INSTRUCTIONS FROM AUTHOR TO LIBRARY FOR THESES AND PRIZE ESSAYS

AUTHOR Richard Myles Litvak

TITLE "The Moral Transformation of Cultic Provisions in Rabbinic Homilies"

TYPE OF THESIS: Ph.D. [ ] D.H.L. [ ] Rabbinic [XXX]

Master's [ ] Prize Essay [ ]

1. May circulate [X]) Not necessary
2. Is restricted [ ] for ___ years.) for Ph.D.) thesis

Note: The Library shall respect restrictions placed on theses or prize essays for a period of no more than ten years.

I understand that the Library may make a photocopy of my thesis for security purposes.

3. The Library may sell photocopies of my thesis. X yes ___ no

3/1/77
Date

Richard Myles Litvak
Signature of Author

Library Record

Microfilmed Date 7/5/77

Laura Steinberg
Signature of Library Staff Member

THE MORAL TRANSFORMATION OF CULTIC PROVISIONS IN RABBINIC HOMILIES

RICHARD MYLES LITVAK

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Ordination

Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion

Cincinnati, 1977

Referee: Prof. Jakob J. Petuchowski

To Nancy, my patient and loving wife.

DIGEST

This thesis has been concerned with the moralization of cultic provisions in rabbinic homilies. In it we have traced the development of one trend of rabbinic interpretation of the Biblical cult which emphasized the moral and interpersonal aspects of life as the elements of pious worship. This view of the cult provided moral interpretations of the meaning and significance of the cultic center, personnel, and offerings. Such a perspective emphasized and expanded the moral elements of the cult while de-emphasizing the more literal dimensions of cultic levitical provisions. The Torah, rather than the sacrificial center, became the central instrument of salvation, while leadership was shifted from the priesthood to the hasid and tzadik. Sacrifice itself became the offerings of justice, humility, kindness, modesty, study, and interpersonal sensitivity. The cultic provisions in this trend of rabbinic interpretation became symbolic representations of non-cultic offerings.

We began with an outline of the general nature of the concept of the moralization of the cult as we described above. We then amassed the crucial passages of the Torah which outline the central provisions of the sacrificial cult. Having examined these passages, we gathered rabbinic homilies concerning them from rabbinic literature of the first to ninth centuries. Passages which exemplified a tendency towards moralization were collected and reviewed for patterns of both continuity and innovation.

We were able to note that the literal meaning of the sacrificial

cult is not only problematic for many contemporary Jews but elicited moralizing interpretations which reach back to the earliest rabbinic period. We found that the view of God expressed in this trend of rabbinic thought provided a legitimation for the central values and institutions of rabbinic religious experience. Not levitical sacrifice, but sublimated expressions of the highest aspects of human character and behavior, constitute the proper expression of piety. In the end, we were able to see the central significance of this trend of rabbinic interpretation: rabbinic moralization of the cult served as the means for the transformation of the institutions and authorities of the Biblical cult into those of Rabbinic Judaism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

Since the Emancipation and Enlightenment period, Jews have been exposed to a host of new influences. Major centers of Jewish life have been destroyed and new centers have arisen in the United States and Israel. Leadership of the community has shifted in many cases from rabbis to Federation executives. Secularization has relegated Judaism to the ranks of privatized religious experience and ethnic identification. Much of our heritage has been viewed through the eyes of scientific investigation, and understanding has come to rest at the literal level of analysis. Our rituals have been treated more as an early form of science than as a spiritual enterprise possessing nuances of art and literature. In many cases, such an approach has inevitably led to the rejection of the past as primitive, archaic, and unsophisticated.

In the face of these crises in contemporary Jewish life, it is not unreasonable to ask if a more imaginative understanding of the past might not aid a more fruitful and imaginative future. Though sweeping comparisons are dangerous, it is not unsound to focus our attention on responses to a previous crisis in Jewish history. Certainly the period after the fall of the Second Temple was also a time of great turmoil, of new intellectual influence, and of radical social change. International trade, exposure to Hellenistic thought and culture, urbanization of a rural population, and the destruction of the central institution of Jewish life were bound to have radically challenged the thoughts and

traditions of the past.

The days that followed the fall of the Second Temple were in certain ways not unlike those that followed the French Revolution. The new concerns which developed in the rabbinic period were in many ways similar to the concerns which since 1789 have developed among contemporary Jews. While there are significant differences, we find in both cases a new emphasis on the individual, a new concern with the problems of justice and theodicy, intense competition between differing systems of values, and a great gulf between the institutions and beliefs of the past and those of the present moment. This is not to say that most of these elements were not present in the milieu of the Biblical cult. However, the social and intellectual influences of the rabbinic period did bring them to the foreground in a new and heightened manner. The Weltanschauung of the rabbinic mind was certainly not the same as the world view of the majority of contemporary Jews. We find, however, in both instances, Jews confronted with the need to find continuity in the midst of radical change. Several centuries have passed since the French Sanhedrin and many more since the year 70 C.E. Not all responses to either have even been uniform but certain trends of response have developed.

We will be studying one particular rabbinic trend of thought which attempted to find continuity and meaning through the moralization of Biblical cultic provisions in rabbinic homilies. It is an approach which utilized the imaginative rather than the literal faculty as its primary tool. For those who today are concerned with finding continuity and meaning in traditional forms in the midst of radical change, it presents an interesting model.

Our study of this trend of rabbinic response to the destruction of the Temple must first come to terms with the meaning of the temple cult in Israelite religion. Then we must assess the impact of the sudden loss of temple sacrifices on the religious life of the people. Finally, we must determine what resources for continued meaning and significance were available for rabbinic adaptation.

When we turn to the major works of scientific Biblical criticism on the subject of the cult, we encounter a diverse field of opinion regarding the significance of sacrificial offering. Scholarly views occupy a continuum between two poles of interpretation. At one end is the approach which was propounded by George Buchanan Gray in his study, Sacrifice in the Old Testament.[1] According to his view, cultic sacrifices were primarily gifts to the deity, given to secure the blessings of life and expiation of sin.[2] Among contemporary exponents of this theory, Baruch Levine is perhaps the leading supporter. In his study of the cult, In the Presence of the Lord, he stresses that "cult was the stuff of ancient religions, not because it expressed lofty notions of an abstract character, but because it worked to secure the blessings of life for people individually and collectively."[3] Going beyond Gray's theory of the sacrificial gift, he explores the magical qualities of the cultic sacrificial system. These rest upon the foundation of a belief that destructive or demonic forces attracted by sin could endanger the deity and cause His presence to depart.[4] The blood rituals of expiation addressed themselves in a magical way to the pacification and elimination of these actualized evil forces, creating the purity necessary for God's indwelling presence.[5] From this end of the continuum, we would judge the destruction of the Temple as a major crisis in which

the central means of worship was completely destroyed and the maintenance of blessing and purity was no longer possible.

The opposite end of the continuum is expressed by Yehezkel Kaufmann in his study, The Religion of Israel.[6] God does not need or desire to be fed by Israel nor do magical rituals have any role in cultic worship.[7] There may be some exhibition of seemingly magical activity, such as the presentation of offerings in the form of a meal, but this represents the mere conservation of forms, emptied of magical meaning.[8] In addition, impurity is not an active autonomous force but a condition, "a religious-aesthetic state."[9] The elimination of independent spiritual forces is the very essence of the innovation of Israelite monotheism.

Levine comments directly on Kaufmann's approach, providing examples of magical rituals in the Biblical cult which he feels Kaufmann overlooks. According to comparative studies of ancient Near Eastern literature, he judges the goat which is sent to Azazel on Yom Kippur as Biblical testimony to the independence of other spiritual forces.[10] Kaufmann regards this event as still within the realm of God's control and direction.[11] The story of the use of a copper snake by Moses to cure the snake bites of the people and drive away the snakes, is for Levine proof that once the mashhit--the evil forces--have been released, only magical means can control them.[12] Kaufmann treats this whole incident as strictly non-magical, since it is God himself who commands and directs the fashioning of the copper instrument.[13] Whether we regard one position or the other as a more valid reflection of the realities of the temple cult, we can see that the reaction to the destruction of the Temple would be judged quite differently by those who saw it not as an institution of gifts to the deity but one form of obedience to the Divine will.

What is particularly interesting is the convergence of Gray and Kaufmann regarding the Biblical sources of spiritual continuity, employed by the rabbis after the destruction of the Temple. For both, the prophetic voice is the one which is heard in the rabbinic treatment of the cult. In Sacrifice and the Old Testament we read:

> In brief we may say the tenor of their (the prophets') teaching was not gifts but fellowhsip; but the way to fellowship which they pointed out was not through the existing sacrificial system re-interpreted, but through conduct.... Thus the prophets prepared the way for a religion in which sacrificial gifts of material objects would or need play no part.[14]

Citing the words of the prophets in the mouth of R. Johanan ben Zakkai, Gray provides his fullest exposition of the direct link between the prophetic and rabbinic treatment of the cult in the days after 70 C.E.

> Not gifts but justice, not sacrifice but mercy; that is the prophetic teaching of the O. T....and (it) was used by Johanan ben Zakkai to prove that, though Temple and altar had perished, the heart of religion could still beat.[15]

Kaufmann agrees that the levitical purpose of the cult had not yet evolved to the spiritual level of rabbinic Judaism but it was in many ways an important stage in the development of the prophetic, and later, the rabbinic spiritual stance. The priestly laws of the Torah represent the first stage of the transformation of pagan religion.[16] The mythological-magic basis of worship was eliminated and impurity became a condition rather than an independent and active force.[17] But rabbinic Judaism incorporated the prophetic evaluation of the cult which represents still another stage of spiritual development beyond that of the cultic transformation of pagan religion. It is this difference between the cultic level of Israelite religion and the prophetic/rabbinic understanding of the cult which Kaufmann describes when he says:

> To laws for which no rational explanation could be found the

> rabbis applied the general principle: 'The commandments were given only for the purpose of purifying men' (Gen. Rab. 44:1) (102). But this idea is not yet present in the Torah. The commands are not conceived there as intrinsically indifferent 'decrees' whose sole purpose is to discipline man to obey God. On the contrary, there appears a strong and alive faith in the inner significance of all the rites--though to be sure not in a magical sense.[18]

We then have reached some level of agreement between authorities from both ends of the spectrum regarding the Biblical sources of spiritual continuity and meaning available for rabbinic adaptation after the fall of the Second Temple. Both Gray and Kaufmann testify to the influence of the prophetic portrayal of the cult on the rabbinic treatment of the cultic institutions. It is the message of the prophets rather than that of the Torah which is reflected in the rabbinic understanding of the cult as obedience to God. The same is the source of the rabbinic image of pious offering as justice and mercy rather than sacrificial animals.

While both authors agree to the prophetic influence on the rabbinic treatment of the cult, they differ in their assessment of the contribution of the priestly cult itself to the development of those rabbinic views. The point of contention is the degree to which the rabbinic moralization of the cult is already contained in priestly provisions. The underlying issue is that of continuity or total innovation. According to Gray and Levine who see the cult as a series of magical gifts, the jump to a non-magical, non-propitiatory form of religious expression after 70 C.E. must be understood as a large one. To Kaufmann, on the other hand, who finds the elimination of the magical feeding of the deity in the monotheism of the Israelite cult, the conception of worship as demanding not gifts but obedience to God is just one more stage of spiritual development in the history of Jewish religious expression.

Whatever role we give to the prophetic influences, we must be aware of the overemphasis of both Gray and Kaufmann. We will find that prophetic passages do play an important role in the moral transformation of the cult in rabbinic literature. Their imprint is particularly profound in the development of the rabbinic orientation toward expiation and atonement. But we must not limit ourselves merely to the prophetic pronouncements as sources for the development of the rabbinic moralization of the cult. In addition, Gray and Kaufmann can be somewhat misleading in their emphasis on the trend of rabbinic thought with which we will be particularly concerned. We must be aware of the fact that this tendency is not the only view nor even the prevailing view of the cult in rabbinic literature. Examples of an opposite understanding of the significance of the cult in rabbinic homilies will appear throughout our study. There are many layers and many dimensions to the rabbinic treatment of the cult, but the trend towards moralization of the cult in the midrash will be the emphasis of our study. If taken with a balanced view, we can, with Gray and Kaufmann, place the prophets at the beginning of our list of the sources of continuity of this approach to the cult in Biblical and rabbinic literature.

Two particularly interesting studies by Chanan Brichto and Jacob Milgrom focus on the importance of the cult for the satisfaction of human rather than Divine needs.[19] Both concern themselves with the unconscious dimensions of the cult. Brichto brilliantly elucidates the sota test, the examination of the suspected adulteress, as a ritual with an underlying psychological purpose. Faced with a jealous husband, an innocent wife was hard pressed to free herself from her husband's suspicions. The non-commission of adultery is a difficult thing to establish.

In the absence of proof that she was guilty, but in the presence of the suspicions of her spouse, she could be given the test. If she were indeed culpable, the symptoms of hysterical pregnancy might indeed be brought on by the solemnity of the temple ritual and the repressed feelings of guilt. The symptoms would be the swelling of the belly and the lack of menses.[20] On the other hand, if she were innocent, her husband would be restrained from jealousy by the positive proof of the test. While the study seems to have gone to the heart of the significance of the ritual, we must judge its impact on the rabbinic view of the cult as minimal. It was abolished by Johanan ben Zakkai while the Temple was still in existence, due to the pressures of the "new morality" of the period.[21] Since it required the solemnity of the Temple setting for its full effect on the unconscious, it is clear that this aspect of its significance would have been lost in the period after the destruction of Jerusalem and the cultic center.

An examination of the treatment of the asham by Milgrom is equally problematic as a source of priestly influence on rabbinical traditions. According to his study, anxiety was created by the fear of defilement which could be acquired by the inadvertent trespass of almost any commandment.[22] This fear could become so great that a person could become immobilized. The asham allowed the reparation of inadvertent trespass and the elimination of the anxiety which accompanied such suspicions.[23] This insight into the asham gives us, as did the study of the sota, a more penetrating understanding of the unconscious forces at work in the dynamics of the Biblical cult. It certainly shows us how the cult functioned to gratify the personal needs of the individual Jew. It does, however, have the crucial debility of focusing on the appeasement of

God and the fear of displeasing the deity as its primary motivation. In addition to the fact that these are unconscious motivations in many instances, they do not give us a view of the asham as a source of the spirituality we mentioned before as that begun in prophetic literature and expanded in the rabbinic treatment of the cult.

Büchler's treatment of the sources which influenced the rabbinic moralization of the cult provides an important antidote to the over-emphasis of prophetic pronouncements. In his Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, we find evidence that moral sensitivities were already attached to the cult in the Biblical period in both cultic provisions and prophetic preaching.[24] In both sources, immoral behavior, in addition to levitical impurity, was seen as a source of cultic defilement. We find in Jeremiah that the land is defiled by idolatry (Jer. 2:4-28). Levitical codes (Lev. 18:20-23) record that adultery, sodomy, bestiality, and sacrificing children to Molech create defilement. The suspected adulteress is referred to as the nitmaah, the defiled one (Numb. 5:13). We see in Numbers 35:33-34 that the shedding of blood pollutes the land and forces God's presence to depart.

Büchler stresses the unbroken continuity of Biblical and rabbinic views regarding the creation of defilement through the moral transgressions of idolatry, bloodshed, and sexual lewdness.[25] The examples cited above testify to the diversity of the sources of this continuity. The connection of these Biblical passages and later rabbinic views can be most clearly seen in a rabbinic portrayal of Deuteronomy 24:24, "Thou shalt not cause the land to sin." "Just as taking back a divorced wife defiles the land and causes God's presence to withdraw, how much

the more so for idolatry, immorality, and bloodshed."[26]

The final point of significance from Büchler's study relevant to our project is the rabbinic portrayal of the non-levitical means for purging of sin. Having traced one source of concern for moral defilement to elements of the levitical cult, it is important to find out if such non-levitical impurities can be eliminated in a non-cultic manner. The rabbinic view that suffering of all kinds coupled with repentance and premature death purifies the soul from sin, provides us with testimony to the existence of non-cultic forms of expiation which were regarded as effective in rabbinic literature.[27]

If Büchler emphasizes the sources of continuity between Biblical and rabbinic views of the cult, J. B. Brown gives equal attention to the dynamics of innovation in the rabbinic moralization of cultic provisions and institutions. In Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism, Brown brings to our attention the remorse, anxiety, and immobility which gripped various segments of the Jewish community after the destruction of the Second Temple.[28] Against the backdrop of this situation, certain rabbinic interpretations appeared which helped to ease the strain of loss. According to Jochanan ben Zakkai, acts of lovingkindness still remained to provide atonement for the people.[29] Similarly, reading and study of scriptural passages on sacrifice, prayer, fasting, almsgiving, and other actions served as surrogates for sacrificial offerings.[30] Brown considers the process of transformation of the cult to have occurred in stages over time after the destruction of the cultic center. It began with the expression of equivalency, that is, keilu, or things that were as if sacrifices had been offered.[31] The process reached a conclusion with the replacements by (binkom) and the superiori-

ty of surrogate actions.[32] The entire movement was in his opinion an attempt to preserve sacrifice by rendering its inner meaning.[33] We would differ with this explanation which stresses the dichotomy of internal and external elements. We, rather, perceive a dynamic emphasizing and expanding some elements of cultic significance and deemphasizing other aspects of the cult.

The treatment of the cult by Brown, is in some ways based upon Raphael Patai's earlier study of the symbolism of the Temple.[34] At the conclusion of Man and Temple, Patai actually provides a wider view of the process of the moral transformation of the cult.[35] He includes not only the moralization of the sacrificial offerings, but also the transformation of cultic leadership. Emphasis is given to the shift from the importance of the priest to that of the hasid and tzadik.

Having raised the ideas of Brown and Patai concerning one trend of rabbinic portrayal of the cult, our purpose will be to further investigate these ideas. We will examine the development of sacrificial surrogates and the shift in religious leadership away from the authority of the cultic priesthood. Unlike Brown, we do not posit a steady or unified development of this trend of rabbinic thought. In fact, as we warned earlier against seeing this aspect of rabbinic thought as the predominant rabbinic opinion, so, too, do we caution here against Brown's view of any systematic pattern of development. Nonetheless, while there were many layers and aspects to the rabbinic portrayal of the cult, we will find that the rabbinic moralization of cultic institutions was certainly a significant trend in the rabbinic response to the crisis of the loss of the sacrificial center.

Our hypothesis is that one trend of rabbinic thought sought to

transform the cult and its provisions through the process of moralization in rabbinic homilies. Transformation implies both continuity and change. It conveys the need to accept both the importance of the cult and the problematic nature of its requirements after the destruction of the Second Temple. Since lambs and levitical offerings were no longer possible, it was necessary to turn to available Biblical sources which would deemphasize this particular aspect of worship and piety. Our view is that both priestly and prophetic passages which stressed the moral basis of cultic purity and moral action as a pious offering, served as a foundation for the rabbinic moralization of the cult.

Included in the moralization or moral transformation of the sacrificial cult is a series of attitudes towards the religious significance of cultic institutions and provisions. We find a concern for moral rectitude as the primary criterion of cultic purity. The focus of the cult is not the feeding of God, but the spiritual development of man. Ritual offerings and levitical institutions represent lessons in ethical behavior and interpersonal sensitivity. Sacrifices themselves are transformed from animal offerings to human actions and attitudes. Good deeds, sexual modesty, ecological concern, peaceful and respectful interpersonal relations, prayer, study, suffering, fasting, and death, all become exemplary offerings to God which are symbolized by institutions and provisions of the cult. Leadership is shifted from the priestly clan to the <u>hasid</u> and <u>tzadik</u>, who earn their authority by virtue of their exhibition of the moral qualities and actions cited above. Finally, the process of the moralization of the cult includes an emphasis not on the Temple, but on the Torah as the central institution of salvation and religious authority

Our methodology will be straightforward. We have divided the major

institutions of the cult into five categories: 1) the olah or burnt offering; 2) the shelamim or peace offerings; 3) the kapparah or general expiatory offering, 4) the hattat and asham or the exclusively expiatory sin and guilt offerings; and 5) the mishkan/Temple or cultic center. Significant Biblical passages detailing the provisions of each of these institutions will be amassed and reviewed in the light of scientific Biblical scholarship. We will then sift through expositions of these Biblical passages which are found in the rabbinic literature of the first to ninth centuries, searching for those which exhibit the moralizing tendencies mentioned above, in regard to the cult. Special emphasis will be placed upon the Mishna and Gemara and the major collections of tannaitic and aggadic midrashim in the period just cited. We will be looking for the process of the development of moralization of the cult, but in a very cautious way, as our previous warning has indicated. It will be of particular interest to view evidence of both continuity with the past and significant innovation in this trend of rabbinic treatment of the sacrificial cult.

As we turn now to our analysis, we must add finally that we will use the terms moralization, moral transformation, and sublimation of the cult interchangeably. By sublimation, we mean a process which is not unlike the psychological understanding of the term. It is the channeling of energies and concerns into constructive attitudes and activities. The moralization of the cult as we have outlined it includes a system of piety which is both a continuation and expansion of Biblical Judaism and a utilization of creative innovation. Concern is focused on everyday deeds, thoughts, and experiences. Leadership is attainable without birthright or biological heritage and the central institution of sal-

vation is accessible to all on the basis of study, practice, and personal merit.

In a time in which there was radical social change, a new emphasis on the individual, and the total disruption and elimination of the sacrificial cult, this trend of rabbinic thought could genuinely be considered to be a form of sublimation. In the absence of the Temple, religious energies could be channeled into attitudes and actions which would enhance the life of the community; religious leadership could be acquired on the basis of integrity; fulfillment of the Divine will could be achieved independently of levitical offering or cultic institutions, and the study of Torah and good deeds could serve as pious offerings to God. We can see, then, that moralization of the cult is by its very nature a sublimating process, a constructive response to the destruction of the sacrificial enterprise.

CHAPTER II

We begin our examination of the rabbinic transformation of the sacrificial cult with the Biblical and rabbinic treatment of the olah. We find this sacrifice in the earliest historical books of the Bible as well as in the latest of priestly codes.[1] It is associated with the mountain sacrifice of Balaam and with the continual offering in the Holy of Holies. There are a variety of viewpoints regarding the purpose of burnt offerings in Biblical Judaism. Our understanding of its role naturally reflects whatever general presuppositions we hold concerning the nature and function of the Biblical cult. To those who view the cult primarily as a series of gifts to propitiate the deity, the olah is particularly important in that it is given totally to God.[2] Others who view the cult in a more sublime manner retain the primacy of the olah due to its unique nature. The transformation of the concrete into the invisible expresses for them the worship of a tangible people of an intangible God.[3] Whether we adopt one view or the other, or one somewhere in between, we must agree that the burnt offering constituted a significant element in the sacrificial cult.

When examining and expounding upon the institutions of the Biblical cult, the rabbis of the tannaitic period were certainly called upon to occupy themselves with the meaning of the burnt offering. Reviewing several passages in the tannaitic literature concerned with the olah, we find that they are singularly legalistic and procedural in nature. This is not surprising since the works we consulted are generally referred to

as the "halakic" or "legal midrashim" (Sifra, Sifre, and Mekhilta). What is important for us in this examination is to note that for several reasons we find a minimal amount of spiritualization or sublimation in the tannaitic treatment of the burnt offering. Whether this is due to the continued existence or recent proximity to the destruction of the Temple, the lack of a clear-cut external polemic challenge from Christianity, or the inherent limitations of the genre of tannaitic literature, we cannot say within the scope of this project. We note for our efforts that such is the tendency of this literature so as to see more clearly the tendencies toward spiritualization and sublimation as they appear in the context of later rabbinic texts.

One tannaitic passage concerning ritual sacrifice verges on spiritualization and is particularly worthy of our attention.

> The disciples of Shammai read kebhsim he lambs (Numb. 28:3) as though written kabsim, that they put out of sight. That is, the daily offering of the lambs brings it about that Israel's sins are put out of sight by God as the verse says, 'He will turn again to have compassion upon us, he will put our sins out of sight.' (Mic. 7:19)
>
> But the disciples of Hillel said, 'whatever is put out of sight must return into sight.' Accordingly we find the expression, kebhsim bene shana, the lambs of the first year to be understood as though written, kebbasim bene shana, they cleanse the things that are of many a year. That is they cleanse the sins of Israel of whom it is said, 'Though your sins be as many a year, they shall be white as snow.' (Is. I:18)
>
> And ben Azzai said, kebhsim bene shana means that they cleanse the sins of Israel and make them as innocent as an infant in its first year.[4]

Through a play on the word for lamb, kebhes, we have several midrashic interpretations of the effect of the ritual sacrifice. Ben Azzai is on the verge of sublimation when he equates the ritual requirement of the age of the goat with the moral purity of the child of the same age. Yet, it is clear that even here the focus is still on the ritual lambs and there is little effort to switch to sublimated

forms of human behavior which might replace the lambs as a pious offering. It is for this reason that we refer to this as a tendency towards sublimation rather than a complete transformation.

As we examine now the talmudic and aggadic midrashim of the fourth to ninth centuries C. E., we find a fundamentally different understanding of the sacrificial cult beginning to flower. The legal procedural format of the halakic midrashim continues throughout these later collections and passages. There remains a preoccupation with ritual procedures and levitical purity. But we find a new layer, a new manner of understanding the cult, settling in among older forms.

Certainly both the Biblical and tannaitic periods knew a Judaism which demanded both ritual and moral/ethical purity as expressions of piety toward God. But centuries after the destruction of the Temple, they became more than partners. Through midrashic exegesis, cultic institutions of levitical ritual purity came to symbolize aspects of moral purity and ethical piety. The very basis of their ground of sanctification was sublimated from cultic procedure into human qualities, actions, and interpersonal relations. This transformation was not a total innovation but an expansion and weaving of ancient threads into a rope which would spiritually bind the Jewish people to its earliest traditions.

The strands are brought together slowly, laying one tradition upon another in the Biblical and rabbinic treatment of the ethical and levitical purity of the cult. We see the binding occur, for instance, in the talmudic citation of the deuteronomic idea that the hire of a harlot is unacceptable as an offering to God.[5] That which is gained from the morally impure practice of prostitution renders the sacrificial

cult ritually impure in the eyes of Biblical and rabbinic authorities. The same continuity of moral sensitivity within the context of levitical purity continues between tannaitic and later rabbinic portrayal of the olah. R. Yossi continues the thought of ben Azzai when he describes the reason young boys begin their study of Judaism with the cultic book of Leviticus. Like his predecessor, he considers young children morally pure. Since the sacrifices are pure, it is fitting that the morally pure come and study the ritually pure.[6] We find in tractate Bekorot that a goring ox which has not been killed due to a lack of sufficient witnesses is impure for sacrifice.[7] The animal that does violence, like the animal used for idolatry, is rendered ritually unclean by virtue of its moral impurity. This trend of thought reaches its full explication in the Tanhuma exposition of Psalm 24.

> ...Why does it state that 'I love justice and hate thievery' (Is. 61:8) in regard to the olah? Because in connection with the olah, what is said before it shows the relationship. 'And when a person sins and is guilty and returns that which he has stolen,' (Lev. 5:23) then afterwards it describes that he shall bring a burnt offering. 'If you want to bring a sacrificial offering, then don't steal anything fom anyone because I am a God who loves justice and hates thievery, even in regard to the sacrifice of the burnt offering. And when is it then that you may offer up an olah and I will receive it? When your hands are clean of thievery, as David said in Psalm 24, "Who will yaaleh (go up/offer up a burnt offering) on the Mountain of God, who will stand in His holy place? One with clean hands and a pure heart" (that has not engaged in thievery)."[8]

The pious who desire to participate in the ritual offerings of the cult must maintain a level of moral purity equal to that of a young child. The moral transgression of prostitution, violence, and thievery have the power to render burnt offerings unfit and ritually impure.

The dual requirement of both ritual and moral purity continues throughout the Biblical and rabbinic literature concerning the sacri-

ficial cult. Though they differed in emphasis, both the prophets and priestly writers demanded a combination of justice and levitical purity. This two-fold sensitivity we have found, also continues in the rabbinic traditions concerning the olah. However, we can see, as in the case of the term yaaleh cited above (offer up/go up in moral purity), that one trend of rabbinic exposition goes beyond the restatement of earlier traditions. There is a midrashic expansion and elaboration of the moral aspects of cultic purity which also involves a shift in the focus of sacrifice from the placating of God to the moral development of man.

We must note that not every rabbinic treatment of the olah reflects a trend towards expansion and transformation. In fact, though we will examine passages which do represent shift of the focus of sacrifice, the olah is generally portrayed in Biblical and rabbinic literature as an institution for the feeding and appeasement of the Divine. We find in Genesis Rabbah that God enumerated more clean animals than unclean in the list which was given to Noah. We are told that this was done according to a Divine plan for, "He surely desired that sacrifice should be offered to Him of them."[9] From this passage and others like it, we learn that even by the time of the compilation of Genesis Rabbah some rabbis still sincerely believed that God desired the sacrifices of man for His edification. This serves as an important warning concerning the general nature of our study. We must be careful not to generalize or to say that collectively, "the rabbis" spiritualized or sublimated the cult in their characterization of it. We have already shown a tendency among some rabbis to ground the ritual purity of the cult in the context of moral and ethical purity and to expand these themes beyond their Biblical basis. As we turn now to examine further several midrashic

passages which represent a shift in the purpose of the cult from the feeding of God to the moral and spiritual uplifting of man, we are reminded by the passage cited above from Genesis Rabbah that we are portraying one layer, one dimension among several in rabbinic thought concerning the sacrificial cult.

The parable is given of a blind man with a lamp. A man with full vision leads the blind man to his home by means of the lamp. However, when they arrive at the blind man's home, the man of full vision asks the blind man for a lighted lamp so that he may continue on his journey. The midrash continues:

> 'It is only for this reason that I have asked you to give Me light.' The seeing man of the story is the Holy One Blessed Be He, for it says, 'for the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the whole earth' (II Chron. 16:9) and the blind man is Israel for it says, 'We grope for the wall like the blind, yea as they that have no eyes do we grope, we stumble at noon day as in the twilight.' (Is. 59:10) God illumined the way for them and led them as it says, 'and the Lord went before them by day.' (Ex. 13:21) When they were about to construct the Tabernacle He called to Moses and said, 'That they bring unto thee pure olive oil.' (Ex. 27:20) Israel then said, 'For thou dost light my lamp' (Ps. 18:29) and yet thou dost command us that we should give light before thee!' God replied, 'This is in order to promote you that you may give light unto Me even as I have given light to you.'10

The author of this midrash captures the apparent contradiction of the situation and reverses the focus of the ritual act. It is certainly not for God's sake, but for man's that the cultic lamps are lighted. Israel, like the blind man in the story, will then fulfill its obligation for the help received.

We find a second attempt to resolve these contradictions in Numbers Rabbah.

> Rabbi Hanina observed, The Holy One Blessed Be He said, In the eyes which you possess there is black and white. And you cannot see with the white but only with the black. Now if in the case

> of your eyes that contain black and white parts you can only see through the black, shall the Holy One Blessed Be He who is all light need your light? Another comment on the text explains, 'In front of the candle sticks.' (Numb. 8:2) A mortal obtains light from a burning lamp. Can he however obtain light from a lamp out of darkness? Yet of God it says, 'and darkness was upon the face of the deep.' (Gen. 1:2) And what is written further on in the text? 'And God said let there be light.' (Gen. 1:3) 'Out of the darkness I (God) brought light, I told you to kindle the lamps in order to elevate you.' That is the meaning of the expression 'to cause a lamp to burn continually.' (Ex. 27:20)[11]

To participate in the cult is to imitate the actions of the Divine and thereby to be elevated. It is to lift Israel up above the nations of the world as an example to all.[12] Just as the oil gives light, so, too, does the Temple give light unto the nations as it is said, "And nations shall walk by thy light."[13] This shift in the purpose of the cult is most sublimely illustrated in the Pesikta de Rav Kahanah. Introducing the theme of the olah in a commentary on a verse from Hosea, God satirically asks whether or not He would ask man for food were he indeed hungry.[14] Such a request from the Creator of the whole world would be absurd. The climax of the reversal of the purpose of the cult appears in the treatment of the Hosea verse in Pesikta Rabbati.

> R. Samuel said in the name of R. Simeon b. Yohai, (Come and see what this command signifies.' (Lev. 7:2--And the blood thereof shall be dashed against the base of the altar.) Ordinarily blood is a thing despised--it is the food of dogs. And yet the Holy One Blessed Be He says that it should be offered up on the altar: the Holy One Blessed Be He--if anyone dare impute such a thing to Him, said, 'Bring Me an offering and take its blood and dash the blood against the corners of the altar that the blood may expiate for the blood (thou hast shed). It is because of thy need and as a means of expiation for thee that I request offering and not because I wish to eat.' Hence the verse is to be read, 'I hungry? No, the offering I request is for thy sake (and not for Mine).'[15]

As the purpose of ritual activity shifts to its impact upon man and the ritual purity of the cult is made dependent upon its moral di-

mensions, the authority of the cultic priesthood is displaced upon the hasid and the tzadik. In Balaam's entreaty before God we find an example of the transformation of the grounds for cultic leadership.

> Build me here seven altars. (Numb. 23:1) Why seven altars? because of the seven altars which had been built by seven righteous men from Adam to Moses and which had been received with favor. These righteous men were Adam, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses. Balaam said to God, 'Why didst Thou accept them? Was it not on account of the cultic ritual service (avodah) they performed for you that Thou didst accept them? Is it not more seemly that Thou should be worshiped by seventy nations rather than one?' The Holy Spirit answered him, 'Better is a dry morsel and quietness therewith' (Prov. 17:1) (better) 'a meal offering mingled with oil or dry' (Lev. 7:10) 'than a house full of feasting with strife! For you desire to introduce strife between Me and Israel.'[16]

It was because of their righteousness rather than their levitical birthright that the seven ancestors just mentioned were qualified to offer an acceptable sacrifice to God.

As we have seen in previous passages, human qualities of the highest moral standard determine the ritual purity of the sacrifice. In addition, cultic leadership is acquired on the basis of the attainment of these qualities. But even more is expressed in the second part of this exposition of Balaam's sacrifice.

> And God met Balaam, He said to him, fool, what are you doing? Said he, I have prepared seven altars. (Numb. 23:4) This is like the case of a money changer who falsifies his weights. The chief of the market comes and discovers him. You are, he said, falsifying the weights. The other replied, I have already sent a gift to your house. Balaam also acted in a similar way. The Holy Spirit said to him, what are you doing Balaam? He replied, I have prepared seven altars. (Numb. 23:4) Said God, Better is a dinner of herbs where love is, than a stalled ox and hatred therewith. (Prov. 15:17) More acceptable is the meal which Israel prepared in Egypt eating (pascal lamb) with unleavened bread and bitter herbs than the ox you offer in hatred.[17]

The Passover meal and the interpersonal qualities surrounding it are more significant than the levitical ritual impurities of the Land of

Egypt. A communal dinner in the presence of love is more adequate an offering to God than the ritual sacrifice of an ox in the midst of hatred. While ritual purity is not ignored, it is made subservient to moral purity in order of importance. The elaboration and extension of a prophetic theme is brought to its full development in tractate Sukka. There Rabbi Eleazer succinctly states the primacy of the ethical over the levitical/ritual when he says that, "Almsgiving is greater than all sacrifice."[18]

Not only does the ethical take precedence over the ritualistic in this trend of rabbinic thought, but the levitical procedures themselves become vehicles for the representation of aspects of virtue. In a midrashic portrayal of God's treatment of the cult we are given a guide for human behavior. The moral and interpersonal sensitivity which He displays in His direction of the burnt offering is a modes for the pious to follow in the realm of human affairs.

> R. Joshua of Siknin said in the name of R. Levi: Come and see how the Holy One Blessed Be He tried to spare the Israelites expense since He said to them, Whoever has become liable to bring a sacrifice let him bring from the herd, as it says, If his offering be a burnt offering of the herd.... (Lev. 1:3) If he cannot afford from the herd let him bring from the lambs, as it says, And if he bring a lamb.... (Lev. 4:32) And if he cannot bring from the lambs let him bring a goat as it says, And if his offering be a goat.... (Lev. 3:12) And if he cannot bring from the goats, let him bring from the fowl, as it says, And if his offering be a fowl.... (Lev. 1:14) And if he cannot afford from the fowl let him bring fine flour, fine flour for a meals offering (Lev. 6:13). Moreover, other offerings cannot be offered up in halves but this one is to be offered up in halves, half thereof in the morning and half thereof in the evening. (Lev. 6:12)[19]

God only asks what his worshipers can afford. He is careful not to place a burden upon or embarrass anyone. A second midrash concerning God's choice of particular animals for sacrifice elaborates the theme of compassion for the poor and defenseless. Just as God designates for

sacrifice those animals which are not predatory, so, too, does He particularly love those human beings who are persecuted. He has special affection for, and shows man a special model for, treatment of the poor, the defenseless, the preyed upon.[20] God's desire for sacrifice is of an exemplary and righteous nature. It is the fragrance of man's righteousness (obedience and good deeds) that He desires above all else.

> 'The righteous one eateth his fill of that which is a man's soul.' Such a Righteous One is the Holy One Blessed Be He. The Holy One said to Israel, 'My children, of all offerings which you present to Me, I delight to eat only of those with the fragrance (of obedience and good deeds) as it is said, "It is the fragrance which is My own delight."' (Numb. 28:2)[21]

God's righteousness in His treatment of the cult serves as a model for human actions. It represents a shift in the focus of sacrifice from the feeding of God to the moral instruction of man. It is the emulation of this Divine moral sensitivity that provides the _hasid_ and the _tzadik_ the authority to replace the priestly clan as the religious and communal leaders of Israel.

Authority is also displaced from the Temple cult to the Torah and its institutions as the life of Torah comes to be the central source of salvation. Rabbi Joshua ben Levi states that God told David that one day spent in the study of Torah is superior to a thousand sacrificial animals.[22] R. Simeon conveys the same conviction when he says that words of Torah are more precious than burnt offerings and sacrifice.[23] Resh Lakish and Rabba place their interpretation of "This is the Torah of the burnt offering," within the same trend of thought. We find in tractate _Menahot_ that Resh Lakish says that he who busies himself with Torah is as though he were actually offering sacrifices. Rabba interprets the _laned_ as a negative-lo, to read, "He who occupies himself with

Torah need not offer sacrifice."[24] All these views are summarized in a passage found in similar forms in Leviticus Rabbah, Pesikta de Rav Kahana and Pesikta Rabbati.

> R. Aha said in the name of R. Hanania b. Papa, In order that Israel might not say, 'In the past we used to offer up sacrifice and engage in the study of them and now that there are no sacrifices is it still necessary to engage in the study of them?' The Holy One Blessed Be He said to Israel: 'If you engage in the study of them I will account it to you as if you had offered them up.'
>
> R. Huna said two things: All the exiles will be gathered only through the merit of study of the Mishna. What is the reason? 'Yea, if they engage in (Yitnu--the oral learning) teaching among the nations, I will gather them up.' (Hos. 8:10) The other thing R. Huna said, 'For from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof My name is great among the nations and in every place offerings are presented to My name, even pure oblations.' (Mal. 1:11) Are there pure oblations and the taking of a handful of flour and letting of offerings go in Babylonia? What then is referred to? It is the Mishna. The Holy One Blessed Be He said, 'seeing that you are engaged in the study of Mishna, it is as if you were offering up sacrifice.'
>
> Samuel said, 'and if they be ashamed of all that they have done and make known unto them the form of the Temple and the fashion thereof, all forms thereof, and all the laws thereof and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and the ordinances thereof and do them.' This is the law of the Temple.... (Ezk. 43:11) Was the form of the Temple in existence at the time of Ezekiel? No but the Holy One Blessed Be He said, 'as long as you engage in the study thereof, it is as if you were building it.'[25]

The Tanhuma concludes this transformation of the source of salvation. Commenting upon the double usage of the word olah, it relates that after the destruction of the Temple, Israel still had the two-fold offering of Torah and teshuvah.[26]

Even the continual lamps (olot) which the Israelites kindled to God were spiritualized and their focus reversed. As they kindled continual fire before God, so God kindled a lamp which is Torah, for the enlightenment and moral instruction of Israel.

Another explanation of 'a leafy olive tree' (used for the oil of

> the continual fire). Just see how the words of the Torah give forth light to a man when he studies them. But he who does not occupy himself with the Torah and does not know it stumbles. It can be compared to the one who stands in a dark place. As soon as he starts walking he stumbles against a stone, he then strikes a gutter and falls into it and knocks his face on the ground--all because he has no lamp in his hand. It is the same with the common person who has no Torah in him. He strikes against sin stumbles and dies while the Holy Spirit says, 'He shall die for lack of instruction,' (Prov. 5:23) and instruction means Torah as it says, 'Take hold fast of instruction, let it not go.' (Prov. 6:13) He dies because he knows not the Torah and goes and sins as it says, 'The way of the wicked is as the darkness and they know not at what they stumble.' (Prov. 6:19) But those who study the Torah give forth light wherever they may be. It is like one standing in the dark with a lamp in his hand as it says, 'Thy work is a lamp unto my feet and a light unto my path.' (Ps. 119:105) And also, 'If thou runnest thou shalt not stumble,' (Prov. 8:12) and also, 'the spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord.' (Prov. 20:27) God said, 'let My lamp be in thy hand and thy lamp in My hand.' What is the lamp of God? The Torah, as it says, 'For the commandment is a lamp and the teaching is a light.' (Prov. 6:23) Because if one performs a commandment, it is as if he had kindled a lamp before God and revived his own soul, also called a light, for it says, 'the spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord.' (Prov. 20:27)
>
> Because it often happens that when one is eager to fulfill a precept, his evil inclination with him often dissuades him, saying, 'Why perform this command and diminish your wealth? Instead of giving away to others, give it to your own children.' But the good inclination says to him, 'give rather to a pious cause as it says, "for the commandment is a lamp."' Just as the light of the lamp is undiminished, even if a million wax candles are kindled from it, so will he who gives toward the fulfillment of any commandment not suffer diminishment of his possessions. Hence, 'for the commandment is a lamp and the teaching is a light.'[27]

The Torah is the lamp of God. It illuminates the moral path of man, keeping him from sin as do the commandments. The soul as the lamp of God, is revived through the practice of good deeds. The ritual lamps become spiritualized symbols of the Torah, of the soul and of the undiminished continuance of those who give of their possessions.

Certain emotions, attitudes, and personal activities in addition to the study and practice of Torah, are accounted as if sacrificial animals had been offered to God. Prayer, repentance, the offering of the soul and spirit, fasting, suffering, and death, all can serve as

aspects of human experience and behavior which replace the ritual requirements of the levitical cult. As noted above, the soul of man is the lamp of God. A broken spirit and a contrite heart, the sacrifice of the evil inclination, and repentance were accounted to David as merit.[28] When these are accomplished, they are as if one has rebuilt the Temple. Drawing upon the proof text of Isaiah 1:11, R. Eleazer b. Pedat interprets the ritual of prayer which needs neither Temple nor priesthood to be a form of worship more desirable to God than sacrifice.[29]

R. Hayya b. Abba said in the name of R. Jonathan that "if a man answers nature's call, washes his hands and puts on tephillin and recites the shema and says the tefillah, scripture accounts it to him as if he had built an altar and offered a sacrifice upon it."[30] The Tanhuma, as we mentioned, maintains that Israel still has the institutions of teshuva and Torah to provide God with an offering.[31] It continues:

> Say unto Him, 'forgive iniquity and accept that which is good....' (Hos. 14:3) Lord of the universe, in the time that the Temple was in existence we used to offer up sacrifice and we were forgiven. Now all we have in our hands is prayer. Tov in gematria equals 17 and the Tefillah equals 17, minus the prayer against the heretics they have added in our own time. (We therefore read forgive iniquity and accept our prayer.)
>
> Rabbi Simeon said, 'say unto Him forgive all iniquity and accept good....' which equals nefesh. Israel said, behold may our fat and that of our souls be acceptable before you as atonement for us and (our prayers) we will render as the bullocks of our lips.[32]

Prayer, fasting, the human spirit itself, all remain in Israel's hands as sources of piety toward God when the cultic institutions of the Temple have been destroyed.

As in the case of the Biblical texts, so, too, in rabbinic literature do we find the olah among the earliest and latest traditions. There continues throughout the literature the continuity of concern

with the procedures of levitical purity in regard to the burnt offering. But another strand of tradition is continued from the Biblical sources through the midrashic elaborations on the olah in each successive rabbinic text. This dimension of both continuity and divergence is the spiritualized and sublimated transformation of the levitical cult into qualities of moral purity and aspects of human interaction. We find it grows out of the Biblical concern for the moral purity of that which is used in the ritual cult. But it goes beyond this as the midrash begins in places to state the qualification for ritual sacrifice in moral and spiritual terms. The purpose of sacrifice is in time reversed. It is no longer for the propitiation of God but for the development of man. Sacrifices themselves come to symbolize moral qualities such as kindness and thoughtfulness. Personal qualities of repentance, and personal actions such as fasting and prayer, all replace the offering of sacrificial animals. The pious actions of the hasid and tzadik, rather than the birthright of the priesthood, provide legitimation for religious leadership. Finally, the Torah as it is studied and taught replaces the Temple cult as the central institution and instrument of salvation. It is the continual light which illuminates the moral path of man, preserving the souls which also come to symbolically replace the continual temple fire, as the lamp of God.

CHAPTER III

Like the olah, the shelamim offering is of great antiquity in the history of the Biblical cult. We find it 47 times in the historical books of the Bible from Joshua to Kings.[1] Joyous in character, it was associated before the Babylonian exile with royal celebrations of a dedicatory or commemorative character.[2] This is demonstrated by the significance of the shelamim offerings at the proclamation of Saul's kingship and at the dedication of Solomon's temple.[3] While DeVaux accounts it as the most frequent offering in the early period of the cult,[4] Levine states that it was not a regular rite at this time but one preserved for special occasions.[5]

The religious significance of the shelamim is an ongoing question. W. Robertson-Smith, writing in the last century, placed it within the context of the communal meal which is shared between worshiper and deity. In the Religion of the Semites he stated:

> The leading idea in the animal sacrifices of the Semites...was not that of a gift made over to the god, but an act of communion in which the god and his worshiper unite by partaking of flesh and blood of a sacred victim.[6]

Rene Dussaud's work in the 1920's served as the basis for further refinement of this theory in which the shelamim offering is related to the etymology of the Hebrew root shin, lamed, mem.[7] The sacrifice is somehow connected with peace, harmony, and well-being signifying communion between worshiper and deity in a harmonious relationship.[8]

DeVaux casts doubts upon this interpretation when he points out that certain portions such as blood and fat are specifically not shared.

He draws a different interpretation from the same Hebrew root, concluding that it means retribution or gifts sent as pledges of peace.[9] Accordingly, shelamim offerings are tribute offered to God to maintain or to reestablish good relations between Him and his worshipers.

A thorough study of the historical development of the shelamim is offered by Baruch Levine in his study, In the Presence of the Lord.[10] He also questions the theories of W. Robertson-Smith and his followers when he states, "We doubt very much that communion through sacrificial blood rites was part of the motivation and purpose of Israelite sacrifice."[11] He warns also against associating any particular sacrifice exclusively with covenant or communion within the context of the Biblical cult.[12] This is not, however, to say that elements of covenant and of sacral fellowship did not play some role in the religious expression of ancient Israel. But this was not achieved through sacrificial blood rites.

The history Levine portrays is one of transformation from public to private sacrifice. While the shelamim offering was originally a public dedicatory offering, it was shaped by priestly writers and officiants into something private. While P maintains the continuity of its public character by including it in the investiture of Aaron and his sons and in the dedication of the Tabernacle altar, a new dimension is also added. It is the expression of thanks, generosity, or payment of a personal vow. The shelamim was an expression of significant public beginnings. The momentous may have been routinized through this priestly innovation and extended to individual beginnings as well. While DeVaux concluded that the shelamim may very well be a payment of tribute, Levine concludes with a more general view that underlying the shelamim "is the notion of

sacrifice as an efficatious gift of greeting, offered 'in the presence of the Lord.'"[13]

Whatever view we take towards the religious significance of the shelamim, we must note that it is unique. Whether it be a communal meal shared in communion with the deity or a payment of tribute, or a gift of greeting, it is different from the other forms of cultic sacrifice. It is only in the context of the shelamim offering that God, the officiating priest, and the worshiper, all partake of some element of the sacrifice together.

As with the olah, so, too, in regard to the shelamim, the tannaitic sources are primarily legalistic and ritualistic in their orientation. They are concerned with the procedures of such things as the selection of the sacrificial victim and division of its parts. This, however, is not to say that there is an absence of any tendency toward spiritualization. The Sifra commentary on the peace offering stands midway in its spiritualizing tendencies as did the discussion between the disciples of Hillel and Shammai in their representations of the ritual lamb of the burnt offering. When the Sifra states that one who sacrifices the shelamim increases shalom (peace) in the world, it is attributing a spiritual end to a cultic act.[14] The interpretation, however, is closer to the traditional Biblical representations of the cult than a view which has been transformed and sublimated. That it makes peace not only between man and God but also in the world is a significant step towards the sublimating tendency. But no sublimated or spiritualized actions come to replace the sacrificial act and it remains central in the focus of the passage.

More important than this tannaitic passage which stands midway in

its tendencies is one which is interestingly tangential to the spiritualizing and sublimating transformation of the cult. Commenting on the priestly blessing of shalom, Sifre states:

> So great is peace that it is given in the portion of the righteous.... So great is peace that it is not given in the portion of the wicked.... So great is peace that it is given to the lovers of Torah.... So great is peace that it is given to the poor.... So great is peace that it is given to the students of Torah.... So great is peace that it is given to the practicers of tzedakah .... So great is peace that the name of the Holy One Blessed Be He is shalom.... So great is peace that it is equal to the value of all the works of creation.... So great is peace that the beings of the upper world need it...and if so in the case of a place where there is no competition or malice, how much the more so in the place where all these qualities are present....[15]

Many of the values which we have set forth as spiritualization and sublimation or humanization are included in this discourse on shalom. Found here are the virtues of studying and teaching the Torah, tzedakah or righteous deeds, and peaceful relations between human beings. Their presence discloses a series of religious and interpersonal values which were important components of a rabbinic values system during the tannaitic period. As we will see in the later aggadic midrashim such as Leviticus Rabbah, these values appear in expanded form not within the context of the priestly blessing but as aspects of the peace offerings.

An underlying principle of our thesis is that certain values and patterns of behavior came to replace the centrality of the Temple cult in the course of one trend of thought in Rabbinic Judaism. Between the differences in the interpretation of the shelamim in the tannaitic and later midrashim, we can glimpse the process of this transformation. Certain spiritual, moral, and interpersonal values seem to be significant in the mind of some of the tannaitic authorities. These values are presented within the context of the blessing of shalom. However, in the aggadic midrashim which required from two to seven centuries more

for their concretization, the values have moved to the center stage of the religious system. The shelamim offerings of the Temple cult are now spiritualized and sublimated in such a way as to be transformed into representations of these spiritual, moral, and interpersonal values. The cult has become in this trend subservient to the values of the rabbinic values system. The sacrifice of the peace offerings in this case is only a vehicle for the representation of these values, rather than a cultic ritual, independent and significant in its own right as tribute to God. In the aggadic midrashim, the peace offerings become sublimated symbols of various aspects of the components of shalom.

Though the transforming tendencies appear even more clearly in regard to the shelamim than the olot, we must put forth the warning of the last chapter once again. We are not saying that this tendency is monolithic in rabbinic thought but rather true of one trend in rabbinic thought. The more ritualistic tendencies of the Biblical and tannaitic literature are certainly preserved in the homiletical midrashim concerning the peace offerings.

The opening section of the central pisqa on the subject of the shelamim (Leviticus Rabbah 9:1) relates that the sacrifices of thanksgiving are superior sacrifices because they will continue in the world to come.[16] In addition, we find a passage in Haggigah which provides an interpretation of a prophetic verse in a manner which is the complete opposite of sublimation.

> R. Huna wept when he came to the verse, 'And thou shalt sacrifice peace offerings and thou shalt eat thereof....' (Deut. 27:7) Woe that the slave at whose table his Master longs to eat should become estranged from him! For it is written, 'To what purpose is the abundance of your sacrifices saith the Lord?' (Is. 1:11)[17]

A prophetic passage which is often considered within the context of the

cult to show God's displeasure with ritual sacrifice is interpreted in the Talmud to emphasize the importance of sacrifice. To fail to offer sacrifice to God or His refusal of man's sacrifice is interpreted as a sign of Divine estrangement from man.

Nonetheless, we do find as was the case also with burnt offerings, abundant examples of the spiritualization and sublimation of the shelamim sacrifices. The shift of the focus of sacrifice from God to man is also found in the aggadic midrashim concerning the shelamim. In an interpretation of the word "lirezonekhem" in tractate Menahot of the Talmud, God is portrayed as telling Israel that it is because of their desire for sacrifice, rather than his need that He accepts their ritual offerings.[18]

Moral purity or the most noble aspects of human character, rather than ritual purity provides the qualifications for sacrifice. "R. Simeon said, 'Only one who is at peace may offer up a peace offering.'"[19] This is interpreted to mean that a mourner cannot bring a peace offering. One who is not whole in his emotional state or at peace with himself, is rendered spiritually impure for the peace offering.

In tractate Avodah Zarah, we find that Adam is fearful that the setting of the sun marks the punishment of death for his transgressions. He and Eve fast and weep throughout the night and realize at the approach of dawn that this is merely the natural course of the world. In appreciation they offer a bullock in thanks for their lives. But it is a special bullock which is offered, illustrated by the proof text of Psalm 69:32. "I will praise the name of God with a song and magnify Him with thanksgiving. And it shall please the Lord better than a bullock that hath horns and hoofs."[20] The bullock which Adam and Eve of-

fered was one with horns developed before its hoofs and therefore of dubious ritual purity. Yet, as the proof text illustrates, praise and an attitude of thanksgiving are more acceptable and even take precedence over matters of ritual purity.

The use of the name of God, charged in the Bible with magical power and surrounded by barriers of cultic purity, becomes in the midrash an example of the displacement of ritual purity by standards of morality and salutary aspects of human character. In order to create a state of interpersonal harmony, God Himself allows His name to be made ritually impure as it is blotted out in the Sota proceedings of the suspected adulteress.[21] The image of God allowing His own name to be rendered levitically impure for the purpose of domestic tranquility, is perhaps one of the outstanding illustrations of the principle we have been describing.

The metaphor is extended explicitly into human imitation of Divine action in the homilies of Leviticus Rabbah. Rabbi Meir allows a female student to spit in his eye because she was commanded to do so by her jealous husband. Though humilitated in public, he informs his students that his behavior was not only proper but in accord with Divine example.

> Is it not good enough for Meir to be like His creator? For R. Ishmael taught, 'Great is peace since even of the Divine name, written though it be in sanctity, the Holy One Blessed Be He has said, "Let it be blotted out with water for the purpose of making peace between husband and wife."'[22]

We find in this homily not only a levitical ritual which is sublimated into the quality of humility, but the direct explication in which Divine action serves as a model for human behavior. The ritual as transformed through the midrash utilizes a cultic activity as the symbol for an aspect of human character portraying God's humility as the model for human beings.

In several homilies concerning the shelamim, religious authority is based upon qualifications of public service and knowledge of Torah rather than levitical inheritance. Building upon the second half of a text regarding the honor of a type of shelamim, the todah, we find that one who setteth right the way receives God's salvation. The recipients are the scribes and teachers of Torah and Mishna, those who educate the young in the way of faith.[23] According to Resh Lakish, Saul's right to kingship can be traced to the diligence of his grandfather in kindling lights to illumine the path to the synagogue. Those who sell fruit which has already been tithed are also included as recipients of salvation.

In an unusual combination of sublimation and exposition of religious leadership, the animals of the cultic offering symbolically portray various leaders of Israel. We have seen that burnt offerings were replaced by human actions which were counted as if sacrifice had been rendered. Here the oxen of the peace offering are interpreted metaphorically as direct representations of Jacob and Joseph, Moses and Aaron.[24] These tendencies reach their climax when the oxen are portrayed as representations of Isaac and Rebecca, blameless progenitors of kings. Through a play on the words tamim and shelamim, their moral purity is associated with the ritual shelamim sacrifices.[25] In the same series of midrashic interpretations, the oxen of the peace offering at the dedication of the mishkan are transformed not only into the leading personalities of ancient Jewish tradition, but into the written and oral Torah, the fundamental teachings of Judaism, as well.[26]

The sublimation of sacred offering into the obligation of the study of Torah is by now a familiar theme. In this passage from Leviticus

Rabbah on Torah study, anxiety over the destruction of the Temple and the loss of the sacrificial cult surely looms closely in the background.

> R. Aha said, 'This may be compared to a ruler who entered a province with a band of armed men. Said one citizen to another "how terrifying is this ruler." The other answered, "Practice good conduct and you need not be afraid of him." Even so, when the Israelites heard the section of the Torah dealing with sacrifice, they became afraid. Said Moses to them, "Be not afraid. Occupy yourselves with Torah and you will have no fear of all these (sacrificial obligations)." This is indicated by the expression "This is the Torah of the burnt offering, of the meal offering, and of the sin offering and of the guilt offering and of the consecration offering, and the sacrifice of the peace offering."' (Lev. 7:37)[27]

The worshiper may depend on the fulfillment of good deeds as obedience toward God. But those who are fearful and anxious over their inability to offer up sacrifices may study the passages of the Torah concerning them and fulfill their obligation. This is why the expression "Torah" is used in connection with the sacrifices. It is this use of "Torah" which serves as the point of transformation from sacrifice to study as an act of piety.

Blood was certainly a significant aspect of the cult when it was in existence. Blood was considered sacred, the life force, the bearer of prophylactic capacities.[28] It was required in various forms of animal sacrifice. In the aggadic midrashim, the offering of the blood of the sacrificial animal is displaced by the offering of human blood in the fulfillment of the commandment of circumcision. We find in both Bamidbar Rabbah and in the Tanhuma that God appears to Abraham because of the blood of his circumcision. Just as there is blood in regard to the peace and burnt offerings, so, too, is there blood in the act of circumcision. Rabbi Levi concludes, how much more so is the blood of circumcision a cause for God's appearance and blessing, seeing that it came from Abraham himself.[29] An act which centered itself in the Temple,

the priesthood, and in the context of ritual sacrifice is replaced by the mitzvah of an individual Jew, offering a portion of his own blood as a sacrifice before God.

Blood is not the only aspect of the human being which is given to God in place of a cultic offering. The two oxen of the dedicatory shelamim sacrifice of the tribe of Issacar represent not only the two-fold Torah but a double sacrifice of one's evil inclination.[30] It is a shelamim offering which creates peace on high and peace in the world below.

Achan is the classic example of one who offers confession as a peace offering to God. The todah or thanks offering is one specific type of shelamim. We find in Leviticus Rabbah that "It is Achan who confesses and sacrifices his evil inclination as it is written, 'My son, give glory to the Lord, the God of Israel, and give him (todah) confession (of your sin).'" (Josh. 7:19)[31]

The two goats of Reuben's peace offering are portrayed as the actions which he takes to rectify his past transgressions. They represent the two acts of moral transgression which estranged him from God, his father, and his brothers. He had sexual relations with Bilah, his father's concubine, and he was part of the plot to do violence to Joseph, his brother. The two goats also represent the two acts of moral piety which made him an ish shalem (whole person) and brought him into a complete relationship with God and his family. As a shelamim offering he repented his sexual misconduct and delivered his brother from death.[32] His two goats are sublimated into representations of his two acts of moral piety.

The expression, "great is peace" was introduced in the Sifre pas-

sages at the beginning of this chapter. In the pisqa of Leviticus Rabbah concerning the shelamim, these passages are expanded and placed within the context of ritual sacrifices.[33] The shelamim, through association, are transformed into representations of shalom. A discourse on shalom then continues throughout the rest of the homily. Having established the connection between shelamim and shalom, the expositions become additional examples of human behavior and interaction which replace the shelamim sacrifices as piety toward God.

We have seen that ethical purity is so important that it even takes precedence over ritual impurity as an acceptable offering to God. We find that peace is so great that it even takes precedence over other forms of laudatory human behavior. In the story of Yannai's guest we find that the guest is condemned by his host because of his lack of learning. The guest, however, is vindicated when he states his qualifications as one who neither listens to nor spreads harsh words and always makes peace when encountering quarreling individuals.[34] Peace is given greater value in the story than learning. In the story of God's visitation of Abraham and Sarah, God seems, according to the text, to omit Sarah's disparaging remarks about Abraham's virility when He relates Sarah's words to her husband.[35] In the story of Joseph and his brothers, we find that his brothers inform Joseph of their father's request that peace be maintained in the family after Jacob's death.[36] Yet, we have no statement of this request in the Torah. In both cases the Torah seems to include a concealment of truth or a misstatement of it. The value of domestic peace is portrayed as a value higher than absolute honesty.

Since hyperbole is a device within midrashic literature, we should

not press any particular hierarchy of values. They may shift with each additional passage. We rather point to the fact that in addition to the sublimation of cultic rituals into moral, spiritual, and interpersonal values, there is also a concern with the relationship of those values.

While various human actions and values are included as pious replacements for ritual sacrifice, it is also the human essence which is an offering to God. The Temple, The Priesthood, and the Sacrificial Cult are all pictured in the Bible as institutions which stabilize the relationship between heaven and earth. In the context of the aggadic midrash concerning the shelamim, it is the very nature of the human being which secures peace between the upper and lower worlds.

> R. Simeon b. Halafta said, 'Great is peace for when the Holy One Blessed Be He created His universe He made peace between the upper and lower (worlds). On the first day He created part of the upper regions and the lower ones as it says, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth...." (Gen. 1:1) On the second day He created some of the upper portions of the universe as it is written, "And God said, Let there be a firmament...." (1:6) On the 3rd day He created some of the lower things as it says, "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together...Let the earth put forth grass...." (1:9) On the fourth day God created some of the upper objects as it says, "Let there be lights in the firmament of the heavens." (1:14) On the fifth day He created some of the lower objects as it says, "Let the waters swarm with swarms of living creatures." (1:20) On the sixth day when he came to create man, He said: "If I create man as one of the upper elements of the universe, the upper elements will outnumber the lower elements of the universe. If I create him as one of the lower created objects, the lower will outnumber the upper by one created object." What did He do? He created man as of the upper as well as of the lower beings. This is demonstrated by what is written, 'The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground.' (2:7) That is He created him out of the lower parts of creation. 'And He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life.' (2:7) That is, He made him also out of the upper spheres.[37]

In its concluding passages, the pisqa of Leviticus Rabbah on the shelamim returns to its original format. There is an identification of

the shelamim with shalom and then a commentary on shalom. Peace is mentioned last in reference to prayer, blessing, and sacrifice.[38] Just as the peace offering is mentioned last in the levitical list of sacrifices (Numb. 29:39), so, too, will peace be the climax and conclusion of both this world and the world to come. Proof of this is the concluding nehemta passage of the homily.

> The rabbis said: 'Great is peace, seeing that when the messianic king is to come, he will commence with peace as it is said, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger of good tidings that announces peace."' (Is. 52:7)[39]

This entire discourse on the greatness of peace includes most of the elements of the interpretation of shalom as presented in the Sifre. Yet, it goes beyond its earlier resources. It does this not entirely by means of its content, although it is much fuller, but rather in the manner of its transformation and sublimation of the cult. We see a cluster of values, qualities, and actions which were portrayed in the Sifre as aspects of shalom. In the halakic midrashim these elements of shalom are given independent religious significance as are the ritual sacrifices of the cult. However, in the passages which we have included from later aggadic midrashim, we have shown that the portrayal of these qualities, values, and actions within the context of the shelamim comes to signify a significant development in one trend of rabbinic thought.

Various aspects of shalom actually come first to symbolically represent the shelamim and then to replace them as expression of piety. The worship of the Biblical cult is sublimated and transformed from the shelamim sacrifices to the qualities, attributes, and actions which create and preserve shalom. Included as an offering may even be the essence of human nature as it mediates peace between the upper and lower

elements of God's universe.

CHAPTER IV

In our examination of two of the three principal sacrifices of the Biblical cult, we have seen that the olah and shelamim offerings had their own independent forms and functions within the Biblical sacrificial system. However, in the course of the history of the cult, the third principal sacrifice, that of kapparah, came to overshadow the other two. Responding to the destruction of Solomon's Temple and the Babylonian exile, the priestly writers and officiants made expiation the central focus of almost one half of the sacrifices of the Second Temple.[1] As a result, burnt and peace offerings acquired an expiatory function in addition to their previously established roles. We find an excellent example of this when we turn to the first chapters of the "Book of the Priest," the Book of Leviticus. There the olah is described as a vehicle for atonement and the shelamim in other places are accorded similar significance.[2] But these two types of sacrifice merely acquire a secondary expiatory aspect to their role. In contrast, when we speak of the third category of cultic offering, kapparah, we will be referring to those sacrifices whose primary function is expiatory in nature.

An examination of the sacrifices of kapparah is not a simple task. They are perhaps the most complex and complicated of all elements in the structure of Biblical cultic institutions. We will be concerned in the next chapter with the specific sacrifices of kapparah such as the hatat or asham. Here we will deal with the nature of the general category of expiatory sacrifice. As with previous chapters and categories

of sacrifice, we are drawn to a linguistic analysis in an attempt to understand the significance of this ritual. But we are then forced as before, to consider the fundamental presuppositions which may lurk behind any linguistic interpretation.

Among the authors we have noted, the term kapper has been interpreted with such diverse meanings as wiping away, covering, and making composition. It does not surprise us that someone like Baruch Levine who sees the cult in a very magical and literal manner would interpret it to mean wiping off or cleansing.[3] The blood in the majority of kapper rituals serves as a magical prophylactic agent, providing the ritual purity which God needs if He is to find a place among men in which to dwell. On the other hand, it is not too astounding that someone like N. Chanan Brichto would interpret kapper to mean composition.[4] This interpretation takes the focus away from the blood and places it upon the general context and intention of the act. The term is one not of magic but of legal requirement and fulfillment. It is the expression of relation and obligation. Kapparah in this case is a settling of accounts. In both cases the interpretations are congruent with underlying presuppositions of their authors about the nature of the Biblical cult. The debate continues and we will not settle it within the context of this study. Nonetheless, as we begin to examine the midrashic transformation of the kapparah sacrifices, we will become more keenly aware of the multiple dimensions of religious significance provided by the institutions of the Biblical cult. We will see that the expanded tendencies toward spiritualization and sublimation in rabbinic homilies can be traced back to elements of the cult and that an overlapping of ritual and ethical concerns is a continuous organic element in both

Biblical and rabbinic Judaism. On the other hand, we will find a shift in emphasis and innovation in the rabbinic portrayal of the significance and meaning of cultic sacrifice.

One of the clearest and most succinct examples of the ritual of kapparah is found in Leviticus 5:20-26.

> And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying: If any one sin, and commit a trespass against the Lord, and deal falsely with his neighbour in a matter of deposit, or of pledge, or of robbery or have oppressed his neighbour or have found that which was lost and deal falsely therein, and swear to a lie, in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein; then it shall be, if he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took by robbery, or the thing which he hath gotten by oppression, or the deposit which was deposited with him or the lost thing which he found, or anything about which he hath sworn falsely, he shall even restore it in full and shall add the fifth part more thereto; unto him to whom it appertaineth shall he give it, in the day of his being guilty. And he shall bring his forfeit unto the Lord, a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy valuation, for a guilt offering, unto the priest. And the priest shall make atonement for him before the Lord, and he shall be forgiven, concerning whatsoever he doeth so as to be guilty thereby.[5]

A companion passage in Numbers 5:6-10 states:

> When a man or woman shall commit any sin that men commit, to commit a trespass against the Lord and that should be guilty, then they shall confess their sin which they have done and he shall make restitution for his guilt in full and add to it a fifth part therefor...and give it to him in respect of who he hath been guilty.[6]

A fuller description of the ritual itself is found in Leviticus 5:5-10.

> ...and it shall be when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that he shall confess that wherein he hath sinned; and he shall bring his forfeit unto the Lord for his sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb or a goat for a sin offering; and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin. And if his means suffice not for a lamb, then he shall bring his forfeit for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, unto the Lord; one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering. And he shall bring them unto the priest who shall offer that which is for the sin offering first, and shall pinch off its head close by its neck, but shall not divide it asunder. And he shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin offering upon the side of the altar; and the rest of the blood shall be drained out at the base of the altar;

> it is a sin offering. And he shall prepare the second for a burnt offering, according to the ordinance; the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin which he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven.7

Included in the elements of expiation (are) a confession, restoration of damages, a selection of a sacrificial victim, and a blood ritual offering at the altar. These are the general requirements established in the above mentioned passages. We do, however, find some variation within the cult concerning the actions which effect expiation. In connection with the eglah arufah, the breaking of the neck of a young calf at the site of a murder whose perpetrator is unknown, we find a confession and a blood letting. However, the ritual is conducted at the site of the murder rather than at the altar. Pinhas, in another passage, finds two sexual offenders who are polluting Israel through their actions. He kills them without confession where they are found. The blood of their death, however, is clearly an element of expiation for their sins. The shekel tax as a form of expiation is perhaps the least similar to the general format of kapparah.[8] It does not seem to involve confession or blood but is connected with the Temple and with some form of restoration to God. While we see that there are variations, the elements of blood, confession, restitution, and animal sacrifice seem to comprise the routinized ritual of cultic expiation.

When we review the passages from chapter five of Leviticus and chapter five of Numbers concerning kapparah, we are immediately struck by the presence of both the moral/interpersonal and the ritual/levitical as integral aspects of the Biblical cult. Any attempt to reduce the ritual of kapparah to either magical/ritual purification or completion of moral and religious obligation would omit an essential dimension of

this cultic institution. We can see then, that the debate over the religious significance of the cult must be one over emphasis or tendency rather than absolute significance.

Turning to the first halakic midrash, we find a continuation of the significance of ritual purity and animal sacrifice in the Sifra portrayal of the cult. Commenting on kapparah, the text states that blood is the agent of expiation, as it is written in the Biblical verse, "Because the blood will expiate for the soul." (Lev. 17:11)[9] In a later period, the Talmud echoes this statement when it relates that there is no expiation without blood.[10] We find the importance of cultic sacrificial kapparah established even in the aggadic midrashim of Song of Songs Rabbah as the basis of God's love for Israel.

> 'Thou art beautiful O my beloved as Tirzah.' (S.S. 6:4) R. Judah b. Simeon explained the verse as referring to the sacrifices. Thou art beautiful O my beloved as Tirzah: these are the sacrifices since through sacrifices you become acceptable (mitratzim) to God as it says, 'It shall be accepted (desirable) to Him to make atonement for him. (Lev. 1:4) 'Comely as Jerusalem' (same as above).... This refers to the holy things (sacrifices) as it says, 'As the flock for sacrifice, as the flock of Jerusalem' (Jer. 36:38).[11]

Continuing the literal importance of sacrifice as an element of cleansing purification, Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer goes as far as to say that the two goats of the Yom Kippur offering placate the accuser of Israel.[12] This is perhaps the clearest example of Levine's view of the kapparah ritual as a form of magical manipulation.

On the other hand, we see that moral purity also continues to be a significant element in the rabbinic portrayal of the cult. The defilement of Israel is pictured in the Sifra as a moral rather than ritual/levitical defilement. It is ethical contamination which requires expiation.

> And they shall make expiation for the holy place from the impurity of the people Israel and from all their transgression for all their sins and so shall he do to the tent of meeting... (Lev. 16:16)...I include three matters of impurity in this matter (which must be removed). The impurity of idolatry as it says, 'That you defile My holy place and blaspheme My holy name.' The sin of sexual transgression as it says, 'That you do not transgress the laws prohibiting sexual offense which are done before you and not become defiled by them.' The impurity of bloodshed as it states, 'You shall not defile the land in which you dwell, where I dwell amongst you.'[13]

In all three examples, the word tame (defile) is used to express a non-levitical form of defilement. Even in the Biblical period, the departure of God's presence could not be solely attributed to ritual impurity. Here we find tannaitic testimony that the transgressions of idolatry, sexual lewdness, and murder offend the indwelling presence.

These themes are expanded in the aggadic midrashim of Numbers Rabbah. There, in an interpretation of a passage concerning the ritual impurity of the leper, one who has had an issue, or one who has come into contact with the dead, the ritual forms of defilement are transformed into symbols of moral/ethical impurity.

> Every Leper, and every one that hath an issue, and whosoever is unclean by the dead: He (God) hints to Israel that if they commit the following three transgressions--idolatry, immorality, or bloodshed--they will incur the penalty of exile. Leper alludes to idolatry: as a leper communicated defilement by entrance, so does idolatrous sacrifice. One that hath an issue alludes to immorality, for both communicate defilement by means of a flux of semen. Unclean by the dead alludes to those who shed blood and so defile themselves and defile the land by bloodshed. We have learned also that exile comes into the world for idolatry, immorality, bloodshed, and for neglect of the seventh year. For idolatry it says, 'And I will destroy your high places, (Lev. 26:30)...and I will scatter you among the nations.'(Ibid, vs.33) God said to Israel, Seeing that you have a desire for idolatry I shall exile you to a place where there is idolatry. For immorality (proof is given by what) R. Ishmael, son of R. Jose said, So long as Israel are sunk in immorality, the Shekhinah keeps away from them, as it says, That He see no immoral thing in thee, and turn away from thee (Deut. 23:15). For bloodshed, the text states, So ye shall not pollute the land...for blood, it polluteth the land (Numb. 35:33) Scripture tells us that bloodshed defiles and the Shekhinah departs.[14]

We have presented examples of the independent continuance of the two dimensions of ritual and ethical purity in the rabbinic treatment of kapparah. These two aspects of purity were maintained together within the Biblical cult and so, too, are presented together in certain halakic midrashim. The Sifra portrays their unity through its explanation of the significance of the two goats of the Yom Kippur expiatory ritual. The two goats represent the two types of transgressions against God which may create defilement. The goat offered for sacrifice on the altar atones for the ritual defilement of the altar. The goat (azazel) which is led out to the wilderness carries the non-ritual sins of the people and provides atonement for non-ritual defilement.[15] The two goats together combine both ritual and moral aspects of cultic expiation as found in the biblical text and continued in rabbinic tradition.

We have shown examples of the importance of the sacrificial and ritual aspects of the cult which continue even in the latter collections of aggadic midrashim. On the other hand, we find that the importance of moral purity is also maintained as an important element in the rabbinic portrayal of the cult. Finally, we have seen that the two are presented together as integral parts of religious purity in both the Biblical and rabbinic tradition. These elements of continuity and integration are, however, not the only trends which we find. We see also a trend emerging in which the ritual aspects begin to become secondary to the spiritual and moral aspects of religious piety. We find in Exodus Rabbah that God sets an example for Israel regarding the secondary significance of ritual purity. The parable is given of the priest who drops his terumah in a place of ritual defilement by the dead. He retrieves it but becomes ritually impure as a result. God is the priest

in the parable and Israel his terumah. He redeems them from Egypt but becomes ritually defiled in the process, Egypt being a place known for its ritual impurity.[16] While God desires to dwell amongst Israel in a state of ritual purity, His love of Israel is demonstrated to be a more important value. In addition to this example of divine behavior, we find a particularly clear reduction of the significance of ritual purity in the famous spiral of piety of Rabbi Phineas ben Yair.

> Rabbi Phineas ben Yair used to say: Zeal leads to cleanliness, cleanliness to purity, purity leads to holiness, holiness leads to humility, humility leads to fear of sin, fear of sin leads to the saintliness, saintliness leads to the holy spirit, the holy spirity leads to resurrection of the dead, the resurrection of the dead leads to Elijah the prophet (and the messiah).[17]
>
> Zeal leads to cleanliness as it says, 'And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place,' (Lev. 16:20) (to put an end is interpreted to complete the ritual cleansing). Cleanliness leads to purity (tahara) as it says, 'And the priests shall make atonement for her and she shall be pure.' (Lev. 12:8) Purity leads to holiness as it says, 'And he shall purify it and hollow it.' (Lev. 16:19) Holiness leads to humility as it says, 'For thus saieth the high and lofty One, that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit.' (Is. 57:15) Humility leads to the fear of sin as it says, 'The reward of humility is the fear of the Lord.' (Prov. 22:4) The fear of sin leads to saintliness (hasidut) as it says, 'Then thou spokest in vision to thy saints,' (Prov. 89:27) (out of place, should be proof text for next level in the spiral). Saintliness leads to the holy spirit as it says, 'Then thou shalt understand the fear of God and find knowledge of the holy One's holy spirit,' (out of place, proof text for previous level). The holy spirit leads to resurrection as it says, 'And I will put my spirit in you and you shall live.' (Ezk. 37:14) The resurrection leads to Elijah the prophet of blessed memory as it says, 'Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet.' (Mal. 3:23)[18]

While the kapparah ritual of cleansing the Temple of cultic impurity is still included as the foundation of this ladder of piety, it is nonetheless the bottom rung. It is below humility, fear of sin, and hasidut. As Buchler has shown in his classic study, and as demonstrated in this passage from Pinhas ben Yair, both aspects of the cult weave their way

through the fabric of Biblical and rabbinic Judaism.[19] But the strands which represent the spiritual, ethical, or moral dimensions grow thicker and stronger than their ritual counterparts in certain parts of the tapestry. In the passages cited above, ritual purity is relegated to secondary significance. In the midrash concerning the nature of the impurity of the leper, the flux, and the dead, there is a total transformation. The ritual defilements are transformed into symbolic representations of the moral transgressions of idolatry, immorality, and the spilling of blood. We see clearly the rabbinic expansion, the rabbinic transformation of the cult in such a passage. What in the Bible was an example of ritual impurity, comes in rabbinic literature to symbolically represent moral defilement.

Since several of the previous passages concerning kapparah come centuries after the destruction of the Temple, they represent a certain romanticization of the cult, rather than a direct response to its destruction. In the ladder of piety, enough time has passed to include the offering of sacrifice as the point of departure for religious devotion. The importance of the cult is certainly found in the halakic midrashim but it flowers in later romanticized aggadic passages. On the other hand, some eyewitnesses like Rabbi Joshua reacted more radically to the loss of the cultic center. Not long after the destruction of the second temple he lamented, "Woe unto us that this place is destroyed where they atoned for the sins of Israel."[20] Others refused to eat the produce of the land for it could not be properly tithed or offered to God before its consumption by the people.[21] Against this backdrop of anxiety and apprehension we find that teshuvah provided a foundation stone and a bridge, giving continuity and comfort in this period

of rabbinic Judaism. It was so important that it was included as one of seven things in existence before the creation of the world.[22] Dr. Jakob J. Petuchowski substantiates the significance of teshuvah when he says that, "For only on account of it (teshuvah) can sinful man maintain his existence in the presence of God and can Judaism survive the cessation of the sacrificial cult."[23] According to Dr. Petuchowski, "The rabbinic concept of teshuvah contained little which was not already in germinal form in Hosea's plea, 'Return O Israel unto the Lord thy God for thou hast stumbled in thine iniquity.'"[24] However, while the rabbinic idea of teshuvah may not have been an innovation, it certainly was an expansion of the Biblical parameters of the concept. In addition, certain rabbis did portray teshuvah in a way that certainly represented a transformation of kapparah as it was understood in the context of the Biblical cult. In the case of Yom Kippur, the day itself was attributed a special expiatory power, even in the Bible. But for the priestly writers, the occasion of Yom Kippur and the elements of teshuvah, (penitence, confession, and restitution) would not have been adequate for the process of atonement and expiation without ritual sacrifice. Milgrom summarizes this point when he states that while remorse plus confession constituted the priestly doctrine of repentance, without sacrifice it would not suffice to obliterate sin.[25]

In the earliest of halakic midrashim, the Sifra, we find a major divergence from the above stated priestly view of the process of atonement. Drawing upon prophetic sources such as Hosea, we find in the Sifra that "The day atones (Yom Kippur), even when there is no sacrifice, no goat."[26] This principle is reaffirmed in the Jerusalem Talmud, tractate Yoma, when it relates that the scapegoat atones, but in the absence of

the goat the day atones.[27] The day, however, does not provide automatic expiation. The Mishna describes teshuvah as the foundation of and primary requirement for expiation, whether it be by means of ritual sacrifice or its sublimated substitutes.

> The sin offering and the unconditional guilt offering effect atonement; death and the Day of Atonement effect atonement--if there is repentance. Repentance (teshuvah) effects atonement for lesser transgressions against both positive and negative commands in the Torah, while for graver transgressions it suspends punishment until the Day of Atonement comes and effects atonement.[28]

Two conditions must be met for teshuvah to provide this undergirding for expiation. First, the person must experience sincere remorse and specify his sins. "If a man says, 'I will sin and repent and sin again and repent,' he will be given no chance to repent. 'I will sin and the Day of Atonement will effect atonement,' then the Day of Atonement effects no atonement."[29] In addition to remorse, there must be awareness of specific sins. Tractate Yoma firmly states that "a man must specify his sins."[30] R. Akiba and R. Judah b. Baba argue whether or not each Jew has to name his sins explicitly or not but there is no dispute as to the duty of every Jew to specify and confess his sins on the Day of Atonement.[31] This principle is even affirmed in the later midrashic collection, Pesikta Rabbati:

> When Israel specify their iniquities and confess them before the Holy One Blessed be He, He forgives them, pardoning their transgressions as is said, 'for on that day shall atonement be made for you to cleanse you, from all your sins shall you be cleansed before the Lord.' (Lev. 16:30)[32]

Dr. Petuchowski points out the psychological dimension of this process of remorse and confession as undoing repression and bringing the repressed to consciousness.[33]

The second condition necessary for complete atonement is not an intra-personal activity but rather an inter-personal one.

> For transgressions that are between man and God the Day of Atonement effects atonement, but for transgressions that are between a man and his fellow, the Day of Atonement effects atonement only if he has appeased his fellow. This did R. Elezar b. Azariah expound; 'From all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord.' (Lev. 11:30) For transgressions that are between man and God the Day of Atonement effects atonement; but for transgressions that are between a man and his fellow, the Day of Atonement effects atonement only if he has appeased his fellow.[34]

As we can see, the general view of repentance presented by the priestly authors continues in the rabbinic concept of teshuvah. Full expiation requires remorse, specification and confession of sin, restoration of damages and reconciliation between a man and his friend. But the element of ritual sacrifice is noticeably missing. It is no longer required for the completion of the action of expiation of sin in passages such as the one found in the Jerusalem Talmud, Makkoth (Chapter II, halacha 6, p. 31d).

> They asked Wisdom, 'The sinner--what is to be his punishment?' Wisdom answers: 'Evil which pursueth sinners.' (Prov. 13:21) They asked Prophecy: 'The sinner--what is to be his punishment?' Prophecy answered: 'The soul that sinneth shall die.' (Ezk. 18:4) They asked the Holy One blessed be He: 'The sinner--what is to be his punishment?' The Holy One blessed be He replied: 'Let him do teshuvah and achieve atonement.' That is the meaning of the verse (Psalm 25:8), 'Therefore He instructs sinners in the way.'[35]

In the expansions of a parallel passage from the Pesikta de Rav Kahanah, the legitimizing logic which underlies the suspension of the need for cultic ritual offering is concisely and explicitly portrayed. Between the question addressed to Prophecy and the question addressed to God, we find the insertion of a question addressed to Torah:

> They asked the Torah: 'The sinner what is to be his punishment?' The Torah replied: 'Let him bring a guilt offering, in expiation and his sin will be forgiven him.'[36]

The expanded passage then concludes:

> Hence it is written (at one and the same time) kind and strict in judgement is the Lord (Psalm 25:8). R. Phineas commented, How can He who is strict in judgement be called kind: And how can He who is kind be called strict in judgement? Because He doth instruct sinners in the way. That is, He teaches sinners the way to do teshuvah. Therefore Hosea, admonishing Israel said to them: Return O Israel (Hos. 14:2)[37]

God's own desire supersedes the sacrificial requirements of the Torah. He prefers teshuvah rather than cultic offerings of kapparah as a means of atonement. The proof text for this is drawn from the Bible, confirming Dr. Petuchowski's statement that all the elements of the rabbinic concept of teshuvah are to be found in their rudimentary forms in Biblical Judaism. But it is important to see that continuity is maintained not with priestly, but with prophetic aspects of the Bible when it comes to the suspension of the requirement of ritual sacrifice. The levitical requirements of remorse, confession, and restoration of damages are all preserved in the rabbinic concept of teshuvah. But a significant shift of emphasis and interpretation is indicated when the above passage refers back to Hosea to demonstrate God's preference for atonement through the rabbinic requirement of teshuvah rather than cultic offering.

We find, therefore, that one trend within the midrash effectively eliminated ritual sacrifice as a necessary component of atonement and expiation of sin. Since a place for sacrifice became inaccessible and later somewhat insignificant, we find the ritual altar transformed into an institution of time. We might say that teshuvah brought with it in the rabbinic mind a displacement from place to time, with the occasion of Yom Kippur replacing the cultic site as the opportunity for kapparah. But the place maintained a lingering significance, at least in the memory of the people. As we have noted in previous passages, the shock for some was great and more concrete images were necessary to assist the more

abstract leap from place to time. According to R. Abba b. Yudan, the goat which is normally sacrificed on Yom Kippur as a kapparah offering is actually a symbol of human contrition before God. While a damaged animal would certainly be rendered ritually impure for expiatory sacrifice, it is just the quality of a broken spirit or contrite heart which God desires as an offering from man.[38] Here we have the two-fold process of the portrayal of God's desire as superseding that of levitical requirement, and a sublimation of the sacrificial goat into an aspect of human character.

An unusual interpretation of the verse, "Behold Esau my brother is a hairy man" (Gen. 27:11) provides another example of sublimated transformation of the cult.[39] We find the phrase, "And the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a land which is cut off . . . ." (Lev. 16:22) which in the text refers to the goat for Azazel, is interpreted with reference to Jacob and Esau. Playing upon the word for hair and goat (sair), Esau (sair) is associated with the goat for Azazel. Jacob is a quiet person, and therefore tam. "Their sins"--avonot-tam is translated as the sins of the quiet one (tam). The ritual of the goat is transformed into the relationship between these two brothers in which Jacob has a means of atonement (Yom Kippur) but Esau has not. Esau (sair) must beat the sins (avanot) of Jacob (the quiet one--tam) into a land far off because he does not have the precious time of Yom Kippur which even supersedes the ritual cult as an opportunity for expiation. The animals of kapparah have been transformed into the ancestors of Israel and their symbolic relationship portrays a legitimation for kapparah in which sacrificial animals no longer have a place.

Beyond the symbolism of the sacrificial animals, we have the sublimation of ritual sacrifice into the various categories that have now become familiar to us. These provide images less direct than those of the animals of the cult but more concrete than the concept of an institution of time. Just as acts of kindness were possible substitutes for the sacrifices of olot and shelamim, so, too, are they capable of replacing kapparot as pious offerings. The famous saying of Johanan b. Zakkai mentioned earlier, again comes immediately to mind. In reply to the lamentations of R. Joshua concerning the destruction of the Temple as the loss of Israel's place of expiation from sin, he said, "Do not grieve my son, we have a means of atonement that is like it, gemilut hasadim" (deeds of loving-kindness).[40] In Baba Batra 9a, we find that when the Temple existed, a man would atone through sacrifice. But after the destruction, the practice of almsgiving served as a source of atonement.[41] R. Yohannan and R. Eleazar state in tractate berakot, that so long as the Temple existed the altar would atone for Israel, but after the destruction, a man's table atoned for him.[42] Gemilut hasadim, almsgiving, and feeding the poor become sublimated substitutes for cultic sacrifice. The altar of the Temple is transformed into the table of a man's home. The feeding of God is sublimated into the feeding of the poor.

As we know, Torah can also be a source of expiatory activity. Forseeing the eventual destruction of the Temple, God gave Israel the Torah so that the study of sacrifices could be counted as if they had been offered and thereby render Israel merit for atonement.[43] Johanan b. Zakkai continues his words of comfort in Rosh Hashanah when he praises the expiatory power of the study of Torah. Combined with gemilut hasadim it has the power to atone for the descendents of Eli for whom

the sacrifices of kapparot were not effective for achieving expiation.[44]

As in the case of the shelamim, so, too, in regard to the kapparot, the blood of Abraham's circumcision becomes associated with the blood of animal sacrifice. Just as the blood is dashed against the altar during the expiation offering, so the blood of Abraham's circumcision marks the spot where the base of the altar was later constructed. Every year God sees the blood of Abraham and forgives the transgressions of Israel (rather than granting forgiveness on the basis of the blood of animal sacrifice) as proved by His words to Israel, "In thy blood, live." (Ezk. 16:6)[45]

The blood, the suffering, the flesh of sacrifice is transferred from sacrificial victim to the worshiper in a sublimation of exterior cultic ritual. This is true not only for circumcision but of yisurin or chastisements in general. The human experience of fasting, suffering, and death provides an offering directly from the worshiper without the mediation of the sacrificial cult.

The midrash tells us that the Day of Atonement itself was established on the basis of the prayer and fasting of Israel. When Moses returned to the people on the tenth of Tishri, he found them engaged in fasting and prayer. As a result of this merit, the day was established to provide a yearly opportunity for the atonement from sin, as we find in the Torah, "And it shall be a statute for ever unto you in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls. . . . For on this day shall atonement be made for you to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the Lord." (Lev. 17:20-30)[46]

Chastisements are considered by R. Nehemiah as an offering akin to cultic sacrifice. Both provide the grounds for God's forgiveness. But

chastisements are not merely similar to ritual offerings of kapparah. They are better because they come not simply from a man's property but from his most prized possession, his body.[47] Death is perhaps the ultimate offering in this regard and is so considered in the Pesikta de Rav Kahanah concerning the death of Miriam and Aaron's two sons.

> R. Abba bar Zebina said: Why is the account of Miriam's death (Numb. 20:1) put next to the passage on the ashes of the Red Heifer (Numb. 19)? To teach that as the ash of the Red Heifer atones for Israel's sins, so the death of Miriam atoned for Israel's sins.... R. Yiyya bar Abba said: Since Aaron's sons, (Nadab and Abihu) died on the first of Nisan, why does Scripture mention their death in connection with the Day of Atonement? To teach that as the Day of Atonement atones for Israel's sins, so the death of the righteous atones for Israel's sins. We know this from the verse, 'By means of this day shall atonement be made for you.' (Lev. 16:30). And the proof that the death of the righteous atones for sin, how do we know this? We know it from the verse, 'And they buried the bones of Saul and Jonathan his son in the country of Benjamin in Zela, in the sepulchre of Kish his father; and they performed all that the king commanded. And after that God was entreated for the Land.' (2 Sam. 21:14) (Their death caused God to accept the atonement of the sins of the land.)[48]

We have seen that kapparah is indeed a complex subject. More than any other sacrifice, it clearly displays the multiple dimensions of religious significance within the Biblical cult. We began by noting that even in the priestly portrayal of kapparah, expiation was required for both ritual and ethical transgression. In addition, the process of atonement demanded both a ritual and an ethical component. Defilement could be created by such diverse experiences as a flux, leprosy, contact with the dead, sexual lewdness, idolatry, or spilling of blood. Purification of defilement and expiation of sin could be achieved through a combination of remorse, confession, restoration of damages, and sacrificial offering.

Rabbinic Judaism continues this two-fold sense of defilement and

purification. However, it expands and alters it in several crucial ways. One trend arises in which certain categories of ritual defilement are sublimated into symbolic representations of moral impurity, for example, levitical defilement by the dead is interpreted to mean moral defilement created by the spilling of blood. This clearly represents a transformation of the two-fold focus of ritual and moral impurity into a singular concern for moral purity. Similarly, the path to repentance in this thread of tradition reflects a deemphasis of the Temple cult. These rabbinic texts tend to down-play, delete, sublimate, or spiritualize the Biblical demand for cultic offering.

The rabbinic conception of teshuvah carries the continuity of the priestly path of expiation in every respect but that of sacrifice. In this regard, it brings to bear the prophetic element of the Biblical tradition. But it goes beyond the prophetic in its expansion of sublimation and spiritualization of the cult. Yom Kippur, an institution of time, is substituted for a place--the priestly altar--in the format of rabbinic repentance.[45] An occasion for atonement which requires no specific location provides expiation for the people when the temple altar has been destroyed. The animals of the cult are sublimated into human characteristics, such as humility and contrition. The qualifications for cultic leadership are shifted from levitical birthright to aspects of moral integrity. Torah study, good deeds, prayer, fasting, suffering, and death, all become offerings acceptable to God, which require neither Temple nor priesthood.

Legitimation for this transformation is provided by midrashim in which God is portrayed as explicitly permitting the deletion of sacrifice from the list of penitent acts. We may find in the Torah that

sacrifice is required for expiation, but God's desire for the repentance of the sinner is so great that He is willing to suspend ritual offering to encourage teshuvah. Non-sacrificial ritual, however, continues to be important. The ritual of the mikvah, for instance, is still maintained in Tractate Yoma of the Mishna. But it is there transposed by means of a passage from Ezekiel into a symbolic representation of the complete expiation and cleansing offered by God (Israel's mikvah-hope) to one who does teshuvah.[50] The passage reaches its full expansion in the Pesikta de Rav Kahanah in a piyut for Shabbat Teshuvah.[51] The ritual of prayer like the ritual bath is considered to be an important means to the achievement of expiation. But tefillah like the mikvah may be closed, far off, or a source of public exposure and embarrassment. Teshuvah, however, is like the ocean which is always open and near at hand. It allows God to offer acceptance and expiation to the penitent sinner anytime, anywhere, without the mediation of ritual offering, place, or personnel.

CHAPTER V

To a certain extent all sacrifice has an expiatory force.[1] It was therefore appropriate to provide a general introduction in the previous chapter to the nature and dynamics of expiation as portrayed in selected Biblical and rabbinic passages. Possessing a general understanding of kapparah, we are now prepared to move from the general to the specific as we turn to the two cultic offerings which were exclusively epiatory in function. As we review the critical literature concerning the hattat and asham, we will see that we have arrived at a particularly difficult subject. According to Jacob Milgrom, attempts to understand the exact relationship between the two have been the despair of scholars throughout the ages.[2] Roland DeVaux concludes his findings with the view that "the last redactors no longer knew exactly what was specified by the hattat and asham . . . or else they confused the terms whose exact force they no longer knew."[3] Perhaps the most drastic of opinions is presented by G. von Rad when he states that "the old question of the difference between the two sacrifices cannot be solved."[4] In spite of these opinions, we do have several significant studies of the hattat and asham which provide some understanding of, if not final agreement about, the function and importance of these two cultic institutions.

The hattat, or sin offering, was distinct in its use of blood and flesh.[5] The ritual which accompanied the redress of sins for the high priest or the people, included the sprinkling of blood seven times on the altar, the application of it to the horns, and the pouring of blood

at the base.[6] The sins of a prince required a similar ritual without the sevenfold sprinkling of the altar. According to DeVaux, the value of blood is manifestly important in this procedure. Its significance continues even into rabbinic literature in the statement that "there is no expiation without blood."[7] On the other hand, the asham is distinguished by its set fine of one fifth and by the fact that only a ram can be sacrificed as a reparations offering.[8]

The confusion regarding these sacrifices stems not so much from an inability to recognize differences of procedure, but rather from an inability to distinguish differences in function. Attempts to resolve this confusion are found in the comments of some of the leading Jewish thinkers of antiquity. Philo considered the hattat an expiation of involuntary faults against one's neighbor, the asham an expiation of involuntary faults against God and of all voluntary faults.[9] According to Josephus, the distinction was between sins committed without witnesses and sins committed before witnesses.[10] These same views and others are found in the interpretations of modern scholars.

> According to Medebielle, the asham is specially intended for the reparation of wrongs done to rights of property, divine or human, and it adds to the fundamental idea of expiation, already expressed by hattat, that of a more rigorous satisfaction. Schotz deems the asham expiates a fault against the divinity that is a sacrilegious act. According to Cazelles, the asham is offered in cases of involuntary infringement of the rights of the divinity, the hattat for faults against one's neighbour but in relation with the law of Yahweh which condems them. Saydon, under the heading of expiation distinguishes three kinds of faults: 1) the faults which are 'high-handed,' with contempt of the law: they cannot be expiated (Numb. 15:30); 2) ordinary faults committed with more or less consent but which are the effects of human frailty without perversity of will: these are expiated by the sacrifice for sin; 3) faults of ignorance or inadvertence: these are expiated by the reparation sacrifice. Moraldi concludes that the two sacrifices are equally intended for the expiation of sin, but that in hattat, the dominant aspect is that of expiation and that in asham, the dominant aspect is that of reparation; in neither case

are voluntary faults at issue. . . .[11]

Some of the most recent and insightful studies of the hattat and the asham have been written by Jacob Milgrom and Baruch Levine. Though their detailed analysis of dating and redaction is beyond the scope of our enterprise, their general portrayal of the meaning and function of these two cultic institutions is of great interest to us. While the hattat and asham are probably pre-exilic in origin,[12] the conclusions of Levine and Milgrom reflect the particular importance of these two sacrifices in the post-exilic religious institutions of the priestly writers.

Levine begins his study of the asham with the Biblical text concerning the capture and return of the ark by the Philistines.[13] As a result of the capture of the ark, maal--an active estrangement from God--has been created. The realization of this state of maal leads to the return of the ark and the presentation of an asham offering in an effort to achieve expiation from sin. Analyzing these passages, Levine is able to delineate three elements in the creation of maal and the expiation of transgression through the asham offering. The first element is that of misappropriation. Afterwards there is some misfortune and then a vague or uncertain feeling of unintentional transgression. Finally, something of value is presented before the altar as an offering but not burnt as a sacrifice.[14] The fundamental assumption by Levine is that one can learn more about the significance of the asham through the study of its cultic administration than through a linguistic analysis.[15] From such an approach he arrives at misappropriation as the key concept in the function of the offering of reparation.[16] The offense of misappropriation led to the creation of estrangement

from God. But sacred property includes more than the ritual objects of the cult. Since everything belongs to God, the misappropriation of another man's property is also an offense against the deity. Thus, an asham offering and a payment of fine must be offered for misappropriation of any property, whether it belongs directly to God or to another man.

The hattat is not related to misappropriation but to ritual purity and serves a dual function.[17] It is associated with the maintenance of the levitical purity of the sanctuary and the priesthood. In addition, it provides ritual cleansing for the Israelite whose ritual impurity may contaminate others and prevent God's presence from dwelling in Israel. The hattat is offered, therefore, not only at the dedication of the cultic center and the installation of the priesthood but also in conjunction with the purification of the leper, the new mother, the nazirite, and the person defiled by the dead. At times the hattat and asham may merge and result in a graduated asham, which is a form of a hattat.[18] If one withholds testimony, it is necessary to offer an asham. But that offering may be assigned like the hattat according to a sliding scale of ability to pay, rather than a fixed fine.

Milgrom is critical of Levine for several reasons. He feels that passages such as the ones dealing with the Philistines, may not be relevant to the Israelite practice and should not be relied upon.[19] Secondly, he finds, contrary to Levine, that the hattat and asham are not exclusively offered for sins of omission.[20] In fact, it is part of their unique importance that they convert intentional transgressions into forms of unintentional offense, which may then be ameliorated through cultic offering. Finally, Milgrom considers the underlying concept of misap-

propriation totally inadequate to explain the central function of the asham offering.[21] Rather, it is one aspect among many of this complex institution.

Cult and Conscience begins with translation and linguistic analysis and then proceeds to the administrative procedures of the cult.[22] The explication of four different translations for the word asham helps clarify its usage in cultic passages. We find that it can mean: 1) reparation, 2) reparation offering, 3) incurring a penalty of liability, and 4) feeling guilty.

> He shall pay to its owner as soon as he feels guilt. As his reparation to the Lord he shall bring to the priest an unblemished ram from the flock, or its assessment, as a reparation offering. (Lev. 5:24b-25)
>
> When that person feels guilty he shall confess the wrong he has done, make reparation in its entirety, add one-fifth to it, and give it to whomever he has incurred liability. (Numb. 5:6b-7)[23]

With this flexibility of interpretation, Milgrom begins to clarify the function of the asham offering.

The key concept for understanding the meaning and purpose of the reparation offering is "sancta trespass."[24] The desecration of sancta creates a condition of maal and an estrangement from God. Objects which are not sacred are not normally of such importance. However, sanctity is extended to the obedience to all of God's ordinances. Therefore, the transgression of any commandment or law is a desecration of the sacred and the acquisition of liability. The contamination of sancta, on the other hand, requires a hattat offering to cleanse levitial impurity.[25] We can see the difference in functions of the asham and hattat as a restoration of sancta desecration on the one hand and a purification of sancta contamination on the other.[26]

Violations may be unintentional or intentional and it is this dimension of the asham that provides an understanding of its psychological and legal importance. With the extension of the possibilities of sancta desecration to every area of life, the burden of guilt was equally extended.[27] Perhaps some of the multitude of laws and ordinances had been unintentionally violated. For this, an asham could be offered. Perhaps a transgression had occurred but it was not public knowledge. For this, also, confession and reparation could be given. The burden of guilt could be relieved. There were, however, intentional sins for which the asham could also be offered, such as a false oath. While this should be punished by death, the institution of the asham provided for a conversion of intentional transgression to the category of an inadvertent sin.[28] When accompanied by remorse, confession, payment of reparations, and a sacrifice, atonement could be achieved even for an intentional crime. According to Milgrom, the asham was to the cult what teshuvah meant to the prophetic view of expiation and atonement.[29] We find that teshuvah, like the asham offering, had the power to convert even intentional transgressions to sins which God could forgive.[30]

Though Milgrom and Levine disagree on fundamental issues, we can still find important common ground in their interpretation of these two exclusively expiatory offerings. Both view the asham as a purification of moral transgression against God (or God and man), while the hattat provides the ritual purity necessary for the sanctuary, the priesthood, and all of Israel to maintain. Though the two differ as to whether the fundamental principle of the asham is misappropriation or sancta desecration, both find that offense against God is extended to a violation of the Divine statutes applicable to the moral realm of human relations.

For both men, the two-fold offering reflects the two-fold concern of Biblical Judaism with moral and levitical purity. However, though teshuvah may allow an expansion of the concept of expiation to a point which excludes the necessity for cultic offering, the asham and hattat clearly demand cultic sacrifice as part of the process of expiation and atonement for either moral or levitical transgression.

When we examine the rabbinic treatment of the hattat and asham in selected halakic and aggadic midrashim, we find a particular concern for the legal and procedural aspects of these cultic institutions. Passages which represent sublimation or ethical transformation of the cult are conspicuously few. We might attribute a concern for detail and delineation of culpability to the confusion which continues even until today regarding the function of the hattat and asham. Rabbinic authorities seem to concentrate on the questions of who exactly is liable to bring each offering and what ritual actions are required in each case. Their conclusions seem to be in general agreement with contemporary Biblical scholarship that the hattat was offered in relation to levitical cultic purity and the asham for purification of moral transgressions. This dichotomy may account for some of the failure of midrashic transformation, at least in regard to the asham which was straightforward in its moral condemnation. The hattat may have been overlooked for other reasons. Since we find both of them frequently in conjunction with kapparah, it may be that imagination and interest was drawn to this more general and fundamental concept and away from the more technical and specific sacrifices of the hattat and asham.

Nonetheless, we do have a few passages which provide evidence of sublimation and ethical transformation, even of the hattat. God sets a

moral example for man through His treatment of the cult. Unlike a king of flesh and blood, He demonstrates no favoritism toward the group or the individual, since both the annointed priest and the people are required to bring the same sin offering.[31] Through His cultic ordinances He shows concern for the feelings even of the sinner. Since both the sin offering and the burnt offering are sacrificed in the same place, a sinner need not be publicly exposed when he is engaged in repentance.[32]

The shift from sacrifice to Torah study as the source of salvation is also portrayed in the midrashic treatment of the hattat. In tractate Menahot R. Isaac says:

> What is the significance (Lev. 6:18) of the verse, 'This is the Torah of the sin offering and this is the Torah of the guilt offering....?' (Lev. 7:1) They teach that whoever occupies himself with the study of the law of the sin offering is as though he were offering a hattat, and whoever occupies himself with the study of the law of the guilt offering is as though he were offering an asham.[33]

In the days after the destruction of the Temple, the study of Torah is itself accounted as a sacred offering. Like the olah, the hattat and asham are fulfilled by the study of their requirements.

The function of the hattat in the Biblical cult was often to cleanse the Israelite who had acquired levitical impurity. It is thought by some scholars that the sin offering at the completion of the vow of the nazir was a desanctification of property which belonged to God.[34] An interesting moral passage on the nazir from Numbers Rabbah makes almost the opposite point.

> 'And (he shall) make atonement for him for that he sinned by reason of the soul.' (Lev. 6:2) That is, on account of defilement by the dead. This is the opinion of R. Ishmael. R. Eliezer says: On account of a sin he has committed against his own soul; for he has afflicted himself by depriving himself of wine. Now have we not an inference of a kal v homer. If a man who deprives himself of the pleasure of wine requires

> atonement, how much the more so a man who afflicts himself in all matters.[35]

According to this midrash, the nazirite does not become the sanctified property of God through abstinence. In fact, it is the failure of the nazirite to partake of God's property which results in the liability of a sin offering. To refuse the pleasures of God's creation is a sin against the deity and one's own soul. The ritual regulations of the nazirite do, however, teach that caution should be exercised in regard to wine for the preservation of moral sensibilities. The placement of these passages after the test for adultery and before the priestly blessing indicates that the woman who is chaste and keeps away from wine will merit children who are priests.[36]

The ritual purification of the nazir and the leper involves the use of sacrificial birds. Since leprosy was considered a possible punishment for slander, we find in Leviticus Rabbah that birds are a particularly appropriate part of the ritual. Because they use their voices and the one who slanders does so by means of his voice, one voice comes to testify in regard to the other.[37] The voice of the bird comes to symbolize the voice of the one who slanders and becomes a leper as a result of his transgression.

In addition to the various functions of purification, like the cleansing of the nazir, the leper, the new mother, and the one defiled by the dead, the hattat was particularly associated with the purification of the sanctuary and priesthood. Perhaps the most extensive appearance of the hattat in sublimated form can be found in the extended homilies of Numbers Rabbah concerning the dedication of the mishkan. Each one of the twelve tribes brings an array of cultic objects and

sacrificial offerings. Each tribe is then described in the midrash as symbolic of a particular theme. Each individual cultic object or offering is symbolically interpreted as representative of a particular aspect of the general tribal theme.[38] The goat of the sin offering appears in almost every tribal list and an examination of its meaning reveals a summary of most of the significant elements of cultic transformation.

Intricately detailed descriptions of the cultic center were a significant part of the romanticizing of the cult which appeared after the destruction of the Second Temple. The treatment of the tribe of Simeon reflects the influence of the romantic movement. Its tribal theme is the correspondence of every gift with a concrete aspect of the tabernacle. The goat of the sin offering in this context is a representation of the tent which was constructed from goat skins.[39]

Though the hattat is used to purge levitical impurity, we have found in this trend of midrashic interpretation which reaches back to Biblical roots, that the three moral transgressions of bloodshed, sexual lewdness, and idolatry ritually defile the cult. It is fitting, therefore, that we find the hattat symbolizing the redress of these moral sins in this extended homily. The goat offered by the tribe of Benjamin represents the edifice which Herod built as atonement for his murder of the sages of Israel.[40] The goat of Judah symbolizes the goatskin coat which he presented to his father when he and his brothers committed violence against Joseph.[41] Reuben's hattat is offered in repentance of his sexual transgression with Bilah[42] and the goat offering of Gad provides expiation for the sin of idol worship in Egypt.[43]

We have learned that a variety of human actions are capable of re-

placing sacrifice as pious deeds which are pleasing before God. The sin offering of Asher represents the crown of a good name for it is achieved through good deeds.[44] Since repentance and good deeds are "like a shield against punishment," they make atonement for man and secure expiation from sin. Study is, however, also important since it provides the moral instruction for those who do good deeds. According to the theme of the offerings of the tribe of Zebulun, the one who supports the scholar, as Zebulun did Issachar, is the most praiseworthy of all.[45]

The two-fold Torah and its significance is the central theme of the offerings of the tribe of Issachar.[46] The full impact of the midrashic transformation of the cult can perhaps be best grasped through a full presentation of the homiletical treatment of the dedicatory gifts of this tribe. We have demonstrated in previous chapters the shift in emphasis from the cult to the Torah as the source of authority and salvation. In this homily, the first cultic center is transposed into the complete traditions and institutions of the two-fold Torah. The silver dish represents the entire written and oral Torah.[47] Its weight, 130 shekels, equals the sum of the written Torah (24 books) plus the oral Torah[48] and the twenty-six generations from Adam to Moses which preceded matan Torah (24+80+26=130). The mizrak, or silver basin, provides a numerical symbol for Torah as well. Its weight of 70 shekels is equal to the gematria of wine and to the seventy modes of interpretation of Torah.[49] Just as the basin is made of silver, so, too, according to Psalm 12:7, are the words of Torah as pure as silver.[50] The basin and the dish represent the One God who has given the one Torah. The portrayal of these two vessels full of flour, tells us that the oral and

written Torah are full or completely without contradiction.[51] The meal offering, or minha, like the study of Torah and good deeds, is a nahat ruach, a source of pleasure for the Creator.[52] The golden pan which represents the tables of the covenant, has the weight of ten shekels, which is the number of the commandments on the tablet given by God.[53] The gift of incense signifies the fragrance of the 613 commandments which are contained within the 10 commandments.[54] There are 620 letters from first to last. When we subtract 7 letters which symbolize the seven days of creation, we have the sum of 613. This combination teaches us that only for the sake of the merit of Torah was the world created.[55]

Sacrificial animals represent the recipients of the Torah. The bullock symbolizes the priestly clan, the ram the levites, the lamb the Israelites, and the goat the true converts.[56] As we have noted in regard to the peace offering, the two oxen are the Scriptures and the Mishna.[57] Finally, the three types of animal offerings, of which there are five each, correspond to the following three verses about the Torah which contain two phrases each with five words apiece. Each of the six verses describes one of the six orders of the Mishna and according to M. Tanhuma, this is their significance:

> Nashim--'The law of the Lord is perfect restoring the soul' (Psalm 19:8) (i.e., keeping man from immorality and death).
> Zera'im--'The testimony of the Lord is sure making wise the simple (Psalm 19:8) (i.e., faith in the life of the world leads one to sow seeds).
> Mo'ed-- 'The precepts of the Lord are right rejoicing the heart' (Psalm 19:9 (i.e., the joy of festivals).
> Kodashim--'The commandment of the Lord is pure enlightening the eyes' (Psalm 19:9) (i.e., providing the light and instruction to distinguish between the holy and profane).

Toharot--'The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever' (Psalm 19:10) (i.e., it provides the capacity to distinguish between the clean and the unclean).
Nezikin--'The ordinances of the Lord are true, they are righteous altogether' (Psalm 19:10) (i.e., they contain the civil laws and within this order are the majority of civil laws).[58]

The animals represent the verses of Torah and the verses of Torah symbolize the orders of the Mishna. God mentions these verses in this context to show that they are the essentials of Torah and that He commanded to Moses both the written and oral Torah at the same time.[59]

We began with a review of the literature of contemporary Biblical scholarship concerning the nattat and asham offerings. We found that they are complex and often confusing, but of great significance as the two exclusively expiatory offerings in the Biblical cult. While Milgrom and Levine disagree as to certain aspects of interpretation, both portray the hattat as an offering of ritual purification and the asham as expiation for moral trespass which includes not only the divine-human relationship, but also divine statutes regulating relations between human beings. Though we have very few examples of the sublimation and moral transformation of the nattat, the cluster which we do have concerning the dedication of the mishkan is particularly significant. Within these complex homilies are the romanticizing of the details of the Tabernacle and the symbolic representation of the three moral transgressions of idolatry, bloodshed, and sexual lewdness. Included also are good deeds, support of scholars and the study of Torah as sacrificial offerings which replace the ritual sacrifices of the priestly cult. The extended midrashic expansion of the dedicatory gifts of the tribe of Issachar speak perhaps most clearly and simply of all our examples, of the trend which we have labeled the "sublimation and moral transformation of the Biblical cult."

Every type of ritual offering, from silver utensils to sacrificial animals, is transformed into a representation of the Torah. Israel's first cultic institution and source of salvation and religious authority is completely transformed into the institutions and traditions of the written and oral Torah in these rabbinic homilies.

CHAPTER VI

Though we have reviewed the transformation of the major sacrifices of the Biblical cult, our study would not be complete without an examination of the treatment of the cultic center. The sheer bulk of material in the Torah concerning the dimensions and materials of the mishkan should alert us to its overwhelming importance. Concerning the grandeur and beauty of the Temple which eventually replaced the mishkan as the center of Israelite religion, we also have extensive descriptions. When we examine the extensive midrashic transformation of the cultic center, we find that it is the mishkan and not the Temple which receives the major focus of rabbinic attention. It is the original institutionalization of cultic sacrifice which attracts the midrashic imagination and carries on the concern for the cultic center in the rabbinic literature. The extended homilies of the last chapter and the first pisqa of the Peskikta de Rav Kahana dealing with the institutionalization of the cultic center both refer back to the dedication of the mishkan.[1] This may reflect the fact that the Temple does not directly appear within the context of the five books of Moses, and the Tent of Meeting must therefore serve as a symbol for the Temple. It may also reflect the influence of a certain Temple romanticism which grew after 70 C.E. and like any romanticism sought to return to images of antiquity with ancient roots. This romanticism, while including the cosmic portrayal of the Temple which we will see later in the chapter, focused much more in the midrashic homilies on the symbolism of the Tent of Meeting.

Finally, with the Temple no longer in existence and rabbinic leaders desiring to downplay its reconstruction, it may have been safer and more soothing to talk about the merit of the original cultic center than the Temple which had been more recently conquered and destroyed.[2]

DeVaux informs us that Palestinian Semitic sanctuaries date back to at least 3,000 B.C.E. and that they were often associated with water, trees, or high places.[3] A theophany at such a site might have been marked by some form of construction such as a pillar or an altar. A more elaborate response might have been the construction of a complete temple, a building on a holy site in which public worship would be repeatedly performed.[4] The bamot of Shechem, Shilo, Bethel, Mamre, and Beersheba are particularly associated with the period of the patriarchs.[5] These may have been Canaanite religious centers which were taken over by Israelite worship and continued into the days of the Deuteronomic writers.[6] The desert sanctuary, the mishkan or ohel moed is associated with the desert wanderings after the exodus from Egypt. It is the place where God regularly met Moses and the people Israel.[7] We have no ancient description of it, and the main source of our knowledge comes from the priestly writers.[8] The ark and the Tent of Meeting are probably of great antiquity and generally do indeed date back to the period of desert.[9] Their portrayal in the priestly documents is probably, however, a reflection of the memory of Solomon's Temple rather than an actual description of their original characteristics.

During the period of the judges various cultic sites were established. Later, under the leadership of David, Jerusalem was made the center of the Israelite kingdom. It was there that the First Temple was constructed by his son Solomon as the throne of God on earth and the receptacle

of the Law.[10] The Second Temple, which was constructed in various stages after the return from exile, reflects the imagery of the First Temple as the seat of Divine presence and the sign of Divine election.[11]

As we mentioned previously in the introduction, though some may have looked forward to the time of rebuilding the Temple, such an act would have been somewhat of an embarrassment to the developing dominance of the Pharisaic party after its move to Jamnia after 70 C.E.[12] Nonetheless, we do find a Temple romanticism at the time of its existence or shortly after its fall which grows stronger in the years that follow its destruction. This is not unusual, and we find similar tendencies in other cultures. The cosmic symbolism of Philo and Josephus is not unlike the portrayal of the Legends of Lucian about the Temple of Hieropolis.[13] Various physical aspects of the Temple are pictured as representations of the cosmos thereby making the Temple an institution of cosmic significance.

> It was a babylonian curtain, embroidered with blue and fine linen, and scarlet, and purple, and of a contexture that was truly wonderful. Nor was this mixture of colors without its mystical interpretation, but was a kind of image of the universe; for by the scarlet there seemed to be enigmatically signified fire, by the fine flax the earth, by the blue the air, and by the purple the sea; two of them having their colors the foundation of this resemblance; but the fine flax and the purple have their own origin for that foundation, the earth producing the one and the sea the other. This curtain had also embroidered upon it all that was mystical in the heavens, excepting that of the (twelve) signs representing living creatures. . . . Now the seven lamps signified the seven planets; for so many there were springing out of the candlestick. Now the twelve loaves that were upon the table signified the circle of the zodiac and the year; but the altar of incense, by its thirteen kinds of sweet smelling spices with which the sea replenished it, signified that God is the possessor of all things that are both in the uninhabitable and habitable parts of the earth, and that they are all to be dedicated to His use.[14]

We might be tempted to say that the reason the symbolism of Josephus

is so similar to that of Lucian is that he was writing for a Hellenistic audience. It is important for this reason to note that certain Talmudic sages also attached cosmic significance to the Temple. We find in Numbers Rabbah that "the Court surrounds the Temple just as the sea surrounds the world."[15] Another source of similar imagery is tractate Sukka. When Herod wanted to coat the walls of the Temple with gold, the Sages dissuaded him for they said that the white and blue marble resembled the waves of the sea.[16] A portrayal of the Temple in cosmic terms is also attributed to the second century Sage, Pinhas ben Yair.

> The Tabernacle was made to correspond to the creation of the world.... The heaven, the earth, the sea are all houses with bolts. The house of the Holy of Holies was made to correspond to the highest heaven. The outer Holy House was made to correspond to the earth. And the Courtyard was made to correspond to the sea....17

The Temple was, however, not merely equivalent to the outer reaches and elements of the cosmos. It was also symbolically representative of the various aspects of the earthly human being. We read in Bereshit Rabbatai:

> In the hour when the Holy One blessed be He said to Moses, 'Make me a temple,' Moses said, 'How shall I know how to make it?' The Holy One blessed be He said, 'Do not get frightened; just as I created the world and your body, even so will you make the Tabernacle.' How do we know that this is so? You find in the Tabernacle that the beams were fixed into the sockets, and in the body the ribs are fixed into the vertebrae, and so in the world the mountains are fixed into the foundations of the earth. In the Tabernacle the beams were covered with gold, and in the body the ribs are covered with flesh and in the world the mountains are covered and coated with earth. In the Tabernacle there were bolts in the beams to keep them upright, and in the world trees and grasses are drawn in the earth. In the Tabernacle there are hangings to cover the top and both its sides and in the world the heavens cover the earth on both its sides. In the Tabernacle the veil divided between the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies and in the body the diaphragm divides the heart from the stomach and in the world it is the firmament which divides between the upper waters and the lower waters....[18]

This cosmic and human symbolism, utilized in the portrayal of the cult is summarized in the Tanhuma when it states that "the Temple corresponds to the whole world and to the creation of man who is a small world."[19] Patai reports that while not every detail of the Temple can be demonstrated to have symbolic significance, the symbolic interpretations mentioned above were not mere idle speculation.[20] The ritual of water libation at Sukkot provides an important example of the relationship of religious ritual and cosmic imagery. During the Feast of the Tabernacles the covering of the altar with green branches in representation of the earth was part of an intricate rain ceremony of a sympathetic magical nature.[21]

The relationship of symbol and ritual is further fortified by the Talmudic description of the earthly Temple as corresponding to a heavenly counterpart. We read in Exodus Rabbah:

> R. Berekiah began: 'Thine O Lord is the greatness, and the power, and the glory...for all that is in the heavens and in the earth (is Thine)' (I. Chron. 29:11).... You will find that everything God has created in heaven He has also created on earth.... Referring to heaven we read, 'The Lord is in His holy temple (Ps. 11:4)' and on earth we read, 'Now Eli the priest sat upon his seat by the doorpost of the temple of the Lord' (I. Sam. 1:9).... What is more, those that are below are dearer to Him than those above. As a proof you can see that He left those things on high and descended to dwell among those that were below, as it says, 'And let them make Me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.' (Ex. 25:8).[22]

The essential elements of the earthly Temple correspond to the heavenly model. The ritual utilization of the one would therefore in cultic tradition have a corresponding effect on the other. This correspondence clarifies even further the water libation ritual of Sukkot and other Temple ceremonies. The Temple, both above and below, is the dwelling place of God, but the Temple on earth is the more preferable abode. We find also that it is a source of fertility from which rivers flow forth

to replenish the earth.[23] But the waters which are under the Temple are also a source of primordial chaos, held in check by the presence of the cultic center. It is the Temple which preserves the world's stability.

> Rabbi Johanan said...'When David dug the pit (that is perpendicular shafts reaching down under the Temple to the Deep), the Deep rose and threatened to submerge the world. "Is there anyone," inquired David, "who knows whether it is permitted to inscribe the great Name upon a sherd and cast it into the Deep that its waves should subside?" There was none who answered a word. Said David, "Who ever knows the answer and does not speak, may he be suffocated." Whereupon Ahitophel...said to him, "It is permitted." (David) thereupon inscribed the great Name upon a sherd, cast it into the Deep, and it subsided sixteen thousand cubits. When he saw that it had subsided to such a great extent, he said, "The nearer it is to the (surface of) the earth, the better the earth can be watered." And he uttered the fifteen songs of ascent and the Deep reascended fifteen thousand cubits and remained one thousand cubits (below the surface).'[24]

This sherd is also pictured as a rock, the even shetiyah, which was visible within the inner regions of the Temple. It was called the foundation stone because according to the midrash, the world was founded upon it.[25] We find elsewhere in Pesikta de Rav Kahana a reference to the stabilizing effect of the cultic center. The first piska of this collection is a sermon for the Hanukah festival which commemorates the rededication of the Second Temple by the Hasmoneans. Its subject, however, is the dedication of the first cultic center of the entire people, the desert mishkan. This ancient predecessor of the Temple is pictured as bestowing the same stability on a teetering world as did the Temple of Solomon. It states:

> In regard to this same verse, R. Eleazer and R. Johanan had a difference of opinion. R. Eleazer took the words, 'it was on the day that Moses brought an end'(Numb. 7:1) as proving it was on this day that demons came to an end in the world. And his proof? The verse, 'There shall no evil thing befall thee, neither shall any demon come nigh by reason of thy tent'.... (Ps. 91:10)

> R. Johanan also differs with R. Simeon ben Lakish for R. Johanan took the words, 'It was on the day that Moses brought to an end,' as proving it was on this day that enmity came to an end in the world. Until the Tabernacle was set up, there was enmity, jealousy, rivalry, wrangling, and dissension in the world. And the proof? The verse, 'He will speak peace unto His people ...when (by means of the Tabernacle, God's) glory is made to dwell in our land.' (Ps. 85:9-10) But Simeon ben Lakish said: 'Why draw such an implication from so far away in Scripture when I can find it in the passage at hand? 'The Lord...give thee peace' (Numb. 6:26) immediately precedes, 'It was on the day that Moses brought to an end the setting up of the Tabernacle.' (Numb. 7:1) For as R. Joshua citing R. Simeon ben Yohai pointed out, the text does not simply say 'setting up of the Tabernacle' but actually says, 'setting up of (another) along with the Tabernacle.' What was the 'other' set up along with the Tabernacle? It was the earth that was set up with it. Until the Tabernacle was set up, the earth was unstable. After the Tabernacle was set up, the earth became stable.[26]

The Temple or its original predecessor, the mishkan, stabilizes the natural forces of chaos, puts an end to the influence of demons, and creates peace in human relations. It is an institution of cosmic significance in heaven and on earth, the preferred dwelling place of God, established for eternity.[27]

Since God prefers to dwell on earth, the place of His habitation must be free of levitical and moral impurity. The two-fold offense of the sons of Eli which was considered so hard to purge, consisted of both ritual and moral transgression.[28] They defiled the altar through their disregard for the proper procedure of ritual offering (I. Sam. 2:12-17)[29] and through their licentious laying with women who did service at the door of the Tent of Meeting (I. Sam. 2:23).[30] This two-fold defilement of the cultic site continues in the midrashic portrayal of the death of the priestly sons of Aaron, Nadav and Abihu. While no ultimate agreement is reached concerning their culpability, speculation on their transgressions includes both of these categories of behavior.

R. Nani of Sha'ab said in the name of R. Joshua of Siknin, citing

> R. Levi: Aaron's sons were taken because of four offenses, the penalty for each one being death. Death was decreed for Aaron's sons because they entered the Sanctuary having tasted wine beforehand, although Scripture says, 'Drink no wine nor strong drink...that ye die not.' (Lev. 10:9) (Death was decreed for them) because they entered the Sanctuary without washing their feet and hands, though Scripture says, 'Aaron and his sons shall wash their hands and feet' (Ex. 30:19) and goes on to say, 'When they go into the Tent of Meeting they shall wash with water, that they die not' (Ex. 30:20). Death was decreed for Aaron's sons because they lacked the prescribed number of garments, of which Scripture says, '(These garments) shall be upon Aaron, and upon his sons, when they go in unto the Tent of Meeting...that they bear not iniquity and die' (Ex. 28:43). What garment did they lack? They lacked the robe of which Scripture says, 'It shall be upon Aaron to minister, and the sound (of the bells) thereon shall be heard when he goeth in unto the holy place...that he die not.' (Ex. 28:35) Death was decreed for them because they had no children, it being said of them, 'Nadab and Abihu died before the Lord, when they offered strange fire before the Lord... and they had no children' (Numb. 3:4). The fact is--so said Abba Hanun, (they had no children) because they had no wives, even though Scripture commands that the High Priest 'shall make atonement for himself and for his house' (Lev. 16:16), his wife being signified by the word, 'his house' (Yoma 1:1). According to R. Levi, Nadab and Abihu (did not marry) because they were arrogant.... They said, 'Our father's brother is king, our mother's brother is prince, our father is High Priest, what woman is worthy of us?' In this connection R. Menahema said in the name of R. Joshua bar Nehemiah: 'Why does Scripture say, "Fire devoured their young men?" (Ps. 78:63). Because, 'Their virgins had no marriage song."' (Ibid.)....
>
> The arrogance of Nadab and Abihu may be further inferred from the following: Unto Moses He said, 'Come up unto the Lord, thou Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel' (Ex. 24:1). This verse intimates that Moses and Aaron walked first with Nadab and Abihu treading on their heels, saying: 'In no time these two old men will die, and in their place we shall assume authority over the community....[31]

According to the previous speculation, not only were Nadav and Abihu ritually impure when they entered the Tent of Meeting to offer sacrifice, but they were also arrogant toward Moses, Aaron, the elders, and the women of Israel.

In our discussion of the sacrifices of kapparah, we have already explored some of the midrashim which continued this two-fold sense of

impurity. We saw that the levitical defilement by the leper, the dead, and the flux were transformed into symbols of the three moral transgressions of idolatry, bloodshed, and sexual lewdness.[32] The concept of defilement through these primary non-levitical transgressions is amplified in aggada relating to the cultic center. David's treasury was not used in building Solomon's Temple because it was acquired from idolatrous worship and becuse David preferred to save it for the Temple rather than feed his starving people during the great famine.[33] While Solomon is praised for this, he is found culpable in Tanhuma Buber for other reasons. God is willing to dwell in the midst of Israel as long as His ordinances are observed. However, Solomon's acquisition of women and horses violated the moral restrictions placed by the Torah upon any ruler.[34] This transgression and the installation of an idol in the Temple by Menashe force God's presence from this world.[35]

We noted earlier that these three sins, idolatry, bloodshed, and sexual lewdness not only drove the Shekhinah from this world but were also the cause of the destruction of the Temple. Various other forms of immoral behavior were added to the list of actions which defile the cultic center and banish the Divine Presence. A clear example of the extension of these primary transgressions is stated in tractate Sanhedrin where we find that the Divine Presence is excluded from any place where there is oppression of the poor.[37]

So far we have stated those aspects of levitical and moral defilement which prevent the indwelling presence of God from remaining in the midst of Israel. There are, however, midrashic examples of the obverse which provide us with a positive statement of rabbinic values. These we might refer to as the actions which provide the necessary purity for

the "presence of the Lord." According to Pesikta de Rav Kahanah, God's natural dwelling place is on earth. However, since seven generations, beginning with Adam, caused the Shekhinah to depart, it was necessary for seven generations of righteous leaders to bring her back.

> At the beginning of time, accordingly, the root of the Presence was fixed in the regions of the earth below. After Adam sinned, the Presence withdrew to the first heaven. The generation of Enosh arose: they sinned; the Presence withdrew from the first heaven to the second. The generation of the flood arose: they sinned; the Presence withdrew from the second heaven to the third. The generation of the dispersion of the races of man arose: They sinned; the Presence withdrew from the third heaven to the fourth. The Egyptians in the days of our father Abraham arose: they sinned; the Presence withdrew from the fourth heaven to the fifth. The Sodomites arose: they sinned; The Presence withdrew from the fifth heaven to the sixth. The Egyptians in the days of Moses arose: they sinned; the Presence withdrew from the sixth heaven to the seventh.
>
> Over against these wicked men, seven righteous men arose and brought it about that the Presence came back to earth. Our father Abraham arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back from the seventh heaven to the sixth. Isaac arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back from the sixth heaven to the fifth. Jacob arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back from the fifth heaven to the fourth. Levi arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back from the fourth heaven to the third. Kohath arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back from the third heaven to the second. Amram arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back from the second heaven to the first. Moses arose: the merit he earned brought it about that the Presence came back to earth. Hence in the verse, 'It was on Israel's bridal (kalot) day that Moses brought to a conclusion (the coming back to earth of God's indwelling Presence).' (Numb. 7:1)[38]

We find that it is the righteous who cause the Eternal to dwell on earth[39] and that God dwells among the righteous.[40] Here in the Pesikta de Rav Kahanah it is clearly stated that the righteous actions which were begun by Abraham are concluded by Moses and result in the purification necessary for the establishment of the mishkan. The Tabernacle then becomes a symbol not only of levitical ritual, but of the merit of seven

generations of righteous leaders who prepare the earth for the return of God's indwelling Presence. Its erection is a sign of the completion of the moral purification of the cultic center.

The Tabernacle is also a place where the Shekhinah can come and teach Torah according to Tanhuma Buber.[41] It is a center not only of sacrificial offering, but also of learning. In fact, it is even portrayed as the residence of God when He comes to visit the Torah.[42] Having given it to Israel, He cannot completely part with it and the mishkan serves as a guest house of sorts during His visits. All of these views are summarized in a passage which is found in the aggadic passages of the Mekhilta.

> 'In every place I will come and put my name....' A place in which there is no love, from there will I depart. From this they said, 'The shekhinah is among every ten who come into the synagogue.' The proof of this is, 'God is found in the congregation (be-eydat) of the Lord.' And how do we know that (God) is even among three? The proof is, 'In the midst of judges (elohim) He will judge (three sit in judgement).' And how do we know that (God) is even among two? The proof is, 'Where they speak the fear of God between a man and his friend' (Mal. 3:15). And how do we know that (God) is even with one? The proof is, 'In every place which My Name is mentioned I will come to you (you is singular).[43]

The indwelling presence of God may be found in a place where there is love, righteousness, prayer, justice, or study.

According to Haran, each of the various levels of entrance into the mishkan had a specific level of kedushah. The various materials of construction were arranged in ascending order of value as one penetrated more deeply into the Tabernacle.[44] In one trend of midrashic exposition, the materials of the desert mishkan and of the Temple acquire an additional dimension of sanctity. They become symbolic representations of virtues and virtuous patterns of behavior. We find in the earliest

halakic midrashim that the ritual requirement of uncut stones for the construction of the altar signifies the elimination of violence in human interaction. If the altar is not to be the object of cutting by metal but is to be the place for the creation of peace, how much the more so should one avoid doing violence to another human being who speaks and has feelings.[45] The levitical garments of the priesthood which were to be worn for the service at the altar are similarly transformed. If the priest is required to be modest before the stones of the altar, how much the more so should sexual modesty be practiced before other human beings who have sexual sensitivities.[46]

The earth is the original material for the altar. It was chosen according to the Tanhuma as a symbol of man's origin. Since the body was made from the earth, atonement for it should be made upon an earthen altar.[47] According to Bar Kappara, the steps which lead to the sacrificial site are not merely a means of access but testimony that a person should be slow and deliberate in judgement. One is commanded to approach the altar not with leaps but with careful steps and so, too, should judgement be.[48] The same imagery is further expounded by R. Eleazar who continues the passage with his inference that "a judge should not trample on the heads of the people." Because it is written that one should not go up by steps (Ex. 20:26), and this is followed by the expression, "these are the judgements," we learn that a judge should not force his way to the altar, that is not trample the people in his judgements."[49]

The ark is portrayed in this trend of rabbinic interpretation as a symbol of ecological sensitivity. Since no fruit-bearing trees are used in the construction of the ark, man should follow this Divine example: If God spares the trees which bear fruit when building His house,

then, of course, how much the more so should man avoid destroying these trees for his own habitation.[50] The ark is the first object in the mishkan to be constructed and this also is given significance in the midrash. There are three important crowns and each one is symbolized by some part of the Tabernacle. The crown of kingship is symbolized by the table, the crown of priesthood by the altar, and the crown of Torah by the ark. The primacy of the ark in construction of the mishkan is a symbol of the primacy of Torah. It teaches that one who acquires the crown of Torah is as if he had acquired all three.[51] In addition, it is an imitation of Divine behavior. Just as God began the creation of the universe with light (Gen. 1:), so, too, should man begin the creation of the mishkan with light (Torah).[52] A symbolic interpretation is utilized here to transform an ancient cultic center into the image of the mishkan as a center of Torah.

The Tabernacle is pictured in the Pesikta de Rav Kahana as a marital canopy, within which God and Israel are lovers. Utilizing themes and passages from the Song of Songs, the mishkan is transformed into a model for interpersonal sensitivity. Just as God does not return without the consent and urging of Israel, (Let my Beloved come into His garden--S.S. 4:16--and then I am come into My garden--S.S. 5:1), so, too, should a groom not enter the huppah without the permission of the bride.[53] Drawing on passages from the Song of Songs, a comparison is established between a bridal canopy and the interior of the Tabernacle. The description of the mishkan as "inlaid with love" (S.S. 3:10) generates differing interpretations. According to R. Yuda, this refers to the merit of Torah study and righteousness, while R. Azariah, citing R. Judah bar R. Simeon, interprets it as a reference to the indwelling

Divine Presence.[55] The splendor of the Tabernacle is created, according to this midrash, by the study of Torah and the righteous deeds of Israel, and by the presence of God.

With reference to the water-libation ceremonies of Sukkot, we have seen that the Temple probably was viewed in terms of cosmic symbolism even before its destruction. After its destruction we find a growth and development of Temple romanticism but also a focus on the Tabernacle in the central homilies concerning the cultic center. In both the Bible and Rabbinic Literature there is a two-fold emphasis on the moral and ritual purity of the Tabernacle or Temple. When conditions of purity are established, the Divine Presence chooses to dwell in the earthly cultic site. The violations of the sons of Eli and the midrashic speculation on the two-fold transgressions of the sons of Aaron confirm the dual nature of purity and defilement regarding the Tabernacle and Temple. Through midrashic interpretation, various ritual forms of defilement become symbols for aspects of moral transgression. The three cardinal sins of idolatry, bloodshed, and sexual lewdness are elaborated upon, providing a series of moral transgressions which banish the presence of the Shekhinah from the mishkan. On the other hand, we find an expansion of the various moral virtues which have the power to bring the Divine Presence to earth. In fact, we have seen that a trend developed in which these qualities, independent of cultic altar, could provide the necessary conditions of the descent of the Indwelling Presence. Study, prayer, peaceful relations, and righteous judgement, all create the necessary conditions independent of ritual site or levitical purity. In addition, the various ritual objects and elements of the Tabernacle, altar and Temple become in this context, symbols of ethical

behavior and interpersonal sensitivity. The stones, the steps, the garments, the wood, all become illustrations of the pious acts of sexual modesty, peaceful co-existence, study of Torah, righteous deeds, careful judgement, and ecological concern. It is clear that the cultic center, in addition to the sacrifices offered therein, was sublimated, spiritualized, and transformed into symbolic representations of virtuous behavior in the trend of rabbinic thought portrayed in this thesis.

CONCLUSION

We began our study with an outline of the elements which represent moralizing tendencies in the rabbinic treatment of the sacrificial cult. We included a shift in the focus of sacrifice from the feeding of God to the spiritual development of man. Also found in our list was an emphasis on the moral grounds of cultic impurity. Transformation of the cult entailed the midrashic interpretation of animal sacrifices as symbols of human attitudes and actions. Cultic offerings were sublimated into the pious actions of study, prayer, suffering, good deeds, and interpersonal sensitivity. Priestly leadership of the community was displaced onto the authority of the _hasid_ and _tzadik_. The Temple cult was replaced by the Torah and its institutions as the central means to salvation.

In our study of the _olah_, examples were provided of specific _midrashim_ which exemplify in their treatment of the cult certain moralizing tendencies mentioned above. Through our examination of the _shelamim_, we were able to glimpse the process of midrashic transformation. Certain fundamental rabbinic values were found first in the _Sifre_ commentary on the priestly blessing of _shalom_. In the later homiletical _midrashim_ of _Leviticus Rabbah_, the _shelamim_ offerings were identified with _shalom_ and transposed into representations of this significant interpersonal quality.

Our analysis of the rabbinic treatment of expiatory offerings showed us both continuity and innovation in the moralization of cultic

provisions. Preserved in this rabbinic trend of thought is the cultic emphasis on moral as well as ritual purity. There is, however, an expansion of the Biblical attitude which concludes with a total transformation of levitical provisions into moral categories. Defilement by the dead, the leper, and the one with a flux symbolizes the moral defilement of the one who engages in bloodshed, idolatry, or sexual lewdness. The expansion of the prophetic concept of teshuvah in the rabbinic literature results in a total break with the priestly attitude towards sacrificial offerings. A period of time (Yom Kippur), rather than a place (the temple altar), became the central institution of expiation. Study, good deeds, and the actions mentioned throughout this thesis as substitutes for sacrifice became the means to expiation.

A probe of the sin and guilt offering exposed us to the moral transformation of levitical rituals attached to the purification of the nazarite and the leper. We found that the midrashic portrayal of the hattat offered by each tribe at the dedication of the mishkan, provided a cornucopia of moralizing passages. Perhaps the most extensive example of the transformation of the cult in the entirety of our study was provided by the dedicatory sacrifices of the tribe of Issachar. Every cultic object was portrayed as representative of the correspondence between the Tabernacle and the two-fold Torah. This led us directly to the final aspect of our project, the moral transformation of the cultic center. We found that the stones of the altar, the wood for the ark, and the dress code of the officiating priesthood, all served to provide midrashic symbols of sexual modesty, ecological sensitivity, and the sanctity of man.

An appropriate conclusion to our study of the moral transformation

of the cult in rabbinic homilies is provided by the treatment of the ritual of the red heifer in the Pesikta de Rav Kahanah.[1] Of all the institutions of the cult, the red heifer is perhaps the most perplexing. It is one of four rituals about which the yetzer harah raises contradictions to test the faith of Israel.[2] How, it asks, is it possible that the priest who prepares the ashes of the animal is defiled while the people who receive them are purified? The answers given to this question in this pisqa provide the full range of rabbinic responses to the significance of the sacrificial cult in the period after the destruction of the Temple.

The portrayal of the red heifer as possessing some intrinsic significance and power provides an example of the literal interpretation of the meaning of the cult. The exact purpose of the ritual is, however, a closely guarded secret. Its workings were beyond the wisdom of Solomon,[3] accessible only to Moses's keen powers of understanding.[4] The rest of us will be informed of the purpose of its intricacies in the world to come.[5]

Johanan ben Zakkai's discourse to his students concerning the meaning of the red heifer moves from the literal importance of the cult toward what we have described as a moralizing tendency. He explains to his disciples that there is no inherent power in either the defilement of the corpse or the purification of water and ashes.[6] The cultic provisions are merely a means to provide Israel with a way to demonstrate obeisance to God.[7] By deemphasizing the power of the concrete ritual, the importance of the cult is reduced. It becomes significant not in and of itself but merely as an expression of obedience. The door is opened for the development of alternative ways to provide testimony to

obedience to the Divine will. The strength of this half-way house of cultic transformation is also its weakness. It provides the foundation for the creation of new religious institutions and traditions but fails to create continuity with the past. While it eliminates the literal power of ritual acts, it fails to infuse them with symbolic significance.

The full expression of both continuity and innovation is provided in the complete transformation of the cult found in the closing nehemta portion of this pisqa on the red heifer.[8] The provisions and images of this cultic institution are portrayed in the midrash in a way that simultaneously deemphasizes their inherent ritual power and emphasizes their non-ritual significance. The red heifer becomes a symbol of Israel, the cultic provisions the events of Jewish history.[9] The defilement is the defilement of the exile. The final purification is the culmination of Jewish destiny when Israel will dwell in the purity of Jerusalem. The levitical cult is sublimated into the realm of human interaction and transposed onto the plane of history. It is a fine example of the moralization of cultic provisisons in rabbinic homilies.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

[1]George B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament.

[2]Gray, op. cit., p. 2.

[3]Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, p. 41.

[4]Levine, op. cit., p. 76.

[5]Levine, op. cit., pp. 77-78.

[6]Yehezkel Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel.

[7]Kaufmann, op. cit., p. 111.

[8]Kaufmann, ibid.

[9]Kaufmann, op. cit., p. 103.

[10]Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, pp. 79-82.

[11]Levine, op. cit., pp. 79-80.

[12]Levine, op. cit., pp. 85-86.

[13]Levine, ibid.

[14]Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament, p. 44.

[15]Gray, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

[16]Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel, p. 103.

[17]Kaufmann, ibid.

[18]Kaufmann, op. cit., p. 102.

[19]Herbert Chanan Brichto, "The Case of the Sota and a Reconsideration of Biblical Law," in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. 46, 1975, pp. 55-70, and Jacob Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, pp. 123-237.

[20]Brichto, "The Case of the Sota," pp. 66-67.

[21]Tosephta, Sota, 14:1-2, ed. Zuckermandel, p. 320.

[22]Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, p. 80.

[23]Milgrom, op. cit., pp. 123-124.

[24]A. Büchler, Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century, pp. 212-269.

[25]Büchler, op. cit., pp. 270-344.

[26]Midrash Tannaim to Deuteronomy 24:4, ed. Hoffman, p. 156.

[27]Büchler, Studies in Sin and Atonement, p. 374.

[28]J. B. Brown, Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 24-26.

[29]Avot de R. Nathan, Version A, Chapter 4, ed. Schechter, p. 11a.

[30]Brown, Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism, p. 26.

[31]Brown, op. cit., p. 28.

[32]Brown, op. cit., pp. 21-30.

[33]Brown, op. cit., p. 26.

[34]Raphael Patai, Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual.

[35]Patai, op. cit., p. 208.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

[1]Roland DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 426.

[2]George B. Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament.

[3]DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 451.

[4]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 6:4, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, pp. 120-121 [apparently tannaitic].

[5]B. Bekorot 42a.

[6]Lev. Rab. 7:3, ed. Mordechai Marmulies, Vol. I, p. 156.

[7]B. Bekorot 41a.

[8]Torah Shelemah, Vayikra, perek 15, Vol. XXVI, p. 127.

[9]Gen. Rab. 34:9, eds. Theodor-Albeck, Vol. I, p. 317.

[10]Ex. Rab. 36:2.

[11]Numb. Rab. 15:7.

[12]Ex. Rab. 36:2.

[13]Op. cit., 36:1.

[14]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 6:1, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, p. 111.

[15]Pesikta Rabbati, ed. Meir Friedmann, Ch. 1 of Supplement, p. 194b.

[16]Numb. Rab. 20:18.

[17]Ibid.

[18]B. Sukka 49b.

[19]Lev. Rab. 8:4, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 171-172.

[20]Pesikta Rabbati, ed. Meir Friedmann, Ch. 1 of Supplement, p. 193b.

[21]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 6:2, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, p. 117.

[22]B. Shabbat 30a.

[23]Avot de R. Nathan, Version A, Ch. 1, ed. Schechter, p. 119.

[24]Menahot 110a.

[25]Lev. Rab. 7:3, ed. Mordecnai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 153-156.

[26]Tanhuma, Korah, 12.

[27]Ex. Rab. 36:3

[28]Lev. Rab. 7:2, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 150-151.

[29]B. Berachot 32b.

[30]Op. cit., 15a.

[31]Tanhuma, Korah 12.

[32]Ibid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

[1]Roland DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, pp. 34-35.

[2]Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, p. 46.

[3]Levine, op. cit., p. 51.

[4]DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, p. 35.

[5]Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, p. 51.

[6]W. Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, pp. 226-227.

[7]Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, p. 35.

[8]Levine, ibid.

[9]Roland DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 427.

[10]Levine, In the Presence of the Lord.

[11]Levine, op. cit., p. 11.

[12]Levine, ibid.

[13]Levine, op. cit., p. 52.

[14]Sifra, Vayikra, perek 15, ed. I. H. Weiss, p. 13a.

[15]Sifre, Naso, perek 42, ed. Meir Friedmann, pp. 12b-13a.

[16]Lev. Rab. 9:1, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, p. 173.

[17]B. Hagigah 4b.

[18]B. Menahot 110a.

[19]Lev. Rab. 9:8, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, p. 187.

[20]B. Avodah Zarah 8b.

[21]Lev. Rab. 9:9, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, p. 193.

[22]Op. cit., 190-191.

[23]Lev. Rab. 9:2, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 175-176.

[24]Numb. Rab. 13:20.

[25]Op. cit., 14:11.

[26] Ibid.

[27] Lev. Rab. 9:8, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 186-187.

[28] Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, pp. 68-69.

[29] Numb. Rab. 18:5.

[30] Op. cit., 13:15-16.

[31] Lev. Rab. 9:15, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 173-174.

[32] Numb. Rab. 13:8.

[33] Lev. Rab. 9:3, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, pp. 176-178.

[34] Lev. Rab. 9:9, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, p. 189.

[35] Ibid., pp. 189-190.

[36] Ibid., pp. 193-194.

[37] Ibid., pp. 194-195.

[38] Ibid., p. 195.

[39] Ibid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

[1] Roland DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 418.

[2] Lev. 1:4, (1917 JPS translation).

[3] Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, pp. 60-77.

[4] Herbert Chanan Brichto, Sacrifice and Slaughter, (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1976) mimeographed, pp. 10-11.

[5] Lev. 5:20-26, (1917 JPS translation).

[6] Numb. 5:6-10, (1917 JPS translation).

[7] Lev. 5:5-10, (1917 JPS translation).

[8] Ex. 30:11-16, (1917 JPS translation).

[9] Sifra, Vayikra, perek 1, ed. I. H. Weiss, p. 56.

[10] B. Yoma 5a.

[11]Song of Songs Rabbah 6:4.

[12]Pirke de R. Eliezer, 46.

[13]Sifra, Aharai Mot, perek 4, ed. I. H. Weiss, p. 81b.

[14]Numb. Rab. 7:10.

[15]Sifra, Aharai Mot, perek 5, ed. I. H. Weiss, 81b.

[16]Ex. Rab. 15:15.

[17]Mishna, ed. Ch. Albeck, Sota 9:15, p. 262.

[18]Song of Songs Rabbah 1:9.

[19]A. Büchler, Studies in Sin and Atonement.

[20]Avot de R. Nathan, Version A., Ch. 4, ed. Schechter, p. 11a.

[21]B. Baba Batra 60b.

[22]B. Nesahim 54a (Baraitna).

[23]Jakob J. Petuchowski, "The Concept of 'Teshuvah' in the Bible and the Talmud," Judaism, Vol. XVII, 1968, p. 178.

[24]Petuchowski, op. cit., p. 175.

[25]Jacob Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, p. 124.

[26]Sifra, Emor, perek 14, ed. I. H. Weiss, p. 102a.

[27]Yoma, Ch. VIII, 1b, p. 45b.

[28]Mishna, Yoma 8, ed. Ch. Albeck, pp. 246-247.

[29]Op. cit., p. 247.

[30]B. Yoma 86b.

[31]Yoma, Ch. VII, 7-10, p. 45c.

[32]Pesikta Rabbati, 45, ed. Meir Friedman, p. 186a.

[33]Petuchowski, op. cit., p. 180.

[34]Mishna, Yoma 8, ed. Ch. Albeck, p. 247.

[35]J. Makkot, Ch. II, 25, p. 31d.

[36]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 24:7, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. II, p. 355.

[37]Ibid.

[38]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 24:5, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. II, pp. 353-358.

[39]Gen. Rab. 65:11, eds. Theodor-Albeck, Vol. II, pp. 726-727.

[40]Avot de R. Nathan, Version A. Ch. 14, ed. Schechter, p. 11a.

[41]B. Baba Batra 9a.

[42]B. Berakot 55a.

[43]Tanhuma, Korah 12.

[44]B. Rosh Hashana 18a.

[45]Pirke de R. Eliezer 29.

[46]Tanhuma, Tisa 31.

[47]Sifre, Vaethanan, perek 6, ed. Fliezer Finkelstein, p. 57.

[48]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 26:11, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. II, pp. 399-400.

[49]Sifra, Emor, perek 14, ed. I. H. Weiss, p. 102a.

[50]Mishna, Yoma 8, ed. Ch. Albeck, p. 247.

[51]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah, 24:2, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. II, pp. 348-350.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

[1]Roland DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, p. 91.

[2]Jacob Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, p. 1.

[3]DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, p. 92.

[4]Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, p. 1.

[5]DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, p. 92.

[6]DeVaux, ibid.

[7]B. Yoma 5a.

[8]DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, p. 98.

[9]Philo, On the Special Laws, Vol. VII, pp. 231-239, paragr. 226-238.

[10]Flavius Josephus, Antiquities. Book III, IX, 3, p. 106.

[11] DeVaux, Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice, p. 106.

[12] Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, pp. 92-94.

[13] Levine, ibid.

[14] Levine, ibid.

[15] Levine, op. cit., p. 92.

[16] Levine, op. cit., p. 93.

[17] Levine, op. cit., pp. 103-105.

[18] Levine, op. cit., pp. 108-109.

[19] Milgrom, Cult and Conscience, p. 102.

[20] Milgrom, op. cit., p. 103.

[21] Milgrom, ibid.

[22] Milgrom, op. cit., pp. 3-12.

[23] Milgrom, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

[24] Milgrom, op. cit., p. 125.

[25] Milgrom, op. cit., p. 127.

[26] Milgrom, ibid.

[27] Milgrom, op. cit., p. 80.

[28] Milgrom, op. cit., p. 126.

[29] Milgrom, op. cit., p. 124.

[30] B. Yoma 86b.

[31] Lev. Rab. 5:3, ed. Mordechai Marrulies, Vol. I, p. 109.

[32] Lev. Rab. 37:6, ed. Mordechai Marrulies, Vol. IV, p. 752.

[33] B. Menahot 110a.

[34] Baruch Levine, In the Presence of the Lord, p. 101.

[35] Numb. Rab. 10:15

[36] Op. cit. 10:25.

[37] Lev. Rab. 16:7, ed. Mordechai Marrulies, Vol. II, pp. 261-262.

[38] Numb. Rab. 13:1-14:12.

[39] Op. cit., 13:19.

[40] Op. cit., 14:8.

[41] Op. cit., 13:14.

[42] Op. cit., 13:18.

[43] Op. cit., 13:20.

[44] Op. cit., 14:10.

[45] Op. cit., 13:17.

[46] Op. cit., 13:15-16.

[47] Ibid.

[48] The oral Torah is interpreted as equivalent to the numerical sum of 80. This figure is arrived at by adding the first letter of the first word of the Mishna--mem (40) of me'emathai--and the last letter of the last word of the Mishna--mem (40) bashalom. Mem (40)+ mem (40)=80.

[49] Numb. Rab. 13:15-16.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Ibid.

[53] Ibid.

[54] Ibid.

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Ibid.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Ibid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

[1]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 1:1, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, pp. 1-3.

[2]Alexander Guttman, "The End of the Jewish Sacrifical Cult," in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXVIII, 1967, p. 148.

[3]Roland DeVaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 274-279.

[4]DeVaux, op. cit., p. 282.

[5]DeVaux, op. cit., pp. 289-294.

[6]DeVaux, op. cit., p. 294.

[7]DeVaux, op. cit., p. 295.

[8]DeVaux, ibid.

[9]DeVaux, op. cit., 298.

[10]DeVaux, op. cit., p. 299.

[11]DeVaux, op. cit., pp. 325-327.

[12]Guttman, "The End of the Jewish Sacrificial Cult," pp. 147-148.

[13]Raphael Patai, Man and Temple, p. 56.

[14]Flavius Josephus, Wars of the Jews, Book V, V. 5, p. 784.

[15]Numb. Rab. 13:19.

[16]B. Sukka 51b.

[17]Midrash Tadshe, Beth Hamidrash, ed. A. Jellinek, Vol. III, pp. 164f.

[18]Bereshit Rabbati, Noah, ed. Ch. Albeck, p. 32.

[19]Tanhuma, Pecude 3.

[20]Patai, Man and Temple, p. 116.

[21]Patai, ibid.

[22]Ex. Rab. 33:4.

[23]B. Yoma 77b-78a.

[24]B. Sukka 53a-b.

[25]Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 26:4, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. II, p. 391.

[26] Op. cit., 1:5, Vol. I, pp. 10-11.

[27] Lev. Rab. 2:2, ed. Mordechai Margulies, Vol. I, p. 37.

[28] Rosh Hashana 18a.

[29] I. Samuel 2:12-17 (JPS translation 1917).

[30] I. Samuel 2:23 (JPS translation 1917).

[31] Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 26:9, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. II, pp. 390-396.

[32] Numb. Rab. 7:10.

[33] Pesikta Rabbati 6, ed. Meir Friedmann, pp. 25b-26a.

[34] Tanhuma, Benukotai, perek 5, ed. Solomon Buber, p. 55b.

[35] Ibid.

[36] Numb. Rab. 7:10

[37] B. Sanhedrin 7a.

[38] Pesikta de Rav Kahanah 1:1, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, pp. 2-3.

[39] Op. cit., p. 2.

[40] Pirke de R. Eliezer, 35.

[41] Tanhuma, Vayekahel, perek 8, ed. Solomon Buber, p. 62b.

[42] Ex. Rab. 33:1.

[43] Mekhilta, Yitro 11, eds. H. S. Horowitz and I. A. Rabin, p. 213.

[44] Menachem Haran, "The Priestly Image of the Tabernacle," in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXVI, 1965, pp. 200-205.

[45] Mekhilta, Yitro, 11, eds. H. S. Horowitz and I. A. Rabin, p. 214.

[46] Op. cit., p. 215.

[47] Tanhuma, Itzav, 11.

[48] B. Sanhedrin 7b.

[49] Ibid.

[50] Ex. Rab. 35:2.

[51] Op. cit., 34:2.

[52] Ibid.

[53] *Pesikta de Rav Kahanah* 1:1, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, p. 1.

[54] *Op. cit.*, 1:2, Vol. I, p. 4.

[55] *Ibid.*

NOTES TO CONCLUSION

[1] *Pesikta de Rav Kahanah* 4, ed. B. Mandelbaum, Vol. I, pp. 54-77.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 71.

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 65.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 71-72.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] *Op. cit.*, pp. 74-75.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Op. cit.*, pp. 76-77.

[9] *Ibid.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BIBLICAL LITERATURE

The Holy Scriptures. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1972. 2 Volumes.

II. RABBINIC LITERATURE

Avot de R. Nathan, ed. Solomon Schechter. New York: Shulsinger Brothers Lineotype and Publishing Co., 1945.

Babylonian Talmud. (Vilna Edition) New York: Golman-Otzar Hasefarim, Inc., 1958. 20 Volumes.

_____. Soncino English translation, ed. I. Epstein. London: The Soncino Press, 1952. 34 Volumes.

Bereshit Rabbati, ed. Ch. Albeck. Jerusalem: Rav Kook Institute, 1966.

Bet Hamidrash, ed. A. Jellinek. Jerusalem: Bamberger and Wahrmann Books, 1938. 6 Volumes.

Deuteronomy Rabbah, ed. Saul Lieberman. Jerusalem: wahrmann Books, 1964.

Genesis Rabbah, eds. J. Theodor and Ch. Albeck. Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1965. 3 Volumes.

Leviticus Rabbah, ed. Mordecai Margulies. Jerusalem: Office of Education and Culture of the State of Israel, 1952. 5 Volumes.

Mekhilta de R. Ishmael, eds. H. S. Horowitz and I. A. Rabin. Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, 1969.

Midrash Rabbah. (Vilna Edition.) Jerusalem: 1970. 2 Volumes.

_____. Soncino English translation. eds. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London: The Soncino Press. 1961. 10 Volumes.

Midrash Tannaim, ed. David Hoffman. Berlin: H. Itzowski, 1908-1909.

Mishna, ed. Ch. Albeck. Jerusalem and Tel Aviv: Bialik Institute and Dvir Co., 1968. 6 Volumes.

Palestinian Talmud. (Krotoshin Edition.) New York: Shulsinger Brothers Lineotype and Publishing Co., 1948.

Pesikta de Rav Kahanah, ed. B. Mandelbaum. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962. 2 Volumes.

_____, trs. William G. Braude and Israel J. Kapstein. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1975.

Pesikta Rabbati, ed. Meir Friedmann. Tel Aviv: Offset Esther, 1962.

_____, tr. William G. Braude. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968. 2 Volumes.

Pirke de R. Eliezer. (Reprint of 1861 Warsaw Edition.) Jerusalem: 1969.

Sifra, ed. Isaac H. Weiss. Vienna: Jacob Schlossberg, 1862.

Sifre to Deuteronomy, ed. Eliezer Finkelstein. 2nd ed., New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1969.

Sifre to Numbers, ed. Meir Friedmann. Vienna: Holzwarth, 1864.

Tanhuma, ed. Solomon Buber. Vilna: Romm., 1885.

_____. Jerusalem: Lewin-Epstein, Ltd., 1971.

Tosephta, ed. M. S. Zuckermandel. Jerusalem: Wahrmann Books, ;963.

Auxiliary Sources

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., Briggs, Charles. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.

Jastrow, Marcus. Dictionary of Talmud Babli, Yerushalmi, Midrashic Literature and Targumim. Tel Aviv: 1972.

Kasher, Menahem M., ed., Torah Shelemah. Jerusalem: Torah Shelemah Publishing Inc., 1927 ff.

Mandelkern, Solomon. Hekhal Hakodesh. Tel Aviv: Schocken Publishing House, Ltd., 1971.

Secondary Sources

I. BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Abba, Raymond. The Origin and Significance of Hebrew Sacrifice. Fullerton, Calif.: Institute of Judaism of Department of Religious Studies, California State University, Publication IV, 1973.

Brichto, Herbert Chanan. "The Case of the Sota and a Reconsideration of Biblical Law," in Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XLVI, pp. 55-70, 1975.

_____. On Slaughter and Sacrifice, Blood and Atonement. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1976. (Manuscript.)

DeVaux, Roland. Ancient Israel. New York and Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965. 2 Volumes.

_____. Studies in Old Testament Sacrifice. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1964.

Gray, George Buchanan. Sacrifice in the Old Testament. 2nd Edition. New York: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1971.

Greenberg, Moshe. "A New Approach to the History of the Israelite Priesthood." In Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. LXX, pp. 41-47, 1950.

Haran, Menachem. "The Priestly Image of the Tabernacle." In Hebrew Union College Annual, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 191-226, 1965.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. The Religion of Israel. Translated and abridged by Moshe Greenberg. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.

Levine, Baruch. In the Presence of the Lord. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.

Milgrom, Jacob. Cult and Conscience. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

_____. Studies in Levitical Terminology. No. 1. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970.

Patai, Raphael. Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual. New York: KTAV, 1967.

Smith, William R. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. 3rd Edition. New York: KTAV, 1969.

II. RABBINIC LITERATURE

Brown, J. R. Temple and Sacrifice in Rabbinic Judaism. Evanston, Ill.: Seabury Western Theological Seminary, 1963.

Büchler, Adolph. Studies in Sin and Atonement in the Rabbinic Literature of the First Century. 2nd Edition. New York: KTAV, 1967.

Guttmann, Alexander. "The End of the Jewish Sacrificial Cult." In Hebrew Union College Annual. Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 137-149, 1967.

Neusner, Jacob. From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Petuchowski, Jakob. "The Concept of 'Teshuvah' in the Bible and the Talmud." In Judaism, Vol. XVII, pp. 175-185, 1968.

Rivkin, Ellis. "Defining the Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources." In Hebrew Union College Annual. Vol. XLI, pp. 205-249, 1969-70.

Zeitlin, Solomon. The Rise and Fall of the Judean State. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1962/67. 2 Volumes.

III. ADDITIONAL LITERATURE

Cohen, Hermann. Religion of Reason Out of the Sources of Judaism, tr. Simon Kaplan. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co., 1972.

Colson, F. H. (ed. and tr.) Philo. Vol. VII. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Josephus, Flavius. The Life and Work of Flavius Josephus. (tr. William Whiston) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.