## **NOBUYOSHI KIUCHI**

# A Study of Hāṭā' and Haṭṭā'ṯ in Leviticus 4–5

Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe

2

**Mohr Siebeck** 

## Forschungen zum Alten Testament 2. Reihe

Herausgegeben von Bernd Janowski und Hermann Spieckermann

2



Nobuyoshi Kiuchi

## A Study of Hāṭā' and Haṭṭā't in Leviticus 4–5

Mohr Siebeck

NOBUYOSHI KIUCHI, born 1953; 1986 Ph.D. in Theology from the Council for National Academic Awards (College of St. Paul and St. Mary in Cheltenham / The Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Study); presently Professor of Old Testament at Tokyo Christian University, and minister

ISBN 3-16-148055-4 978-3-16-157852-6 Unveränderte eBook-Ausgabe 2019 ISSN 1611-4914 (Forschungen zum Alten Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at *http://dnb.ddb.de*.

© 2003 by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), P. O. Box 2040, D-72010 Tübingen.

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

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Held in Rottenburg/N.

Printed in Germany.

#### Foreword

This study has grown out of my struggle with the Leviticus text for a decade or so. It is about a topic familiar to all humanity, that is, sin. It, however, focuses on one important Hebrew root  $h_{i}^{2}$ , yet not all of its derivations are the object of inquiry, but only  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  and  $hatt\bar{a}^{2}t$ . The term 'sin' has been used comprehensively, as referring to various other so-called sin-terms such as  $pe\check{s}a^{4}$ , ' $\bar{a}w\bar{o}n$  etc. As the present study will bring home to the reader, this has so often obscured the particular aspects of each term.

Sin is something that everyone does not desire to face. All the more so if it is one's own. Yet, in a true sense the Hebrew Bible appears to talk about human sin from Genesis 3 to its end, so that without a precise understanding of the nature of human sin, much of the Scripture seems to lose its significance for the reader. It is one of my convictions that I had after having worked on these particular terms  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^2$  and  $hatt\bar{a}t$  that these terms really constitute a cornerstone that has been neglected despite all its importance.

More personally, I have been surprised on two counts. One, though I started the study just with an intention of clarifying the meanings of the terms, it turned out that it was a study of humanity or more poignantly of myself. Two, it turned out that the present work became a sort of revision of my idea on the purification offering that I submitted nearly fifteen years ago, in *The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature*, Sheffield 1987. As the reader will notice, I have altered my view on some of the points on the purification offering and the matter of sin and uncleanness.

Special thanks are due to the editors of Forschungen zum Alten Testament for accepting this work into its second series and to the publisher Mohr Siebeck for their labor to complete this production.

It is my sincere desire that through this small work the reader will see more what human nature is like, and how sin continues to distress the present world.

Fuchu, Tokyo August, 2002 N. Kiuchi

## Table of Contents

Introduc	tion	1
Chapter	1 The meanings of $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}$ and $hattar{a}t\bar{a}$ in Lev 4–5	5
-	*šgg (šgh) and its related terms	
1.1.1	*šgg (šgh)	5
1.1.2	Lev 5:17-18	7
1.1.3	Non-mention of *šgg (šgh) in Lev 5:1–4	10
1.1.4	*šgg (šgh) and <i>hāţā</i> ?	14
1.2	ḥāṭā' min	16
1.3	māʿal and ḥāṭā'	18
1.4	A proposal for the meanings of hāțā' and hațțā'	24
1.5	The nature of the breach of one negative commandment	27
1.6	The scope of the <i>miswoit</i>	30
1.7	Lev 16:16, 21	32
1.8	Num 15:22–29	34
1.9	The meaning of <i>hattā't</i>	41
1.10	The <i>hațtā't</i> offering in other legal contexts	42
1.10.1	$Hatta^{j}t$ for purification, consecration and dedication	42
1.10.2	Lev 19:20–22 The case of a betrothed slave-girl	48
1.10.3	Num 5:5–8 The reparation offering for an inter-human case	49
Chapter	2 The meanings of <i>hāțā</i> <sup>2</sup> and <i>hațţā</i> <sup>2</sup> outside legal contexts	51
2.1	A reexamination of the meaning 'to miss' for $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}$ '	51
2.2	An overview of the related terms of $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}$ and $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}t\bar{a}$	56
2.2.1	Related terms of <i>hāțā</i> <sup>2</sup>	56
2.2.2	Related terms of <i>hattā<sup>2</sup>t</i>	59
2.3	Not concrete acts but the description of the whole person	60
2.3.1	ḥāṭā'	60
2.3.2	ḥaṭṭā' <u>t</u>	67

VIII	Table of contents	
2.4	Unconscious hypocrisy in hāțā? and hațțā?	72
2.4.1	ḥāṭā'	72
2.4.2	ḥaṭṭā²ṯ	78
2.5	Tentative conclusion	83
Chapter	3 Distinguishing the two offerings	85
3.1	Redefining the "sins" of the two offerings	85
3.2	A paradox of the two offerings	90
3.2.1	A paradox	90
3.2.2	A further paradox	92
3.3	Conclusion	96
Appendi Appendi	ix A Preliminary considerations on the idea of uncleanness 1 ix B The meaning of $hitter$	
Appendi	ix C The meaning of <i>hithattā</i> ? 1	119
1.1	hitte, hithatta' and the accompanying ritual acts 1	120
1.2	hittē <sup>2</sup> and hithattā <sup>2</sup> in Num 19 1	121
1.2.1	Verse 12 1	22
1.2.2	Verse 13 1	23
1.2.3	Verse 19 1	24
2.1	Job 41:17	125
3.1	Conclusion 1	126
Bibliogr	aphy	129
Indices	Scripture Index	
	Author Index 1	139
	Hebrew Word Index	
	Subject Index	143

### Abbreviations

#### I. Miscellaneous abbreviations

Hiph.	Hiphil
Hithpa.	Hithpael
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Massoretic Text
Niph.	Niphal
Р	Priestly source
Pi.	Piel
*	Hebrew root

#### II. Bible translations

ESV	English Standard Version
JPSV	Jewish Publication Society Version
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NEB	New English Bible
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
REB	Revised English Bible
RSV	Revised Standard Version

#### III. Publications

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	Anchor Bible Dictionary
BBB	Bonner Biblische Beiträge
BDB	F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English
	Lexicon of the Old Testament
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
DCH	D.J.A. Clines (ed.), The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew

Х	Abbreviations
DDD	K. van der Toorn, B. Becking and P.W. van der Horst (eds.), Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
G-K	E. Kautzsch and A.E. Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar
HAL	W. Baumgartner, Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten
1111L	Testament
HALOT	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament tr. by M.E.J. Richardson
IBHS	B.K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew
	Syntax
ICC	International Critical Commentary
JBTh	Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie
Joüon-Muraoka	P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew
JPS	Jewish Publication Society
JSOTS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
NDBT	T.D. Alexander and B.S. Rosner (eds.), The New Dictionary of Biblical
	Theology
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NIDOTTE	W.A VanGemeren (ed.), The New International Dictionary of the Old
	Testament Theology and Exegesis
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
RB	Revue Biblique
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
THAT	E. Jenni and C. Westermann (eds.), Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum
	Alten Testament
TWAT	G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), Theologisches Wörterbuch zum
	Alten Testament
VT	Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
ZAH	Zeitschrift für Althebräistik
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

#### Introduction

The question of what "sin" means is related to the very foundations of world religions. Particularly in Judaism and Christianity explation for sins and redemption of the sinful constitute the starting point for one's salvation. It is not too much to say that the whole lifestyle of a believer rests on what kind of understanding he adopts on the idea of "sin."

Reading Leviticus, the present writer has long felt that the common English term sin is somewhat inexact for the Hebrew  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  and its related terms.<sup>1</sup> Below is a small contribution, if it is one, towards a reappraisal of the Hebrew terms  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  and  $hatta^{2}t$ . In reviewing the occurrences of those terms, various aspects of "sin" have emerged, chief among them is a new understanding of the lexical meaning of the terms.

We shall start from Lev 4–5 as the section appears to be most delicate in the usage of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^2$ ,  $hatta^2t$ , and other related sin-terminologies. Indeed, terms relating to so-called sin appear to be meticulously differentiated in Leviticus 4–5. For instance, they raise a natural question why the root  $ht^2$  is used for some parts, and the root 'sm is used for other. This question no doubt has the bearing on the difference between the purification offering (or sin offering) and the reparation offering (or guilt offering). <sup>2</sup> This short study aims at defining the meaning of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^2$  in its relation to \*sgg (sgh) and  $m\bar{a}^cal$ , thereby shedding a new light to the nature of the purification offering and reparation offering.

It is clear that the section on the purification offering ends in 5:13, and that

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> For German 'Sünde' see R. Knierim, Hauptbegriffe, 56, 66–67. Knierim proposes 'sich verfehlen' for  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ , and 'Verfehlung' for  $hatt\bar{a}^{2}t$ ; J.Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 229. Passages adduced for the meaning 'miss, forfeit' will be discussed in chapter 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> We will use the term 'purification offering' for hattail and 'reparation offering' for ' $a\bar{s}\bar{s}\bar{a}m$  in the following discussion. The qualification of the former appellation is, in a sense, the main theme of this study. For a discussion over the appellation see Rendtorff, Leviticus, 220–21. The central question is how the same term hattail can refer to "sin" and a purificatory offering, or how the two distinct ideas, sin and uncleanness, are integrated in the mind of the ancients. For a recent discussion on the relationship between ritual impurity and moral impurity, see J. Klawans, Impurity, 21–42; J. Sklar, Atonement, 134–49; A. Schenker, Anlässe 45 no. 2.

the section on the reparation offering starts from 5:14.<sup>3</sup> The remarkable fact is that the root 'sm appears more frequently in the later section of 4:1-5:26, though  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}$ ' appears for all the cases. Thus, the verbal form ' $\bar{a}s\bar{e}m$  appears in 4:13, 22, 27; 5:2, 3, 4<sup>2</sup>, 5 for the purification offering and in 5:17, 23 for the reparation offering. The verb ' $\bar{a}sam$  appears in 5:19 twice. The noun form ' $\bar{a}s\bar{a}m$  appears for the first time in 5:6 and then occurs with increasing frequency afterwards, i.e., in 5:7, 15<sup>2</sup>, 16, 18, 19, 25. On the other hand, while the noun *hattā*'t and the verb 'ht' occurs frequently in ch. 4, they gradually disappear and shift to the root 'sm. In the section on the reparation offering, the root ht' occurs only in the verbal form and not in the noun form.

It is also remarkable that the noun  $hatta^{i}t$  never appears for the reparation offering. This implies that the reparation offering does not deal with  $hatta^{i}t$  (commonly translated 'sin'). Thus, if what the reparation offering deals with was conceived as "sin," whatever the understanding of the English term, the subtle nuance of  $hatta^{i}t$  tends to be neglected.

Ordinarily the term  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  has been translated 'sin,' 'commit a sin,' or 'sich verfehlen,' but the English equivalents have become too vague to explain the above linguistic phenomenon. Moreover, the use of the term 'sin' seems to have been used mostly in reference to a 'violation of the commandment,' that is, conduct of a person. It is dubious if this conduct-oriented understanding of "sin" does justice to the Biblical data on the use of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ . Some exegetes have indeed felt that the common translations such as 'sin' or 'pécher' do not correspond to the Hebrew  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ . Thus, R. Péter-Contesse comments on Lev 4:2 as follows,

Le champ sémantique du verbe  $\square$  ne correspond pas exactement à celui de «pécher» en français. Il ne s'agit pas avant tout d'une notion morale, liée à la connaissance subjective d'une loi. C'est d'abord une notion relationnelle. Comme le suggère l'étymologie, il y a à la base l'idée de «manquer/ne pas atteindre le but» (voir p.ex. Es 65.20; Jb 5;24). De là découle le sens de «ne pas être dans une relation juste et normale avec quelqu'un ou quelque chose», et en fin de compte avec Dieu.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The term  ${}^{\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{a}m}$  in 5:6, 7 seems to mean 'reparation'; it is not the name of the  ${}^{\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{a}\bar{m}}$  offering, just as *hattā*'t means both "sin" and the offering that deals with it (see 4:3, 14, 23, 28-29). Cp. Schenker, Anlässe, 49–50; Verfehlungen, 249-54 and a response by Milgrom, Leviticus 23–27, 2446–49.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> R. Péter-Contesse, Lévitique 1–16, 75. That hata a in Lev 4–5 has more than a moral sense is also noted in R. Péter-Contesse & J. Ellington, Handbook, 46. They comment, "the prime meaning of the Hebrew word used for "sin" here is not a moral one, as if breaking

It seems that this understanding by Péter-Contesse represents the view of the large majority of exegetes of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  in such a context. Yet the definition is still vague and it is not clear how the sense differs from another sin-term such as *peša*<sup>c</sup> which appears to be concerned with mainly the breaking of personal relationship.

Thus, re-examination of the term is required in several senses. In order to grasp the exact sense of the verb  $h\bar{a}_t\bar{a}^2$ , it is necessary to probe into the relationship between the verb on the one hand, and the root šgg (šgh) and  $m\bar{a}^c al$  on the other. We begin the examination by first determining the sense of \*šgg. As these terms appear in the rest of the Hebrew Bible as well, reference will be made to those occurrences to give an overall picture of the term in question.

The course of the discussion I take in the following is as follows. First I will examine the meaning of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  by scrutinizing its related terms such as  $\delta\bar{a}g\bar{a}g$ ,  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  and  $ne^{c}lam$  mimmennû. In so doing I will propose a meaning of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ , simultaneously making sure that this meaning fits in well with all the legal cases in Leviticus and Numbers.

Then I will test the meaning in the rest of the Hebrew Bible. Based on the examination of all the occurrences of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}$  and  $hatt\bar{a}t$ , significant passages will be interpreted with our new proposal for the meaning of those terms vis-à-vis the conventional meaning 'to sin' or 'to miss.'

When it is confirmed that those Hebrew terms really have these meanings, we will grapple again with the terms in Lev 4-5 in an attempt to explore the difference between the purification offering and the reparation offering.

Lastly, I will address myself to the significance and challenge of the conclusion to moderns in the light of all the arguments.

English translations following the Hebrew text are, unless otherwise indicated, mine.

In dealing with the Biblical text, account will be taken of the general literary genre in which the term in question occurs, but throughout the inquiry any arguments regarding source-critical matters will be left out, partly because the date of the text in question is not the object of our task, and partly because, as

a specific commandment of the Law. It conveys rather the idea of breaking a relationship." Cp. R. Koch, Sünde, 44–48; P.A. Bird, Genesis 3, 23.

our inquiry will show, the basic sense of hata, does not seem to have changed.

It came as a sort of surprise to find that a term so crucial in forming one's understanding of salvation has received so scant an attention throughout the ages. The last few decades have seen the appearance of significant commentaries on Leviticus, both from Jewish and Christian sides, and it is evident that such works have contributed to the understanding of the message of the book.<sup>5</sup> Yet the impression cannot be denied that more meticulous inquiry into the other so-called sin-terminology should be done in the future.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> For example, J.R. Porter, Leviticus (1976); G.J. Wenham, Leviticus (1979); R.K. Harrison, Leviticus (1980); B.A. Levine, Leviticus (1989); J.E. Hartley, Leviticus (1992); R. Péter-Contesse, Lévitique 1–16 (1993); P. J. Budd, Leviticus (1996); F.H. Gorman, Leviticus (1997); R. Rendtorff, Leviticus 1:1–7:38 (1985–1992); J. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16 (1991), 17–23 (2000), 24–27 (2001).

#### Chapter 1

#### The meanings of $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ and $hatt\bar{a}^{2}t$ in Lev 4–5

In order to approach the meaning of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  in Lev 4–5 we start from relatively less problematic terms, viz., the roots šgg and m<sup>c</sup>l in relation to  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ , and then consider the unique aspects of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ .

#### 1.1 \*šgg (šgh) and its related terms

#### 1.1.1 \*šgg (šgh)

In Lev 4–5 we are given the words  $\bar{s}a\bar{g}ah$  and  $\bar{s}e\bar{g}a\bar{g}ah$ , which may help to clarify the meaning of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^2$ . The qal  $\bar{s}a\bar{g}ah$  occurs 17 times in the OT; Lev 4:13; Num 15:22; I Sam 26:21; Isa 28:7<sup>3</sup>; Ezek 34:6; 45:20; Ps 119:21, 118; Job 6:24; 19:4; Prov 5:19, 20, 23; 19:27; 20:1. Qal  $\bar{s}a\bar{g}a\bar{g}$  occurs 4 times; Lev 5:18; Num 15:28; Ps 119:67; Job 12:16. It is agreed that those verbs basically mean 'err inadvertently,' 'go astray.'<sup>1</sup> As has been pointed out, the root  $\bar{s}gh(\bar{s}gg)$  concerns an uncontrollable movement. The 'uncontrollableness' and 'inadvertence' are what characterize these roots. Thus, it could be observed from Job 6:24 and Isa 28:7 that it describes a situation in which a person 'strays' from a right course while considering that he does not think so. In other words, when one  $\bar{s}a\bar{g}a\bar{h}$  ( $\bar{s}a\bar{g}a\bar{g}$ ), one is objectively in a wrong course or situation but subjectively he does not think so, rather he may well think that he is in the right path.

These general features of this term also apply to those passages in Lev 4–5 where  $s\bar{a}\bar{g}\bar{a}h$  ( $s\bar{a}\bar{g}a\bar{g}$ ) appears. In Lev 4 \*sgh appears with regard to the violation of any of the Lord's commandments.

אָם כָּל־עַרַת יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁגוּ וְנָעְלַם דְּבָר מֵעֵינֵי הַקָּקָל וְאָם כָּל־עַרַת יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁגוּ וְנָעְלַם דְּבָר מֵעֵינֵה וְאָשֵׁמוּ:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Milgrom, Ś<sup>E</sup>GĀGĀH, 122–32; R. Knierim, שנג 869–72; T. Seidl, שנג/שנה, 1058–65.

Here  $yisg\hat{u}$  is explicated by  $w^ene^{c}lam \cdots x^aser l\bar{o}^{s} t\bar{e}^{c}\bar{a}sen\bar{a}h$ . Unintentional erring from a certain Lord's commandment is described as  $hahattaitait x^aser hattein u^{a}$  ( $\bar{a}leyh\bar{a}$  in v. 14. It may thus be possible to equate the meaning of  $yisg\hat{u}$  with that of  $h\bar{a}t^{e}\hat{u}$ , but the following example shows that there is some difference between  $s\bar{a}g\bar{a}h$  and  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{s}$ .

Here,  $yeh^{\epsilon}t\bar{a}^{\circ}$  is explicated by  $w^{\epsilon\epsilon}\bar{a}s\bar{a}h$  ---  $bis^{\epsilon}\bar{g}a\bar{g}a\bar{h}$ , which appears to suggest that  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{\circ}$  means 'inadvertently failing to obey any of the Lord's prohibitive commandments,' and that it has inadvertence as a semantic element. But that the latter is not the case is indicated by the phrase  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{\circ}$   $bis^{\epsilon}\bar{g}a\bar{g}ah$  in 4:2 and 5:15 where  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{\circ}$  is distinct from the idea of \*šgg.

It seems that the sense of  $\delta \bar{a} \bar{g} \bar{a} h$  is exemplified most clearly in v. 13 where  $yi \bar{s} g \hat{u}$  is further explicated by

The word  $d\bar{a}\underline{b}\bar{a}r$  lacks an article. Therefore it is not to say that  $yi\underline{s}g\hat{u}$  is hidden, but that the indefinite 'a thing' is hidden from the eyes of the assembly. This means that the clause  $ne^{c}lam$  ff. is a circumstantial clause and explains the  $yi\underline{s}g\hat{u}$ . Here it could be observed that the agent of  $\underline{s}a\bar{g}ah$  knows his own act but is unconscious of the act of violating the Lord's prohibitive commandment. For the meaning of  $ne^{c}lam$  min, see below.

In four verses, 4:2, 22, 27; 5:15,  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  is followed by  $bi\delta^{*}\bar{g}a\bar{g}ah$ , which indicates that the sense of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  is distinct from that of the root idea of \*šgg (\*šgh). Thus,  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  itself does not mean 'sin inadvertently,' though Lev 4 deals with inadvertent "sins." Inadvertence does not appear to constitute an intrinsic semantic element of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ . Rather, inadvertence is expressed by \*šgg (\*šgh) and that is just a circumstantial condition when someone  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ . This suggests that there are cases of "sin" which are not inadvertent, and indeed there are, e.g., Lev 5:21–23. It is probable that the principal sense of the root šgg (šgh) is erring inadvertently; 'to err unintentionally, or inadvertently,' and  $bis^{*}\bar{g}a\bar{g}ah$ 'inadvertently' or 'unintentionally.' Below we shall take a look at the relevant passages in an attempt to differentiate the two terms in Lev 4–5 more exactly. Thus,  $\delta \bar{a} \bar{g} a \bar{g}$  is a general term meaning 'to err' from something, describing from an objective point of view an overall course of a person who goes astray. It is not restricted in the religious matters such as the Lord's commandments as Isa 28:7 suggests. The person who goes astray is not conscious about his own total situation in relation to the right course, even though he is aware of what he is doing (I Sam 26:21; Job 6:24).

#### 1.1.2 Lev 5:17-18

It seems that this understanding of the term suits the difficult prescription of Lev 5:17–18. It reads,

5:17 וְאִם־נָפָשׁ כִּי תֶחֲטָּא וְעָשְׂתָה אַחַת מִכָּל־מִצְוֹת יְהוָה
 אָשֶׁשֶׁר לֹא תַעָשֶׂינָה וְלֹא־יָדַע וְאָשֵׁם וְנָשָׂא עֵוֹנוֹ:
 5:18 וְהַבִיא אַיל תָּמִים מִן־הַצֹּאו בְּעָרְכְּדָ לְאָשֶׁם אֶל־הַכֹּהֵן
 5:18 וְכַפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן עַל שְׁגָנָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר־שָׁנָג וְהוּא לא־יָדַע וְנָסְלַח לוֹ:

These verses have posed an exegetical crux to scholars because of their similarity to the cases of the purification offering in chapter 4 (cp. 4:13, 22).<sup>2</sup> Here we restrict our discussion to the lexical meaning of \*šgg, setting aside the discussion about the nature of the case itself, which will be made later.<sup>3</sup>

The crucial problem is in v.17b which is repeated in v. 18b after  $si\bar{g}g\bar{a}\underline{t}\bar{o} \, ser$  $s\bar{a}\bar{g}a\bar{g}$ . In this connection it is necessary to consider the concept of  $y\bar{a}\underline{d}a^{c}$  in Lev 4–5 more systematically. In Lev 4 a certain "sin" is inadvertently committed, but since a person knows and admits it later, is it not evident that he can remember the act? This means that, though vague, the knowledge of his own

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Probably because of the difficulty the proposal has been made from ancient times that together with the case in vv. 14–16 this case in vv. 17–19 forms "a single case of accidental poaching upon sancta: the first part, real; the other, suspected." Milgrom,  $S^E G\bar{A}G\bar{A}H$ , 123. However, there is neither a textual problem, nor is there any need to assume so. We take the case in vv.17–19 as distinct from the case in vv. 14–16 as we argue throughout this study. Cf. Schenker, Unterschied, 115–18; Interprétations, 65–66.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> In the following discussion we assume that  ${}^{2}\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{e}m$  means to 'realize guilt' rather than to 'be guilty' or 'be held guilty.' See Milgrom, Cult, 3–12; Kiuchi, Purification, 31–34; Rendtorff, Leviticus, 152–53; J. E. Hartley, Leviticus, 62. This rendering is also adopted by JPS and ESV.

act is in his consciousness before he realizes his guilt. Then what is the situation of a person in 5:17–19, where he is said,  $l\bar{o}^{2} y\bar{a}\underline{d}a^{c}$ ? Since the person realizes his guilt, it is evident that he still remembers his act. This leads us to question the common assumption regarding the concept of  $y\bar{a}\underline{d}a^{c}$  in Lev 4–5 that if he does not know he cannot remember his act. On this assumption some exceptes have assumed that 5:17–19 deals with some *unknown* sin.<sup>4</sup> But it must be asked in what sense the knowing is meant. There is a hint in Lev 5:1.

#### והוא עד או ראה או ידע

Here the text should be translated 'if he is a witness, either he has seen it, or he has learned about it.'<sup>5</sup> In other words,  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  here means an experiential knowledge as it is subordinated under ' $\bar{e}d$  ('witness'). When this meaning is applied to  $h\hat{u}^{2} l\bar{o}^{2} y\bar{a}da^{c}$  in Lev 5:17-19, it means that the person does not know about his own act as an experiential knowledge, and this leaves room for the possibility that he knows it in his subconsciousness. Therefore, there is no need to consider that since he does not know, the "sin" is unknown. As long as the person realizes his own guilt, the knowledge must be stored in his subconsciousness, so that it somehow can be remembered later. All the occurrences of  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  in Lev 4-5 make sense on this assumption (see below).

The question is whether  $w^e l \bar{o}^2 y \bar{a} \underline{d} a^c$  in v. 17b refers to the ignorance of the Lord's commandment or the ignorance of the act itself. It seems that the clause  $w^e l \bar{o}^2 y \bar{a} \underline{d} a^c$  refers to both: The person does not know what he did. In this sense the clause  $w^e l \bar{o}^2 y \bar{a} \underline{d} a^c$  is different from the phrase  $bi \underline{\delta}^e \bar{g} \bar{a} \bar{g} \bar{a} h$  in 4:13, 22. Here in 5:17b the clause  $w^e l \bar{o}^2 y \bar{a} \underline{d} a^c$  refers even to his act itself. In other words, not only is he unconscious of the Lord's commandment, but he is also unconscious about his own act.

How should the clauses  $w^e h \hat{u}^2 l \bar{o}^2 y \bar{a} \underline{d} a^c$  in v. 18b be understood syntactically? It is a circumstantial clause and adds an explanation to the concept of  $\delta \bar{a} \bar{g} a \bar{g}$  that precedes it. This means that there is  $\delta^e \bar{g} \bar{a} \bar{g} \bar{a} h$  of a kind in which a person knows his own act but does not know it constitutes a violation of a certain divine prohibitive commandment as in Lev 4, but there is also such a  $\delta^e \bar{g} \bar{a} \bar{g} \bar{a} h$  as here in which a person does not know not only that he has violated a divine

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Cf. Milgrom, Leviticus 1–16, 332–33, 361–63; Schenker, Anlässe, 45–66, esp.53–55; P. Budd, 256–59 and n. 3 on p. 257.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> On  $\overline{\partial} - \overline{\partial}$  cf. HAL 19.

commandment but he also does not know his own act. In terms of clarifying the concept of \*šgg, it is germane to ask whether \*šgg here indicates that a person does not know even his own act. The question is: Is what is meant by the circumstantial clause  $w^e h \hat{u}^2 l \bar{o}^2 y \bar{a} d a^c$  part of the concept of \*šgg? In my view it is not. It is crucially important to see in 5:17–19 a further stage of the cases in Lev 4, that is, the person does not know even his own act: \*Šgg simply states his going astray. This understanding has implications for the concept of \*šgg in Lev 4, for the cases there imply that the person knows his own act. However, in 4:14, 23, 28 the fact that the root yd<sup>c</sup> appears only at the end of the protases suggests that until then the person has not known the "sin."

Thus, there are degrees in human consciousness. And in this connection it would be in order to address the meaning of *ne*<sup>c</sup>*lam min* in Lev 4:13 and 5:2, 3, 4. It means to 'be hidden from,' but more importantly it refers to a particular aspect of not knowing. Considering that the phrase is contrasted with  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  in 5:3, 4, and that  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  has the same meaning in Lev 4–5, to 'know in the surface of one's consciousness,' the phrase means to 'be hidden from one's surface consciousness.' Because a certain commandment of the Lord is not taken as important by a person, that commandment and his violation of it disappear from his surface consciousness.

With these comments on  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  and  $ne^{c}lam$  min in view, it could be posited that \*šgg means to 'go astray inadvertently.' It presumes an initial ignorance of a certain act constituting a "sin," but in view of Lev 5:17–19 where the person is not even conscious about his own act, it can be surmised that in Lev 4 the person vaguely knows his own going astray in his consciousness.

It would do, at this stage, to confirm that  $w^{e}(h\hat{u}^{2}) l\bar{o}^{2} y\bar{a}da^{c}$  is different from  $s\bar{a}\bar{g}a\bar{g}$ , but that the both presume the knowledge of an act, but in different degrees; the person in 5:17–19 is not conscious about his act at all, whereas the person in Lev 4 is conscious about his act, but unconscious about his "sin."

Now that the meaning of  $\delta \bar{a} \bar{g} a \bar{g} (\delta \bar{a} \bar{g} \bar{a} \bar{h})$  is established, it is in order to consider the semantic relationship between  $\delta \bar{a} \bar{g} a \bar{g}$  and  $h \bar{a} t \bar{a}^2$ . As mentioned above,  $h \bar{a} t \bar{a}^2$ appears in all the cases of the purification offering and the reparation offering. It appears on the surface that those are synonymous, but it has also been suggested above there is some difference. In chapter 4, vv. 13–14 and vv. 22–23 appear to indicate that  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  is synonymous with  $s\bar{a}\bar{g}a\bar{g}(s\bar{a}\bar{g}\bar{a}h)$ , because one can read in such a way that  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ , as it stands at the beginning of the protases and is explicated by the following, refers to the state of a person going astray until realizing his guilt. Lexically,  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  appears to be no different from  $s\bar{a}\bar{g}a\bar{g}$  in a context such as this, which discusses a violation of a certain commandment of the Lord. But, on the other hand, as pointed out above, it is discernible from the phrase  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  $bis^{e}\bar{g}a\bar{g}ah$  (4:2, 27; 5:15) that the sense of  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$  is distinct from the idea of \*šgg (šgh). In this connection, it would be helpful to consider Lev 5:1–4, in which \*šgg(šgh) does not appear, to see what \*šgg(šgh) is not.

#### 1.1.3 Non-mention of \*Sgg (Sgh) in Lev 5:1-4

 $\tilde{S}\bar{a}\bar{g}a\bar{g}$  does not appear in Lev 5:1–4, a section on the so-called graduated purification offering. Before answering why the term does not appear we need to comment on the meaning of each protasis. The text runs as follows;

ן וְגָפָשׁ כִּי־תֶחֲטָא וְשָׁמְעָה קוֹל אָלָה וְהוּא עֵר אוֹ רָאָה אוֹ יָדָע אָם־לוֹא וַגִּיד וְנַשָּׁא עֵוֹנוֹ:

It is clear that this case addresses a situation in which a person, knowing a truth or fact, does not testify, which is a deliberate act. A circumstance is given 'while he hears the curse ( $2\bar{a}l\bar{a}h$ ).' The curse is one that accompanies the covenantal oath, which assumes that the divinity is involved. <sup>6</sup> The reason why the term  $2\bar{a}\bar{s}\bar{e}m$  is not mentioned as in vv. 2, 3, 4 would be that the person, by not testifying, already realizes his guilt. So it is enough to state, 'he bears his guilt.'

5:2, 3, 4 These verses have posed a crux to exegetes, but they also provide some clues to the meanings of \*šgg,  $y\bar{a}da^{c}$  and  $h\bar{a}t\bar{a}^{2}$ .

אוֹ נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תּגַּע בְּכָל־דֶּבָר טָמֵא אוֹ בְנִבְלַת חַיָּה טְמֵאָה אוֹ בְּנָבְלַת 5:2 אוֹ נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תּגַּע בְּכָל־דֶּבָר טָמֵא וְגָעַלם מִמְנוּ וְהוּא טָמֵא וְאֲשֵׁם:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Since this case addresses a deliberate negation of the curse, some exegetes judge that this verse is out of place. E.g., J.R. Porter, Leviticus, 41. See, however, Péter-Contesse, Lévitique, 86. Indeed, this case appears more serious than the cases in chapter 4 or the following three cases in 5:2, 3, 4, but our sense of 'seriousness' ought to be challenged as we argue in the following.

## Scripture Index

Old Testament		16,28 19,10. 14 20,6	30 n.25 121 30 n.25
Genesis		20,20	52 n.2, 63
2-3	17	29,36	107–109, 113–16
2,16-17	17	,	109, 110, 113f.
3-4	70–71	29,38-39.41	109
3	102–106	30,12	75
3,1-8	67	32,31	72
3,6	73	32,32, 34	59
3,7	106	34,9	59
3,8-9	104		
3,8	70	Leviticus	
3,14	105	4-5	1, 2 n.4, 5–32, 29
3,16	105, 106		n.20, 35 n.32, 47,
4,7	68–69, 75		48, 49, 51, 56,72,
4,16	70		83, 85–96, 98
4,26	70	4,1-5,13	34, 42f., 92, 97, 104
13,13	72	4,1-35	87f., 92
20,6	56	4,2	2, 16f., 30 n.25,
31,36	33, 58, 59		33, 35, 36, 45, 84
31,39	107, 116 n.8	4,3–4	117
39,9	56, 78	4,3	25, 115
40,1	50, 56	4,6.7	117
42,22	56, 78	4,13	5, 7ff., 17, 23, 30
43,9	50, 56, 78		n.25, 35f., 56, 115
44,5	74 n.15	4,20	109 n.3
44,32	50, 56, 78	4,22	6,17, 23, 30 n.25, 36
50,17	3, 59	4,23–24	115
		4,23	99
Exodus		4,27–35	92 n.5
7,14	61	4,27	17, 30 n.25, 36, 39
8,11,28	61	4,28–29	115
9,7	61	4,28	99
9,27	57, 63	4,32	115
9,30	57	5,1–13	41, 85, 92
9,34	56f., 61, 66, 72	5,1–4	10-14, 72, 85f.,
10,1	61		88f., 90, 93
15,26	30 n.25	5,1	8, 29 n.20, 57

5,2-4	0f = 10 = 6 = 14	13,44. 46	11
5,2-4 5,2-3	9f., 10 n.6, 14 88	13,44.40	43
5,25 5,34	29 n.20	14,2-7	114
,		,	114 111f.
5,4	69, 88f.	14,48	44
5,5	34	14,13	
5,6–13	90 n.5	14,19	44, 109 n.3
5,6	2 n.3, 87,	14,22	44
5,7	2 n.3	14,30	109 n.3
5,10	109 n.3	14,31	44
5,13	1, 17	14,49	107, 112
5,14	2	14,52	107, 111
5,1426	49, 90	15	43, 102, 103ff., 106
5,14-16	88f.	15,1–18	106
5,15	16, 17–20, 23, 88f.	15,15	44, 109 n.3
5,16	16	15,19	82
5,17–19	8f., 25, 38f., 41, 86f.	15,19–30	106
5,17–18	7–10, 85–87, 90ff.	15,30	44, 109 n.3
5,17	17, 30 n.25, 36, 57, 85	15,31	124
5,18	5	16	97
5,19	87	16,9	109 n.3
5,21-26	50, 72, 89ff.,	16,16.21	32-34, 59, 84
5,21-23	6, 25	16,24	109 n.3
5,21	19-20, 23	16.34	31
5,22-23	85	17,10-11	29 n.20, 117
5,22, 26	17	17,10	29 n.20
6,19	107–10, 113–15	17,11	29 n.20, 117
7,38	31	17,11a	29 n.20
89	46-47	18	49
8	43f., 44f., 46, 48	18,26.29	16
8,5	31	19,17	108f.
8,15	107–108, 110, 114	19,20–22	48-49
8,36	31	20,3	124
9	43f., 46f.	20,20	108
9,6–7	31	21,11	45
9,7	109 n.3	22,9	108
9,15	107f., 110, 113–16	22,14	88
9,16, 22	109 n.3	22,31	30 n.25, 36
9,24	47	24,15	108
11–17	121	24,23	31
11–17	119	24,23	
11-15	44f., 102ff.,104, 120		35 n.32
11-13		26,3.14	30 n.25, 36
	105	26,15	30, 30 n.25, 31
11,4,5,6	11	04.40	n.26, 36
11,42	105	26,40	20
12	43f., 103f., 106	27,33	48
12,2	82	27,34	30 n.25, 31
12,6.8	44		
13	102–104		

134

Numbers		13,7	75 n.17
1,3	75	19,15	59
5,5-8	49	20,18	60
5,7	59	26,17	31 n.26
5,12.27	19	27,10	31 n.26
5,13	12	32,51	20f.
6	43, 48	,	
6,1-21	45	Joshua	
6, 9	45	7,1	19
6,11	41, 43, 45, 47, 63,	7,11	60f., 72f.
· ,	78	7,19	73
6,14	46	7,20	60
7	43	7,21	73
8	43	5,18	75 n.17
8,7	120	24,19	33, 59
8,21	11 <b>9f</b> .	,	
12,8	57	Judges	
12,11	57, 64	10,6-18	73
14	35, 64	10,10.15	72
14,11.40	57, 64	11,27	78
15,22–29	34–40	20,16	51f., 55
15,22-23	34		
15,22	5, 36f., 30 n.25	I Samuel	
15,27	29 n.20	2,17.19	58
15,28	5	12,9–11	73
15,39.40	34, 30 n.25	12,10	72
16,22	72	14,38	58
17,3	29 n.20	15,24	57, 63, 72
19	43, 103, 121–26	15,30	63
19,11	127 n.5	19,5	56
19,12	119	20,1	58f.
19,13	119, 127 n.5	24,12	56
19,19	107, 111ff., 120	26,19	75 n.17
19,20	119, 124	26,21	5, 7, 56f., 72
20,12	20-21		
21,7	72	II Samuel	
22,34	72	11-12	73–74, 93–95
26,1-3	75	12,13	73, 94
31,19.20.23	119	12,13b–14	94
32,23	59, 78	24	75
36,13	30 n.25, 31 n.26	24,1	74f.
		24,10	57, 60, 66, 72, 74
Deuteronomy		24,17	57
1,32.41	57		
4,40	31 n.26	I Kings	
9,16	72	8,33	57, 65
9,18	60	8,35	7, 59, 65
9,21	59	8,47	57, 65f.
9,23	57	8,50	56

12,26-27,30	79	59,2	59, 80f.
13,33–34	79	59,12	33, 59
14,16	59, 79	64,4.6	58
14,22	59f.	65,20b	55
15,3	59		
15,30	59, 79	Jeremiah	
15,34	79	2–3	65
16,2	79	2,19	60
16,13	59	2,35	58, 72
16,19	59, 60, 79	3,6.8.11.12	60
16,26.31	79	3,17	58
17,22	59	3,22	60
18,9	78	3,25	56
18,37	66, 76f.	5,6.25	59f.
21,25	75 n.17	7,24	58
,		8,5	60
II Kings		9,13	58
3,3	79	11,8	58
10,31	79	13,10	58
13,2.6.11	79	14,7	57, 60
14,24	79	14,10	59
15,9.18.24.28	79	14,20	57
17,7–9	77	16,10	57ff., 72
17,7	57, 64	16,12.17	58
17,14	57	16,18	59
17,22	79	17,1	60, 81f.
18,32	75 n.17	17,11	55
21,11	57	18,12	58
21,16	60	18,23	59
21,17	59f.	23,17	58
21,17	571.	31,34	59
Isaiah		33,5	58
1,4.28	56f., 73	33,8	56ff.
3,9	79f.	36,3	59, 71
6,7	59	38,22	75 n.17
28,7	5, 7	43,3	75 n.17
30,1	72, 80	44,15-23	58
33,14	126	44, 32	56
36,18	75 n.17	50,7	72
40,2	59	50,20	59
40,2	78	50,20	59
43,24	59	Ezekiel	
		3,20	57
43,25	33, 59		
43,27	56	3,21	29 n.20, 57
44,2	59	14,13	6
44,22	33, 57, 59, 71	16,51	72,80
53,12	117 n.10	18	65 20 - 20 - 55 - 65
58,1	33, 59	18,4	29 n.20, 55, 65

18,10	17	4,5.6	57,65
18,14	59	18,26-27	76
18,20	57, 65	25,7	33, 59
18,21	57, 59, 71	32	71
18,24	57, 59f., 65	32,5	33, 59f., 71f.
21,29	33, 59	36,4	69
33,10	33, 59	38,19	59
33,12	56f., 65	39,2	57,63
		41,5	29 n.20
33,14	57, 59, 71	,	
33,16	59f.	51,5-6	79
34,6	5	51,4	59, 111f., 114, 116
37,23	56	51,5	33, 59
43,20.22	107, 110f., 113f.	51,6	60
43,23	107, 113	51,9	107, 111–14, 116,
45,18	107, 113		120f.
45,20	5	51,15	56
		55,24	55
Hosea		59,4	33, 59
4,8	59	78,17	72
8,11-13	72	78,22	57
8,13	59f.	78,32	57, 65
9,9	59f.	85,3	59f.
10, 9	56f., 65	104,35	57
10,13	57, 65		57
13,2	72	106,6,12,24	76 n.19
,		109,6	
13,12	59f.	109,14	59
		119,10-11	56
Amos		119,11	57
5,12	33, 59	119,21.67	5
		119,68	69
Micah		119,118	5
1,5.13	59		
3,8	59	Job	
3,11	81	1,1	62, 62 n.7
6,7	59	1,5	61f., 64
7,19	59	1,22	62
		2,3	57, 75 n.17
Habakkuk		2,9-10	91 n.4
2,10	29 n.20, 52, 54f.	2,10	57, 62f.
2,10	29 11.20, 52, 511.	5,24	51f.
Zephaniah		6,24	5, 7
1,12	69		56
1,12	09	8,4	
7.1.1		10,6	59
Zechariah	<b>80</b> 82	10,13	58
13,1-6	82-83	10,14	57f.
13,1	59	12,16	5
		13,23	33, 58f.
Psalms		19,4	5
1,1.5	57	31,30	63

138	Scriptu	re Index	
33,27	57	Daniel	
34,37	33	9,5,15	57
35,6	56	9,20	59
41,17	119, 125f.	9,24	33, 59
Proverbs		Nehemiah	
5,19.20	5	1,6	59
5,22	59	3,37	59
5,23	5	6,13	57, 60
8,35-36	52f., 54	9,2	59f.
8,36	29 n.20, 51, 55	9,29	60
11,31	57	-	
13,21,22	57f.	I Chronicles	
16,29	53	21,1	75f.
17,26	53	21,8	57, 60, 72
18,5	53	21,17	57
19,2	29 n.20, 51, 53f., 55	22,1	76
19,27	5		
20,1	5	II Chronicles	
20,2	29 n.20, 52, 54f.	6,37	57
20,9	60	7,14	59
20,23	53	29,24	107f., 112f.
21,4	60		
23,27	57		
25,27	53	New Testame	nt
28,21	53		
		Luke	
Ecclesiastes		23,40-43	95 n.6
7,20	57		
8,12	57	Rom	
		7,7–8	17
Lamentations			
4,13	59	James	
4,22	59	2,10-11	17
5,7	57		

## Author Index

Budd, P., 45
Cogan, M./Tadmor, H., 78
Greenberg, M., 76
Knohl, I., 30
Licht, J., 45f.
Marx, A., 103
Milgrom, J., 13, 16, 18, 30, 33, 34, 45, 91, 101
Oswalt, J.N., 80

Paran, M., 112 Péter-Contesse, R., 2f. Porter, J.R., 43 Rendtorff, R., 18 Sarna, N., 75 Schwartz, B., 48f. Weiss, M., 62f. Wenham, G.J., 88 Wright, D.P., 101, 107

#### Hebrew Word Index

ארם 29 n.20, 49, 127 n.5 אָתָה (אֶחָד) 16f., 28f. 10,88 אַלָה \*אכזן 57 -Hiph. 21, 64f. 122 אַפָר אשם\* 1-2 口哎咪 1 n.2, 2 n.3, 49, 89 (see also Reparation offering) בשֶׂאָ 2, 7, 7 n.3, 10f., 24, 27, 30 n.22 דטה 57, 64f. 48 בַּקֹרֵת 31 בִּרִית \*עור Qai 126 105 גַּרוֹז Pi. 59 גלה\* נעל 20f. 6 רָבָר 106 רָם 53 רַעָת 60 1 זכר 59 \*52, 78 n.23 মণ্ড্ন See also Hiding oneself. - basic meaning of 24-27 - traditional meaning of 51-55 - followed by 24 n.16, 51

- followed by 🤉 16, 51 - followed by 75 16-18 - in relation to "שגה/ שנה/ שנה 5-15 - in relation to מַעַל/ מָעַל 18-22 - in relation to שנה,שנג \*/ נַזעַל 23 - in relation to other synonyms 57f. - in relation to יָרָא 52, 52 n.2, 57, 63f., 67, 77 - in relation to קמד 73 - with 28-29, 29 n.20 - with we as its object 54f. - in relation to \*שוב 64 - in relation to אמן\* Hiph./ בַטָּה 64f. - Pi. 41f., 101, 107-118, 119-121, 124f. - Hiph. 51f., 55 - Hithpa. 119-127 108 הַטָּא דעאה 72 See also Hiding oneself. - meaning of 41f., 44f., 47f. – הְשָאת offering 1 n.2, 41f., 102 - in relation to yg 33 - other related terms of 59f., 68f. - preceded by lekol 33, 84 דומה 73 (see also Covetousness) Pi. 77f., 78 n.23 ⊓Pi. חקות 30f. 19,61 הֵרָם See also Cleanness טָהֶר - Qal 111f., 114, 119, 122 - Pi. 108, 110, 114, 120

- Hithpa. 120

שמא 11ff., 43, 101f., 104, 108, 119 \*אל Ni. 57 ידה\* - Hiph. 65, 71 - Hithpa. 24, 34, 59 See also Consciousness -Qal 8f., 11-12 - Niph. 25 - Hiph. 25, 59 \*כט⊂ Hiph. 69 \*יסף Hiph. 72 יַעַץ 54 52, 57, 63f., 67, 77, 126 יֵרָא 030 110ff., 120f. 80 <u>כ</u>חָד Ø∏⊇ 19ff., 25 33 כַּל 59,71 COT 111, 120 כפר 57, 60, 66 Hiph. 112 לבן\* 73 לַקַח 72 מאר 20 0%0 \*Niph. 59 מחה 16-17 כָּז 1, 3, 5, 18–22, 24, 26, 56, 85, 88-89 קצא 53, 59 מצות 30f., 35–37, 88, 92 60 מְשָׁבָה 70 מְשֵׁל סיטפטים 30f. 59,82 נדה ພ້ອງ 28f., 29 n.20, 39, 52-55, 127 28 נשיא \*חות Hiph. 75

םכל\* - Niph./ Hiph. 57 \*כתר 58f. 80 - Niph. 70 - Hiph. הָסָתִיר פַּנִים 58, 80f. 72, 74 סָתָר \*עבר Hithpa. 54 ער 8 \*עוה Qal/Hiph. 57 עון 27, 34, 57, 59 (see also Guilt) עזַב 72 \*עלם Niph. 3, 6, 9, 11–13 עשה 17, 25, 36, 59f., 109 Hithpa. 65 פלל\* 70, 80 פַנִים 3, 33, 59, 81, 135 ມໝັງ 56,84 109 פר 57 צַרִּיק \*מְצָוֹת Pi. 31 (see also מְצָוֹת) נפן 57ff. 103, 111ff., 115 צַרַשָּת 21 קרש\* – Pi. 121 -Hiph. 21 קרשים) קרשים) קרשים) 17f., 88 \*ראה Qal/Niph. 59, 73 69 רָבַץ \*רעע Qal/Hiph. 57 79 רע \*עמע Qal/Hiph. 56f. 57 רשע ໄປຢູ່ 76 n.19 \*אוֹש Pi. 53 110 שֵׂעִיר

\*שבע אבע לישָקר אַגרישָׁק 20, 25 אַגרישָׁק 5ff., 9f., 13ff., 21, 23ff., 35, 41 6, 8, 21, 23, 31, 38f., 84, 87, 91 \*ביד 57, 64f., 67, 71, 98 אַרָשָ אָשָרָ אַרָשָ 110 גער 73 גער 112

אָמָע 81 שְׁמָר 36,58 שְׁרְרוּת לֵב שִׁרְרוּת לֵב קוֹדָה – קוֹדָה קשׁוּקה 69f.

#### 142

#### Subject Index

Abel 70,75 Achan 72f. Adam & Eve 17, 67, 70, 73, 103f., 106 Anger 54, 74f., 78, 99 Atonement 93, 98, 117, 120 - in the purificatory ritual 93 - the day of 32-34, 107 - scope on the day of 33 Apostasy 60 (see also Idolatry) Bathsheba incident See David Blood 34, 102, 106ff., 110-17, 121 Cain 69f., 75 Chewing the cud 105 Cleanness 48, 101ff., 105f., 111, 114, 116f. (see also קיהר) Commandments. - all the commandments 29, 36f. - breach of one commandment 17, 27ff. - scope of 30ff., 35, 35 n.32, 98 - impracticability of 48 Confession of "sin" 63ff., 73f., 79, 83, 97 (see also "רדה" Hithpa.) Consciousness/unconsciousness - degrees of 9, 14, 72, 86 Covetousness 73, 99 (see also קמר) David 72, 79, 96 - Bathsheba incident 73f., 93ff. - and a census 66, 74ff. Death 17, 32, 45, 57, 103, 105

- the death penalty 48, 84, 94

Elijah - His intercession 66, 76f. Exile, 78 - the Assyrian 64f., 77, 79 - the Babylonian 58 Face, divine 58, 63f., 67, 69f., 75ff., 80f., 99 Fall, the 68, 70, 102-106 Fear of God 52 n.2, 63f., 98 (see also ירא) Forgiveness 38, 59, 71, 94f., 98 Guilt 10, 24, 27, 30 n.22, 34, 57f., 67f., 71, 87 (see also עָוֹן) - realize guilt 7 n.2, 8, 10f., 13f., 24f., 29 n.20, 41, 49, 73, 87, 93, 102, 108 (see also □₩N) Hardening of heart 35 n.32, 61, 63, 65 Hāțā' See also Hiding oneself, הַטָא - basic meaning of 24-27 - different from inadvertence (שַׁנג/שֶׁנָה) 41-45, 87f. - difficulty in the traditional meaning of 2f., 44, 51-55 - nature of 27-30, 45, 83f. Hattā't See also Hiding oneself, הטאת. - basic meaning of 41f., 44f., 47f. - in relation to natural uncleanness 42f., 44 in consecration and dedication 42–46 Hattā't (offering) 41f., 47

Hiding oneself See also NOT and חטאת. - human heart as its locus 15, 29f., 57f., 60-68, 75f., 78, 80, 82f., 88, 96-98 - degrees of 25, 49, 72, 78f., 80, 83, 88, 90, 92, 97 - its meaning being existential 26f., 63, 67, 73, 83, 94 - by human lips 13, 63 - pride and coveting 99 - in relation to the 1st commandment 63f., 67, 97 - in relation to the 10th commandment 29, 73, 97 - in relation to the altar 81f. - in relation to providence 76f. - as punishment 55, 76f., 76, 78, 99 - in relation to punishment 32, 34, 71, 77, 95, 97ff., 103 - more than the moral 2, 48, 101 Hiding of face, divine 58, 75, 80f., 99 Hithatta? 119-26 Hitte? 107-18 Holiness 45f., 116 Holy 45-48, 75f., 88f., 91, 97, 102, 114-17 Holy objects 18, 21, 26, 31, 45, 86, 88, 108, 114 Hoof, divided 105 Hypocrisy 29, 72-83, 95f. Idolatry 66, 72, 76ff., 83 Inadvertence 5f., 14f., 20f., 23, 25f., 31, 38ff., 41, 45, 56, 85f., 90 (see also (שַׁנֵג/שָׁנָה) - leniently viewed 39, 87 Jeroboam 66,79 Job 52, 58, 61-64 Kāret-penalty 29 n.20, 32, 44, 124 Knowing (the guilt) See יֵרְע

Laundering 119ff., 127 Māʿal - meaning of 18-21 - psychological factor of 20f. Nazirite 40, 43, 45-47, 63 - holines of the 45f. - rationale for the  $hatta^{2}t$  46 Oath 10, 12ff., 18, 21f., 88f., 90 Omniscience, divine 89 Prayer 80f. Prophecy, false 83 Purification See also ℵ@⊓ - as decontamination 41, 102, 107 - as an uncovering process 41, 102, 106, 112 Purification offeirng 1ff., 7, 9, 10, 15, 22, 26, 29, 31f., 34, 38-45, 47, 49, 56, 83, 85-93, 97, 107ff., 116, 123 (see also (קטאת) - paradoxes of 90-96 Purification water 111, 119-126 Purity 101, 116f., 120, 122 (see also Uncovering, NUT) Red heifer 119, 121, 123f. Reparation offering 1ff., 9, 15, 21, 22, 26, 31ff., 41, 45f., 48f., 56, 83, 85-96 (see also □₩N) - nature and purpose of 18f., 86-92 - for an inter-human case 49f. Repentance 20, 30 n.22, 63, 65, 94 (see also שוב\*, אָשָׁם) Satan 76, 76 n.19 Serpent 68, 70f., 105 Sin See Hiding oneself Slave-girl, betrothed 48f.

Stubbornness 35 n.32, 58, 65, 68, 78, 80, 97, 98 (see also שָׁרִרוּת לֵב)	- and sanctuary 47f., 82, 101f., 117, 123f., 126f.
Ten Commandments, the 36	<ul> <li>degrees of 104, 121, 125, 126f.</li> <li>as a detergent-like entity 106f., 116</li> <li>difference from "sin" 2f., 29f., 37, 96</li> </ul>
Uncovering 42, 74, 83, 97, 101f.,106f., 112, 116f., 116 n.8, 118 n.12, 120, 125ff. (see also Purity,Purification)	<ul> <li>- in relation to the presence of the Lord 47f, 102, 104ff., 112, 115, 124</li> <li>- in relation to the fall 70, 102–106</li> <li>- menstrual 82, 103, 106</li> </ul>
נרָה מָמָא Uncleanness See also	
- meaning of $47f.$ , $101-104$ - <i>a</i> -moral character of $48$ , $101$	Wrath of God 58, 73–76, 83 (see also Anger)

- and death 102f., 119, 121f., 124, 127

#### Forschungen zum Alten Testament Herausgegeben von Bernd Janowski und Hermann Spieckermann

#### Alphabetische Übersicht

Barthel, Jörg: Prophetenwort und Geschichte. 1997. Band 19. - siehe Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen. Baumann, Gerlinde: Die Weisheitsgestalt in Proverbien 1-9. 1996. Band 16. Bodendorfer, Gerhard und Matthias Millard (Hrsg.): Bibel und Midrasch. Unter Mitarbeit von B. Kagerer. 1998. Band 22. Chapman, Stephen B.: The Law and the Prophets. 2000. Band 27. Diße, Andreas: siehe Groß, Walter. Ego, Beate: siehe Janowski, Bernd. Emmendörffer, Michael: Der ferne Gott. 1997. Band 21. Groß, Walter: Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa. Unter Mitarb. von A. Diße und A. Michel. 1996. Band 17. Hanhart, Robert: Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum. 1999. Band 24. Hausmann, Jutta: Studien zum Menschenbild der älteren Weisheit (Spr 10ff). 1995. Band 7. Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen: Studien zu Prophetie und Weisheit. Hrsg. von J. Barthel, H. Jauss und K. Koenen 1998. Band 23. Huwyler, Beat: Jeremia und die Völker. 1997. Band 20. Janowski, Bernd und Ego, Beate (Hrsg.): Das biblische Weltbild und seine altorientalischen Kontexte. 2001. Band 32. Janowski, Bernd und Stuhlmacher, Peter (Hrsg.): Der Leidende Gottesknecht. 1996. Band 14. Jauss, Hannelore: siehe Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen. Jeremias, Jörg: Hosea und Amos. 1996. Band 13. Kagerer, Bernhard: siehe Bodendorfer, Gerhard. Knierim, Rolf P.: Text and Concept in Leviticus 1:1-9. 1992. Band 2. Köhlmoos, Melanie: Das Auge Gottes. 1999. Band 25. Koenen, Klaus: siehe Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen. Kratz, Reinhard Gregor: Kyros im Deuterojesaja-Buch. 1991. Band 1. Lange, Armin: Vom prophetischen Wort zur prophetischen Tradition. 2002. Band 34. Michel, Andreas: siehe Groß, Walter. Millard, Matthias: Die Komposition des Psalters. 1994. Band 9. - siehe Bodendorfer, Gerhard. Niemann, Hermann Michael: Herrschaft, Königtum und Staat. 1993. Band 6. Otto, Eckart: Das Deuteronomium im Pentateuch und Hexateuch. 2001. Band 30. Perlitt, Lothar: Deuteronomium-Studien. 1994. Band 8. Podella, Thomas: Das Lichtkleid JHWHs. 1996. Band 15. Rösel, Martin: Adonaj - Warum Gott 'Herr' genannt wird. 2000. Band 29. Ruwe, Andreas: "Heiligkeitsgesetz" und "Priesterschrift". 1999. Band 26. Schaper, Joachim: Priester und Leviten im achämenidischen Juda. 2000. Band 31. Schenker, Adrian (Hrsg.): Studien zu Opfer und Kult im Alten Testament. 1992. Band 3. Schmidt, Brian B .: Israel's Beneficent Dead. 1994. Band 11. Schöpflin, Karin: Theologie als Biographie im Ezechielbuch. 2002. Band 36. Spieckermann, Hermann: Gottes Liebe zu Israel. Band 33. Steck, Odil Hannes: Gottesknecht und Zion. 1992. Band 4. Stuhlmacher, Peter: siehe Janowski, Bernd. Weber, Cornelia: Altes Testament und völkische Frage. 2000. Band 28. Weippert, Manfred: Jahwe und die anderen Götter. 1997. Band 18. Willi, Thomas: Juda - Jehud - Israel. 1995. Band 12. Young, Ian: Diversity in Pre-Exilic Hebrew. 1993. Band 5. Zwickel, Wolfgang: Der Tempelkult in Kanaan und Israel. 1994. Band 10.

Einen Gesamtkatalog erhalten Sie gerne vom Verlag Mohr Siebeck • Postfach 2040 • D-72010 Tübingen. Neueste Informationen im Internet unter http://www.mohr.de