high density of words derived from the root קדש and a distinctive concern in these materials with holiness, which is particularly evident in the unique exhortation to the Israelites in Lev 19:2 יהוה אלהיכם 'you shall be holy, for I Yhwh your god am holy'.⁴ The use of motive clauses and exhortations, such as the frequent references to the exodus from Egypt as a rationale for law observance and the repeated threat of being 'cut off' (כרת) from the community if certain statutes are not upheld, was also noted as contributing to the unique rhetoric of these chapters.

These linguistic peculiarities led classical scholars to wonder if at least Lev 18–26 preserve traces of a once independent legal code that was taken up by the scribes responsible for the Priestly source and incorporated into their narrative of origins.⁵ The Holiness Code was formed, in the view of Julius Wellhausen, via a process of cobbling together an assortment of laws to form a somewhat unruly legal corpus, lacking in overarching logic.⁶ Importantly, Wellhausen was the first to decisively argue that Lev 17, not Lev 18, must have constituted the original introduction to this collection of laws.⁷ While the root קדש is not found in Lev 17, this chapter has a similar linguistic profile to Lev 18–26 on account of the כרת formula (vv. 4, 9, 10, 14) and the specification that the law in vv. 3–7 be considered 'חוקת עולם...לדורות' 'an eternal statute...throughout their generations'. Wellhausen also noted that Lev 17 frames the H materials with a structure similar to that of other legal collections in the Pentateuch, opening the collection with a law on sacrifices and then, in ch. 26, closing with an exhortation to obedience.⁸ Leviticus 17 thus logically serves, in Wellhausen's view, as the introduction to an originally discrete code, equivalent to the Covenant Code of Exod 20–23 (CC) and the Deuteronomic Code of Deut 12–26 + 28 (D). Furthermore, the Holiness Code was written by scribes who knew and critically engaged with both these earlier legislative codes, especially the D materials. This view was corroborated by Bruno Baentsch who

⁴ See, e.g., Abraham Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*, trans. Philip H. Wicksteed (London: Macmillan, 1886), 88–91; Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 4th ed. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963), 149–72; August Klostermann, "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," in *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1893), 406–45; and Samuel Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 9th ed., International Theological Library (New York, NY: Meridan, 1956), 49–50.

⁵ Graf, *Die geschichtlichen Bücher*, 91–92 already excluded Lev 27 from H, arguing that it formed a later appendix to the book of Leviticus. On the arguments that support this view, see §2.2.1.

⁶ Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 149–72.

⁷ Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 149–52.

⁸ Wellhausen, *Die Composition*, 167–69; see also Driver, *Introduction*, 48.

in 1903 provided a detailed comparison of D and H and argued that Lev 17–26 show a heavy dependence on D as a legislative source.⁹

The view that Lev 17–26 form a legal code that predated the Priestly source had a significant impact on the study of H for much of the twentieth century, but new interpretations have emerged in recent decades.¹⁰ First, scholars have questioned Wellhausen's characterization of H as an assortment of various independent laws, stitched together in a haphazard way. In the 1960s and 1970s, scholars such as Christian Feucht and Alfred Cholewiński revived an earlier argument by Baentsch that the H laws had already been assembled in thematic units (e.g., Lev 18–20, 21–22) prior to their compilation to form the Holiness Code.¹¹ As they saw it, the redactor of H brought together large blocks of material, each of which had its own internal logic, rather than an assortment of disparate sources. A different approach was spearheaded by Karl Elliger and Rudolf Kilian.¹² Both argued that H was not edited by a single scribe but was composed via a series of complex redactions, although they did not agree on their precise scope.¹³

Since the 1990s, however, scholars have tended to question both the idea that Lev 17–26 were composed of a mix of originally independent sources (whether large or small), as well as the alternative theory that H was composed in a series of successive redactions. Klaus Grünwaldt, Eckart Otto, and

⁹ Bruno Baentsch, *Das Heiligkeits-Gesetz Lev. XVII–XXVI: Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung* (Erfurt: H. Güther, 1893), 76–80. For later studies of H's dependence on D, see Alfred Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium. Eine vergleichende Studie*, An-Bib 66 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976); Eckart Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitgesetz Levitikus 17–26," in *Levitikus als Buch*, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Hans-Winfried Jüngling, BBB 119 (Bodenheim: Philo, 1999), 125–96; Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: A Study in the Composition of the Book of Leviticus*, FAT 2/25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 401–545; Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*, FAT 1/52 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

¹⁰ For detailed histories of research on H scholarship in the twentieth century, see Henry T. C. Sun, "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17–26)" (PhD diss., The Claremont Graduate School, 1990), 1–43 and Klaus Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Levitikus 17–26. Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition und Theologie*, BZAW 271 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999), 5–22. For more recent histories of research, see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 4–11 and Paavo N. Tucker, *The Holiness Composition in the Book of Exodus*, FAT 2/98 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 18–28.

¹¹ Christian Feucht, *Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitgesetz* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964) and Cholewiński, *Heiligkeitgesetz*. For Baentsch's earlier observation, see Baentsch, *Das Heiligkeit-Gesetz*.

¹² Karl Elliger, "Heiligkeitgesetz," RGG 3:175–76; Elliger, *Leviticus*, HAT 4 (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1966); and Rudolf Kilian, *Literarkritische und formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitgesetzes*, BBB 19 (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1963).

¹³ For a similar approach, see Sun, "Investigation."

Christophe Nihan, among others, have argued in detail that the number of independent sources used by H is far fewer than traditionally assumed, and that the redactional models proposed by Elliger, Kilian, and others are also unnecessary.¹⁴ Traces of earlier source materials can still be identified in select passages of Lev 17–26, as, for instance, in the two lists of prohibited sexual unions in Lev 18 and 20.¹⁵ Additions were also certainly made to Lev 17–26 in a late compositional stage, the episode of the blasphemer in Lev 24:10–23 being one such important example (see further discussion of the blasphemer episode in §2.2.1). Nevertheless, these scholars insist that H can generally be read as a well-structured literary unit, organized around the central theme of holiness.¹⁶

A second but related change in the study of H has been the rejection of the premise that Lev 17–26 originated as an independent code prior to the writing of the Priestly source.¹⁷ Beginning with a dictionary entry by Elliger in 1959, followed by his commentary in 1966, scholars have gradually come to question whether Lev 17–26 can be read without reference to (at least) the *Priestergrundschrift* (Pg).¹⁸ In trying to reconstruct what might have been the state of the Holiness Code prior to its redaction by the Priestly scribes, classical scholars were required to treat all the references to the Priestly narrative from Lev 17–26 as secondary additions. However, bracketing out these secondary elements significantly disrupted the logic of H's laws. Leviticus 17–26 frequently mention the narrative setting of the Priestly narrative, including Moses, Aaron, the Israelite מחנה 'camp', Mount Sinai, the exodus, and the promised entry into the land of Canaan.¹⁹ If all these references to the Priestly narrative context are

¹⁴ Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz*; Eckart Otto, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17–26 in der Pentateuchredaktion," in *Altes Testament – Forschung und Wirkung. Festschrift Henning Graf Reventlow*, ed. Peter Mommer and Winfried Thiel (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1994), 65–80; Otto, *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments*, ThW (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994), 237–43; and Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 395–45.

¹⁵ See, among others, Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 430–59.

¹⁶ See further Jan Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17–26*, VTSup 67 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 5–7; Andreas Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Priesterschrift. Literaturgeschichtliche und rechtssystematische Untersuchungen zu Leviticus 17,1–26,2*, FAT 1/26 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 79–134. On the literary structure of Lev 17–26, see further §2.2.1.

¹⁷ Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz* is an important exception to this trend. Grünwaldt has maintained the original independence of the Holiness Code, even though he has accepted Elliger's core insight that it was most likely composed with knowledge of the Priestly document.

¹⁸ Elliger, "Heiligkeitgesetz," 175 and Elliger, *Leviticus*, 14–20.

¹⁹ For references to Moses, see Lev 17:1; 18:1; 19:1; 20:1; 21:1, 16, 24; 22:1; 22:17, 26; 23:1, 9, 23, 26, 33, 44; 24:1, 11, 13, 23; 25:1; 26:46. For references to Aaron, see Lev 17:2; 21:1, 17, 21, 24; 22:2, 4, 18; 24:3, 9. For reference to the camp, see Lev 17:3; 24:10, 14, 23. For references to Sinai, see Lev 25:1; 26:46. For references to the exodus, see Lev 18:3;