

The first five books lay the foundation of Scripture's epochal events down vectors of history. The Old Testament Pentateuch structure of New Testament barely intelligible.

Here we meet the people of Israel—Abraham and the tower of Babel, the presence of the Law, the books of the Pentateuch. The creation of the world, the fall of Eve, the judgment of Abraham from the covenant of Sinai, the giving of the Law in Egypt, the giving of the Law in the wilderness, the taking of the Law to the Promised Land, the announcements of the Law and the curses that contribute to the power of the Law. This deals with themes and concepts.

Behind and beyond the Pentateuch, the Pentateuch has both practical and theoretical aspects. Whereas in the many English translations, the patriarchs are confident of their status, the patriarchs have now changed. In some cases, some have radically changed the ancestral final composition. Hellenistic and weights of the Law and weighs the possible solutions.

The documents reigning criticism rumored to their appearance.

Dictionary

OF THE Old Testament:

Pentateuch

Editors:

T. Desmond Alexander

David W. Baker



InterVarsity Press

Downers Grove, Illinois
Leicester, England

2003

ISBN 0-8308-1781-6

ISBN 0

The fi
lay th
of Sci
epoch
down
is play
of the
the Pe
ture c
barely

Here
of Isr
and t
prese
book
disait
Eve,
of Ab
cover
Egyp
plan
ence
ann
ings
cont
pow
then

Beh
the
have
wh
mar
con
the
has
case
rad
the
fina
Hell
and
pos

The
reig
run
hei

InterVarsity Press, USA
P.O. Box 1400, Downers Grove, IL 60515-1426, USA
World Wide Web: www.ivpress.com
E-mail: mail@ivpress.com

Inter-Varsity Press, England
38 De Montfort Street, Leicester LE1 7GP, England
World Wide Web: www.ivpbooks.com
E-mail: ivp@uccf.org.uk

©2003 by InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of InterVarsity Press.

InterVarsity Press®, U.S.A., is the book-publishing division of InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA®, a student movement active on campus at hundreds of universities, colleges and schools of nursing in the United States of America, and a member movement of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students. For information about local and regional activities, write Public Relations Dept., InterVarsity Christian Fellowship/USA, 6400 Schroeder Rd., P.O. Box 7895, Madison, WI 53707-7895, or visit the IVCF website at <www.ivcf.org>.

Inter-Varsity Press, England, is the book-publishing division of the Universities and Colleges Christian Fellowship (formerly the Inter-Varsity Fellowship), a student movement linking Christian Unions in universities and colleges throughout the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland, and a member movement of the International Fellowship of Evangelical Students. For information about local and national activities write to UCCF, 38 De Montfort Street, Leicester LE1 7GP.

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the Holy Bible, New International Version®. NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan Publishing House. Distributed in the U.K. by permission of Hodder and Stoughton Ltd. All rights reserved. "NIV" is a registered trademark of International Bible Society. UK trademark number 1448790.

The maps on pages 278 and 920-21 created by Maps.com, Santa Barbara, California.

Cover design: Kathleen Lay Burrows

Cover image: Sistine Chapel, Vatican, Rome, Italy/Fratelli Alinari/Superstock

USA ISBN 0-8308-1781-6

UK ISBN 0-85111-986-7

Printed in the United States of America ∞

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch/editors, David

Baker, T. Desmond Alexander.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0-8308-1781-6 (cloth: alk. paper)

I. Bible. O.T. Pentateuch—Dictionaries. I. Baker, David W.

(David Weston), 1950- . II. Alexander, T. Desmond.

BS1225.52.D53 2002

222'.103—dc21

2002009227

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

P 25 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Y 24 23 22 21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 10 09 08 07 06 05 04 03

InterVarsity Press

Project Staff

Reference Book Editor/Project Editor

Daniel G. Reid

Copyeditor

Bob Buller

Design

Kathleen Lay Burrows

Design Assistant

Mark Smith

Typesetters

Gail Munroe

Marj Sire

Maureen Tobey

Proofreaders

Elizabeth Bowman

Bill Kerschbaum

Allison Rieck

David Zimmerman

Technical Support

Drew Blankman

Mark Gates

Tricia Koning

ris; London: Histories and Mysteries of Man, 1989 [1962]); A. Maes, "Le costume phénicien des stèles de Umm el-'Amed," in *Phoenicia and the Bible*, ed. E. Lipinski (OLA 44; Studia Phoenicia 11; Leuven: Departement Orientalistiek/Peeters, 1991) 209-30; J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991); P. R. S. Moorey, *Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999 [1994]); M. Noth, *Exodus* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962); E. Riefstahl, *Patterned Textiles in Pharaonic Egypt* (New York: Brooklyn Museum, 1944); N. Sarna, *Exodus* (JPSTC; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1991); C. Van Dam, *The Urim and Thummim: A Means of Revelation in Ancient Israel* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1997). C. Van Dam

PRIESTLY SOURCE. See AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH; PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM, HISTORY OF; SOURCE CRITICISM.

PRIESTS, PRIESTHOOD

The Israelite priesthood was a religious institution within which certain people were given particular and often exclusive rights, roles and responsibilities as mediators between the divine and human realms. The purpose of this article is to describe the Israelite priesthood as portrayed in the Pentateuch. The article will focus on the origin and development of the priesthood, on the symbol system within which it operated and on its roles within Israelite life and faith.

1. The History of the Priesthood: The Pentateuchal Portrait
2. Reconstructing the Historical Priesthood
3. The Message of the Pentateuchal Portrait
4. The Symbolism of the Priesthood
5. The Functions of the Priesthood

1. The History of the Priesthood: The Pentateuchal Portrait.

The origin and history of the Israelite priesthood within the history of the Israelite cult (that is, its system of religious expression) presents one of the most vexing problems for biblical historians. The difficulty has two causes. First, the Pentateuch is composed of a variety of texts that have been composed, collected and edited at different times under differing circumstances. Second, the communicative intention of some of these sources and of the final canonical shaping was not to provide a complete history of the Isra-

elite cult (see 2 below). Although a general portrait, virtually in the form of a montage, of the origins of the priesthood and the official Yahwistic cult of Israel may be gleaned from the Pentateuch as a whole, this portrait is rather incomplete and hazy in places. Moreover, individual traditions in the Pentateuch, as well as in the historical books and the prophetic books, present differing sketches related to the origin and development of the Israelite cult. Attempts of historians to separate out, reorder and bring together all of the sketches like pieces of a jigsaw puzzle in order to provide one clear and complete image have not achieved a consensus.

1.1. Priesthood Prior to Moses and the Giving of the Law. As the pentateuchal narrative unfolds, the first direct association of the priestly institution with Israelites designates them all as a "kingdom of priests and a holy nation" among all of the peoples of the earth (Ex 19:6). However, prior to that reference and prior to the formal creation of the Israelite priesthood (Ex 28-29), which occurs after the exodus and the giving of the *Decalogue at Mount Sinai, the biblical characters demonstrate knowledge of cultic practices. For example, one finds sacrificial acts by *Abel (Gen 4:4), *Noah (Gen 8:20), *Abraham (Gen 22:13) and *Jacob (Gen 31:54; 46:1; see also Ex 24:5). Often scholars have used such evidence to draw the conclusion that in the patriarchal period the patriarchs served as their own priests. However, it is possible that the biblical presentation actually meant to avoid such a picture. M. Haran has argued that in the ancient Near East individuals could offer *sacrifices at *altars without encroaching on the prerogative of the priests, who served the gods within the enclosed sacred space of temples (Haran, 13-42).

The biblical portrait also presupposes a cultural background that from the beginning is familiar with priestly institutions. Examples of priests appear in the Bible prior to the mention of any Israelite priestly system (e.g., Canaanite, Gen 14:18; Egyptian, Gen 41:45; Midianite, Ex 2:16). Indeed, Abraham honors a Canaanite priest, *Melchizedek, who is apparently a worshiper of the same God (Gen 14:18-20; note that "God Most High" is identified here with Yahweh), and Moses' father-in-law was a Midianite priest (Ex 2:16-21; 18:1; see Jethro). Moreover, Exodus 19:20-24 gives the impression that some sort of priestly system of Yahweh worship ex-

isted among the Israelites, who had recently exited Egypt, both prior to the giving of the Decalogue at Mount Sinai and prior to the formal instructions recorded later for establishing the priesthood (Ex 28-29). The form and content of this early cultic worship is not clarified.

1.2. The Aaronide Priesthood. Following the giving of the Decalogue and the establishment of the *covenant with the people whom Yahweh had delivered from Egypt, Yahweh took the initiative to establish official forms and means of worship (Ex 25-30). The establishment of the *tabernacle, a portable sanctuary, created an area of "sacred space" in which God would symbolically dwell in order to be present with his people and at which place they could officially worship (Ex 25-26). As in other ancient Near Eastern cultic systems, the creation of sacred space called for the consecration of sacred functionaries, priests, to attend to the matters of that place. The first formal mention of persons being designated as priests to the God of Israel occurs in Exodus 28:1-4, where *Aaron, the brother of Moses, and Aaron's sons (*Nadab, Abihu, *Eleazar, Ithamar, Ex 28:1) are named. (Their actual consecration as priests, which lasted for a week, and their first official actions as consecrated priests are recorded in Lev 8-9.) However, an earlier reference to Aaron and his sons being given the role of keeping the lamps burning in the tent of meeting (Ex 27:20-21), which is later a priestly role, along with the inclusion of Aaron with Nadab and Abihu in the events of Exodus 24:1, 9, gives the impression that their "selection" took place earlier, perhaps when "Aaron the Levite" (see 1.3 below on Levites) was chosen as a spokesperson with Moses (Ex 4:14). The distinctive garments, role and manner of consecration described for Aaron (Ex 28-29 and Lev 8) presuppose that he will serve as the "high priest," an office that is not specifically mentioned until much later in the Pentateuch (Num 35:25). By divine decree the priesthood became a dynastic role of the Aaronide family (Ex 29:9). The role of high priest was also apparently hereditary, being passed on to Aaron's third son, Eleazar (Ex 6:23; Num 3:2), after Eleazar's two older brothers, Nadab and Abihu, were consumed by fire for offering unauthorized fire before Yahweh (Lev 10:1-3; see Num 20:25-28, where Eleazar becomes Aaron's successor). However, another traditional reason for the perpetuation of the

priesthood through a son of Aaron is given in Numbers 25:10-13 (also 1 Macc 2:26, 54). Here the descendants of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, are granted a lasting priesthood because of an act of loyalty to Yahweh by Phinehas.

1.3. The Levites. In addition to the priests proper, there was a lesser order of cultic functionaries known as the Levites. This distinction between the two orders is clearly delineated in Exodus and Numbers. However, Deuteronomy fails to make such a clear distinction and appears to speak of the priestly nature of the whole tribe of *Levi. According to Exodus and Numbers, the Levites primarily assisted the priests in their duties. On a scale of "holiness," the Levites stood between the people, who were "common," and the priests, who had been sanctified for closer contact with the divine realm (see 4.2 below on holiness; see Num 8:5-22 for the purification of the Levites). As a result, the Levites could perform functions that the layperson was not permitted to do, but they were not permitted to fill some of the roles of the priests. According to the traditions in Numbers, the Levites initially had two main duties (Num 3:5-10; 4:1-49; 18:1-32). First, Levites were expected to aid the priests by guarding against encroachment. Encroachment occurred when those who were common or less holy illegally came into contact with the more holy objects of the cult. Second, they were to help with the labor of loading and transporting the cultic paraphernalia of the tabernacle from place to place. (Milgrom [1970] has demonstrated that in priestly texts *mišmeret* means "guarding" rather than the more general "service," and *'ābōdā* refers to portage-related duties rather than to "work" in general.) Over time the role of the Levites changed somewhat. Once the Yahwistic temple cult became permanently fixed at a site, the latter duty of portage would have become obsolete. According to the traditions in Chronicles, when David and Solomon centralized the temple cult in Jerusalem, the Levites were also given the role of temple musicians, a function not found in the Pentateuch (1 Chron 15:16-22).

Pentateuchal traditions give us two accounts for the origin of the secondary role of the Levites, although the accounts are not necessarily mutually exclusive. In Exodus 32, when the people followed Aaron in the worship of the golden calf, it was the "Levites" who zealously executed those who had committed apostasy. For this act

of loyalty the Levites were appointed for their special role. Deuteronomy also attributes priestly roles to the tribe of Levi in association with an act of zeal (Deut 33:8-10), although it is not clear whether or not the text is referring to the *golden calf incident. On the other hand, Numbers 1 does not count Levi among the twelve tribes to be numbered but reckons them as simply appointed to the charge of the tabernacle (Num 1:47-53). The reason for their not being counted among the other tribes is found in Numbers 3, where they are taken by God as belonging to him in exchange for the firstborn male children of Israel, who had been spared when God struck down the firstborn males of Egypt.

Because of their special professional role of serving the Israelites as cultic personnel, the whole tribe of Levi, which included the priestly lineage, were not given a tribal allotment of land. Instead they were to be given certain towns with accompanying pastoral land scattered among the other tribal territories (Lev 25:32-34; Num 35:1-8). Also, they were to be maintained by tithes given by the people (Num 18:20-32). Another tradition explaining the landlessness of the Levites is found in Genesis 49:5-7. Here Levi and his brother *Simeon are cursed for their acts of violence (traditionally associated with their actions found in Gen 34), so that they (that is, their tribal families) would be scattered about the land of Israel.

2. Reconstructing the Historical Priesthood.

Although a general portrait of the priesthood may be gleaned from the Pentateuch, individual traditions appear to present differing sketches about the origin and historical development of the Israelite cult. As a result, biblical scholars have raised questions about the historical accuracy of the pentateuchal portrait and have sought to reconstruct a more consistent picture. For instance, because of the various traditions regarding the Levites, biblical historians have debated whether the term Levi originally designated a person from the tribe of Levi, and by extension became used for these cultic functionaries, or if the term originally had a cultic connotation and somehow became associated with a tribe called Levi. (A. Cody, however, has convincingly shown that Levi is a proper name and not an appellation [Cody, 29-38].)

2.1. Critical Reconstructions. One classical and

popular thesis among biblical historians for sorting out the differences in the individual biblical traditions was tied to the identification of and dating of sources in the Pentateuch. This thesis is known as the Documentary Hypothesis (see Source Criticism). Toward the end of the eighteenth century, after over a century of scholarly efforts to identify and date literary strands in the Pentateuch, J. Wellhausen promoted this thesis. In his work, Wellhausen accounted for some of the differing "sketches" in the traditions about the priesthood by arguing a logical progression from more primitive and less organized forms of cultic expression to later and complex forms. The linchpin of his argument was the thesis that the literary source containing the complex cultic forms, the Priestly source, or P (represented for the most part by Exodus 25-40, Leviticus and Numbers), belonged not to the Mosaic age but to the postexilic time and was fabricated as a defense for later cultic practices. Less formal and complex cultic activity was then to be found in the earlier pentateuchal sources of J, E and D. For instance, he posited the following development. In the patriarchal period, primarily recorded in J and E, the patriarchs themselves could function as priests. In the period of the judges, Levites, a name for cultic functionaries, came to refer to the preferred priestly personnel. They later became associated by literary invention with the tribe of Levi. However, there were other competing priestly houses. The D source, mainly Deuteronomy, came from the late monarchy when Josiah centralized the cult at the temple in Jerusalem around 621 B.C. At this time all Levites could serve as priests in Jerusalem. Later, after the return from the Babylonian exile, the Priestly source (P) told about stricter cultic reforms that had occurred. By this time Levites had been demoted to the role of second-class cultic functionaries.

This very influential reconstruction promulgated by Wellhausen did not, however, resolve all difficulties left by the gaps and the differing sketches of the individual traditions found in the OT. Moreover, the linchpin of his thesis was found to be problematic. New evidence of complex cultic institutions with, for example, differing orders of priestly personnel, were found to exist in the ancient Near East even prior to the time of Moses (see Sabourin, 98-157). Scholars also began to date some of the terminology and

practices in P as preexilic in origin. As a result of these factors, during the last hundred years there have been several other attempts to reconstruct the history of the Israelite priesthood. For example, F. M. Cross argued that the discrepancies could be explained better by positing two ancient priesthoods that vied with one another: an Aaronic priestly house with sanctuaries in Bethel and Jerusalem, and a Mosaic (Mushite) priesthood at Dan, Shiloh and other places in the Negev (Cross, 195-215). M. Haran, on the other hand, sees one priestly line going back to the ancient Levites, the kinsmen of Moses, who were distinguished later in terms of their location in the northern kingdom ("Levites") or in the southern kingdom ("Aaronides").

2.2. A Critique of Historical Reconstructions.

Many of the assumptions of historical-critical reconstructions are sound. For instance, throughout their history the people of Israel lived in different sociological, economic and political settings: family, village, city, tribal alliance, royal statehood, vassal nation and a province within a foreign empire. One would expect that the precise nature of the priestly office changed within those different settings in terms of its roles, the size and specialization of its members, its status, the ways and means of priestly sustenance and the complexity of its ritual expression. Indeed, the current generation of biblical scholars will need to incorporate our increasing knowledge about the sociological nature of ancient Israel into our understanding of priestly institutions (e.g., Anderson).

The basic pentateuchal portrait also appears to contain different sketches of the priesthood, possibly coming from different traditional sources. If possible, it would be important to identify and date any sources and layers of editing that have been employed in the composition of the Pentateuch. One might expect the cultural and sociological setting of the times of writing and editing to influence the perspectives, emphases and even the agenda of the authors and editors, although the total process of the composition of each text and its inclusion in the Pentateuch was inspired to achieve God's total communicative intent. Understanding those perspectives would then guide the modern interpreter as he or she seeks to reconstruct both the historical developments of the Israelite priesthood and the role the priestly cult played at different times in Israelite life.

However, the presence, the diversity and the historical setting of the individual traditions regarding the priesthood are not the focus of the canonical form of the Bible (see Childs, 84-91, 145-74). In some traditions the priestly institutional features are said to have originated by divine, Mosaic or royal decree. In other instances, cultic features are linked to historical events. But in all cases, the emphasis is on the divine design of the Israelite cult. The biblical cultic texts, the bulk of which are not historical narrative but are instructional and expository discourse, preserve the essence of the Israelite Yahwistic cult. Therefore, although reconstructing the history of the Israelite priesthood is a valid scholarly enterprise, the message about the priesthood in the canonical form of the Bible is not to be found in such reconstructions.

3. The Message of the Pentateuchal Portrait.

What the biblical writers and editors preserved and presented was the message about the priesthood's divine origin, its lofty calling to holiness and the dangers of its role being perverted. In the Pentateuch, priestly perspectives have been integrated with the overarching biblical theme of a covenant made with God. Whereas texts that focus on the concept of covenant present Israel's relationship to Yahweh in terms of a legally binding contract, the texts that focus on the priestly cult present that relationship in terms of a symbol system that emphasizes Yahweh's holy presence. The Pentateuch asserts that proper worship was established by God and was an integral part of the covenant. Both *law and praxis came from Yahweh. The modern tendency to separate cultic law from ethical law was unknown.

Because Israel was called to be a holy nation and a kingdom of priests to the nations (Ex 19:6), the Israelite priests had an analogous function of being a holy priesthood to Israel. The priesthood held the people accountable to Yahweh by teaching (Lev 10:10-11; Deut 33:10), a role that was expanded from cultic precepts to the totality of the Torah. This was done within a ritual complex that at every turn reminded the people of the awesome holiness of Yahweh and their covenant to be holy (see 4 and 5 below).

However, not to be overlooked in the pentateuchal material is the brutal reminder of the dangers of forsaking God's decrees even in the face of God's graciousness: Aaron created a

*golden calf (Ex 32), priests offered unholy fire (Lev 10:1-3) and Levites tried to usurp the priests (Num 16). Even the sacrificial system that the priests oversaw, which was given by God to atone for sin, was primarily for inadvertent sins rather than for deliberate sins (Num 15:22-31). The priestly system could seek to engender obedience to the holy God and speak of the blessings of obedience and of atonement for some sin (Lev 26:1-13; Deut 28:1-14); however, the cultic system could never atone for consistent, outright rejection of the covenant (Lev 26:14-46; Deut 27:9-26; 28:15-68).

4. The Symbolism of the Priesthood.

4.1. The Symbolic Nature of the Cult. Cultic practices are symbolic by nature. They reflect, enact and shape one's beliefs about reality. They draw on the symbol systems by which one's culture comes to comprehend and create its view of reality. Moreover, it is often the "priests" of a culture who teach, interpret and mediate the important elements of these systems. Therefore, it is important to examine some of the symbol systems that lie behind, and help to explain, the roles of the Israelite priests. As a caution, however, one should note that this section presents the cultic system not in terms of its historical growth but as a whole. Again, it is likely that some of the symbol systems, or at least their forms of expression, developed over time.

The Israelite, priestly ritual complex made use of the imagery of the surrounding cultures but transformed it within a symbol system that expressed a different worldview. The worldview of autonomous primordial beings who were susceptible to various influences by one another and from human magic was disavowed within Israelite priestly theology. Instead, in their worldview Yahweh was sovereign, not contending with primordial beings for supremacy and not susceptible to magical words or gesticulations (see Divination, Magic). The Israelite system had no means to coerce God or to heal diseases that others believed were caused by evil primordial forces (see the works of Kaufmann and Milgrom).

The heart of the ritual complex employed classification schemes. In these classification schemes people, animals, places, things and times were recognized as clean or unclean, holy or common (see Holy and Holiness, Clean and Unclean). Biblical scholars have yet to sort out

fully the intricacies of these schemes and how they related to one another; however, their importance is quite clear. The role of clarifying these distinctions and preserving them fell to the priests. As they preserved and restored these distinctions, they helped to maintain the divinely created order (see Gorman; Jenson).

4.2. Clean and Unclean, Holy and Common. Cultures often tend to classify people, animals and objects, even places and seasons, as either "clean" or "unclean" (see some of the categories in Lev 11-15). Such categories have nothing to do with modern concepts of hygienic cleanness and are sometimes only indirectly connected with notions of sin. However, by extension these categories also become applied to the realm of behavior and ethics (Lev 18). For Israel, the standard by which something was clean or unclean appears to have rested on a theology of creation that is represented in Genesis 1:1-2:3. In this account of *creation, one sees how God rules over the elements that are contra life and order (the symbols of chaos: darkness, a watery deep and a formless "earth"). God created an orderly separation of these elements into life-ready realms and then filled those realms. God created an orderly, life-filled world and called it good. For Israel, then, that which was associated with the divinely created order or life was clean, and that which somehow was symbolic of chaos or death was unclean.

The normal state of a person was clean. Uncleanness was a state of being that sometimes was contagious or transferable and could make the clean person or object become unclean. Unlike the belief of some of their neighboring cultures, in which uncleanness could be the result of demonic gods, the Israelites represented uncleanness as an abstract dynamic "power" representing human susceptibility to the realm of chaos and death as well as to wrongdoing. Uncleanness had no place in the presence of the God of life and order. It polluted God's dwelling in Israel's midst. Such uncleanness was of two types: tolerated and prohibited. On the one hand, a person could become unclean through normal and necessary actions, such as sexual intercourse, childbirth and preparing a dead family member for burial. (On the symbolism connecting such acts with the concept of uncleanness, see Milgrom; Wright.) Such uncleanness was tolerated and not a sin, although the person was required to go through a ritual act of

cleansing to remove the impurity. On the other hand, flagrant sin resulted from the mismanagement of tolerated uncleanness or from breaches of prohibited uncleanness, such as incest, adultery (see Sexuality, Sexual Ethics) and spiritualism (see Lev 18; 20).

Things were also classified as "holy" or "common." In the ancient Near East, that which belonged to the realm of the gods was holy. So too, for Israel, that which specifically belonged to Yahweh was holy (Lev 27:9; Num 3:13; 8:17). The normal state of people and things outside of the divine realm was common. Holiness, like uncleanness, was a "power" that in some cases was contagious and could sanctify that which had been common, making it holy. However, God's holiness, God's life-producing essence, had to be approached with utmost respect. Coming into contact with that which was holy could be quite risky. The Israelites believed that improper close contact with God could result in death (Ex 19:21-24; Num 4:19-20; for an example, see 2 Sam 6:6-7). Holiness was found in gradations; there was a scale of holiness whereby some things were more holy than others (e.g., the difference between the holy place and the holy of holies within the tabernacle/temple, Ex 26:33-34). In general, contact between nonadjacent elements on the scale of holiness was prohibited (e.g., that which was less holy could come into contact with the holy, but that which was common could not come into contact with the more holy).

The two classification systems of clean/unclean and holy/common shared a complex interrelationship. For example, a layperson could be common and in a state of being clean or unclean. Also, an object could be holy (a sacrifice) and clean prior to use but unclean after being used to remove impurity.

4.3. Sin and Pollution. Dealing with the distinctions of clean/unclean and holy/common was a serious matter. Mismanagement and violations of these distinctions were sins that resulted in harmful consequences for individuals and for the community. In the pentateuchal portrait, when Israel entered into covenant with Yahweh, they entered into a relationship involving God's presence with them. God's presence in Israel's midst was represented by the portable tabernacle and later by the temple. By extension of this spatial concept of God's presence, Israel viewed the Promised *Land as God's land, in which

they were received as sojourners (Lev 25:23). Improper care of the distinction between holy and common when approaching to worship God was an egregious affront to God's gracious presence and could result in death (Lev 10:1-2). Also, the failure to preserve the distinctions of clean/unclean resulted in spiritual "pollution." Such acts of defilement polluted God's land and, more specifically, God's dwelling place as represented by the tabernacle or temple. Such pollution impeded Israel's relationship with God and could result in the people being vomited out of the land (Lev 18:24-29). As a result, the sin of one person had consequences on the total community's relationship with God.

The sacrificial system, for which the priests were the main overseers, provided a major means of dealing with the polluting influence of sin, particularly for unintentional sins as opposed to defiant sins (Num 15:22-31). In some cases, the purging influences of sacrifices were required to cleanse God's dwelling place. However, in other cases purification was not possible. The party guilty of causing such pollution often was to be executed (Lev 20). Continued pollution would result in Israel being "vomited out" of the land (Lev 18:28).

5. The Functions of the Priesthood.

The priests worked to create, maintain and reestablish the divine order symbolized by the classification systems of the clean/unclean and the holy/common. The charge given to the priests in Leviticus 10:10 to "distinguish" (*habdil*) between the holy and the common and between the clean and unclean uses the same Hebrew root for the divine action of making distinctions in the process of creation (Gen 1:4, 6, 7, 14, 18). Therefore, one might say that, just as God established the original creational distinctions between order and chaos, life and death, the priests in particular, and to some extent all people who were created "in the image of God," became "cocreators," or at least "comaintainers," with God. By maintaining those distinctions, they upheld the creational order from the constant threat of encroachment of chaos and death (see Gorman). (See too the use of *habdil* in Leviticus 20:24, 25, 26: as God has made a "distinction" between Israel and other nations, Israel is to make "distinctions.")

The priestly role corresponded with their unique "position." They occupied the boundary

zone or "no man's land" between the holy (the presence of Yahweh) and the common. To be a priest was to operate in the danger zone of encroaching upon the divine realm for the purposes of representing the divine will to the community and representing the community before God. To be in the presence of the holy God was to risk death (Ex 20:18-19; 28:35, 43; 30:20-21; Lev 10:1-3). Those set aside to be priests were placed in a special state of holiness that allowed them access to the "dwelling" of God (on their consecration, see Ex 29; Lev 8-9). The priests had to wear special garments (see Priestly Clothing). These garments not only symbolized the priests' representative status (e.g., the breastplate of the high priest had twelve stones representing the twelve tribes of Israel) but also "protected" them from dying when entering before Yahweh (e.g., their undergarments, the high priest's bells and possibly the seal on his turban; Ex 28). The priests also had to live by stricter rules of cleanness than the layperson, particularly when on duty (Ex 30:17-21; Lev 10:8-9; 21:1-22:16). The priests' position of having a greater status of holiness than that of the layperson not only put them at greater risk of dying but also placed them in a position of being able to serve the community of faith effectively.

The following is an attempt to order the various roles of the priests; however, it should be recognized that these categories, which are not prescribed in the Pentateuch, are imperfect. Certain roles may fit under more than one category or perhaps be better listed separately.

5.1. Custodians of the Cult. The priests were the general custodians of the instructions that were designed to set the community apart as holy to Yahweh (Lev 19:2). As custodians of these instructions, they had several subroles.

5.1.1. Teachers. The priests were teachers. They held the responsibility for teaching the people the instructions regarding clean/unclean and holy/common (Lev 10:10-11; Deut 33:10; see also 2 Chron 35:3; Ezek 22:26; Hag 2:11-13). The various instructions, which expressed these classifications, constantly reminded the people as they went about their daily lives that their God, Yahweh, was a God of life and order and that they should reject "death" and choose life. Yahweh was unfathomably holy and could not dwell with impurity. Moreover, in Jewish tradition the priests' role as teachers expanded from teaching cultic precepts

to teaching the totality of the Torah. The movement toward this fuller responsibility is found already in Deuteronomy 31:9-13, where it is prescribed that every seven years, at the Feast of Booths, the priests were to read the laws of the covenant to the assembled people. Perhaps the reason that the levitical cities were spread throughout the land was to make them accessible to the people for instruction. As the people of this holy God, they needed to be aligned with the divine design of life and order to be in right relationship with Yahweh. The priests taught them how to live in that right relationship.

It has also been suggested that priests might have had the role of perpetuating the traditions regarding the origin of their sanctuary and cultic practices, as do the priestly functionaries at some relatively modern Palestinian cultic sites (Gray, 222-23). One might suppose that the Israelite priests knew the stories of the origins of their cultic practices as found in the Pentateuch and that they might have carried the teaching responsibility of passing on these traditions.

5.1.2. Boundary Interpreters. The priests were interpreters of the cultic boundaries in time, space and status. They had to clarify and set the boundaries in the ritual complex according to the guidelines that had been established under divine guidance. It was their role to distinguish between the holy and unholy, the clean and unclean (Lev 10:10; 11:47; see Foods, Clean and Unclean). That task involved making an abstract principle clear in concrete situations. For instance, guidelines for distinguishing clean and unclean animals are given in Leviticus 11. These guidelines seem to come from the *zoological classification system of their culture and aided in identifying animals that might have symbolically seemed to have blurred the bounds of the creational order. However, not all animals are listed in such texts. The priest would have to make decisions about other animals based on these guidelines. Another example is found in the case of skin diseases, in which the priests virtually played a diagnostic role. The person who was afflicted with a condition that might be unclean was brought to the priests. They examined the condition and pronounced the person as clean or unclean (Lev 13-15). One would also suppose, however, that new situations and new questions would always be arising. In such cases, it was probably up to the priests to clarify the boundaries of acceptable and unacceptable be-

havior on the basis of what had been revealed about the character of Yahweh and how Israel was to be set apart to be a different people. For example, the community was to avoid the polluting practices of the nations that God was expelling from the Promised Land (Lev 18:3, 24-28; 20:22-25). Although some pagan practices are specified in such lists as Leviticus 18-20, not all such practices are mentioned. Apparently the priests were given the responsibility to make these decisions. Practicing cultic rituals at the right time was also important (Lev 23:1-44). However, keeping a lunar calendar was not always an easy task. Although not stated in the Pentateuch, the priests probably also had to track astronomical signs and determine when the holy times and seasons began and ended.

5.2. Agents of Divine Blessing, Holiness and Purification. The priests, as occupants of the medial zone between the divine and the common, enabled communication and transference between the holy and the common or unclean. It was their job to establish, maintain and restore the proper creational order of persons and things.

5.2.1. Purifiers. Most important, priests had the responsibility of purifying the holy place and the *altars, which symbolized Yahweh's dwelling with Israel. First, they "made atonement" for accrued pollution from sins. That is, by the manipulation of the blood of the sacrifices, they cleansed away the pollution and made God's dwelling holy again, bringing the situation back to its proper state and order (e.g., Lev 4:1-6:7; 16:1-19). Second, they purified the person whose impurity had lasted more than seven days, such as in the cases of childbirth and abnormal genital discharges (Lev 12; 15:13-15). The primary function of the sacrificial system, which the priests oversaw, was to restore God's dwelling and people to their orderly status and to enable a right relationship with God.

5.2.2. Spokespeople for God. The priests spoke for God in at least two ways. First, there were times when they pronounced divine *blessing upon the people (Num 6:22-27; Deut 10:8). Such words were apparently seen as efficacious: the pronouncement resulted in wholeness and prosperity. Blessings might be pronounced over the people on public occasions (Lev 9:22) and possibly in response to cultic petitions. Although this latter function is not clarified in the Pentateuch, there is some evidence from passages

such as 1 Samuel 1:9-20 (perhaps Judg 17-18) and the Psalms (see Ps 12:5 [MT 12:6]; 85:8 [MT 85:9]; 118:26) that, in response to petitions, a priest might have spoken a prophetic word of blessing on God's behalf. (See also words of blessings that might have been spoken by priests in Ps 20:1-5 [MT 20:2-6]; 115:14-15; 121:7-8; 128:5; 134:3.)

Second, perhaps closely related to the last function, the priests also pronounced oracles announcing the will of God for certain decisions, sometimes having employed the Urim and Thummim, a divining device (Num 27:21; Deut 33:8; see Ezra 2:59-63). The exact nature and function of the Urim and Thummim is uncertain. However, it does appear that they were devices used by the priests to determine the divine response to a petition by a leader, such as *Joshua or a king (Num 27:21; 1 Sam 14:41; 28:6), or to determine someone's status in cultic matters (Ezra 2:59-63; Neh 7:63-65). These cases of priests speaking for God appear to be primarily in response to petitions that were made in cultic settings.

5.2.3. Judges. In Israelite history, the realm of judicial authority probably progressed from the heads of households to recognized elders of status to appointed officials. (In Genesis the patriarchs ruled their households, and in Ex 18:5-27 and Deut 1:9-18 Moses instituted a system of judges.) It is expected in Deuteronomy 16:18-20 that each town would have appointed *judges. However, one also finds provision for the priests to assist as judges in difficult cases (Deut 17:8-13; 19:16-17; 21:1-5). It appears that in these difficult cases, which involved a lack of witnesses or conflicting witnesses, the priests stood as divine representatives and perhaps were expected to divine the truth as they did in the case of the wife suspected of adultery (Num 5:11-31).

5.2.4. Participants in Warfare. The priests participated in *warfare, which was basically viewed as a religious activity. In their role as diviners (see 5.2.2 above) the priests were called on to give oracles from God about whether or not the people should go out to war (Num 27:18-21; Judg 20:26-28). Deuteronomy 20:2-4 has the priests addressing the troops before they go out to battle. The priests probably also went out to battle on many occasions. First, one notes that Phinehas went out to battle taking articles from the sanctuary and the trumpets for signaling (Num 31:6). Second, if it was customary to take

the ark of the covenant and the trumpets into battle, as appears to be the case in nonpentateuchal material (Josh 6; 1 Sam 4; 2 Sam 11:11; the imagery of Ps 24; see also Num 10:33-36; 14:41-45), then the priests would have had to be present, because they were in charge of the portage of the ark (note that Levites may carry the ark, but the priests are in charge [Num 3:31-32; Deut 31:9, 25] and of blowing the trumpets (Num 10:1-9). Finally, it is possible that the priests made decisions about the purification and division of the booty that was taken in war, at least when it was perceived as sacred war (Num 31:21-31; see *Hērem*).

5.3. Supervisors of Cult Objects. Priests would have had some administrative roles. At the least, they would have had charge of caring for the sacred paraphernalia. (See Num 3:5—4:33, where they supervise the Levites.) For instance, although the Levites were to help serve the priests by transporting the cultic objects (Num 3:27-32), the Levites themselves could not come into direct contact with these objects. The priests first covered and prepared the objects (Num 4:1-20). Furthermore, as the temple became part of the hub of the centralized state government, the administrative roles of the priests probably grew in complexity. (At least by the time of the second temple period, the temple had some banking functions [2 Macc 3:10-12].) Any precise historical development based on the biblical sources is difficult to reconstruct.

5.3.1. Guards. The priests literally served as guards. People and objects that were common or less holy were not to come into contact with those that were more holy (Num 3:10). The priests were to "bear the guilt" of the sanctuary (Num 18:1); that is, they were held responsible to keep others from profaning it. Priests had, along with the Levites, the role of protecting the holy things from encroachment by persons and things less holy or unclean. They had to do so upon the penalty of their own lives (Num 18:1-7; for clarification of technical language, see Milgrom 1970 and 1990).

5.3.2. Tithes Assessors and Collectors. As early as the book of the covenant (Ex 20:22—23:33), in connection with the feasts, tithes of *firstfruits were to be brought to the house of Yahweh (Ex 23:14-19). In Exodus 30:11-16 a payment of atonement money for each Israelite was to be given to Yahweh, presumably through the priests, and to be used for the service of the tent

of meeting. Other systems of tithes and offerings are also prescribed (e.g., Lev 27:1-33; Num 18:8-32; Deut 14:22-29; 18:1-8; 26:1-15), which generally fell under the supervision of the priests and Levites, who were to receive part of this income as compensation for their service to the people. Indeed, in some cases priests were to determine the value, often in monetary terms, of what was to be given (Lev 27:8, 11-12, 14, 18, 23). Such monetary transactions were based on the standard weight of the "sanctuary shekel" (Lev 27:3, 25).

The priestly activities, symbolized in rituals involving sight, smell and sound, time, space, and status, taught Israel the healthy fear of being confronted with the presence of the holy God, the Creator of life and order. Israel was reminded of the great gap between their God and humanity. Only the priests, who were specially sanctified, could step carefully into that gap and mediate between the divine and human realms. Through their instructions and rituals, the priests warned Israel how its waywardness, intentional and unintentional, polluted God's dwelling and hindered God's presence in their covenant relationship. Individuals and community alike were called to be "clean" and pure before God. Moreover, through the priestly role, Israel saw that Yahweh's graciousness was not limited to mighty historical acts and the anointed leadership of key individuals. God had provided the means of removing the pollution, of purifying the unclean person and of restoring the divinely intended order. It was through the priesthood that this message of grace was mediated.

See also AARON; ALTARS; ATONEMENT, DAY OF; BLOOD; FESTIVALS AND FEASTS; FOODS, CLEAN AND UNCLEAN; LEVI, LEVITES; LEVITICUS, BOOK OF; LIFE, DISEASE AND DEATH; MELCHIZEDEK; NADAB AND ABIHU; PRIESTLY CLOTHING; RED HEIFER; RELIGION; SACRIFICES AND OFFERINGS; TABERNACLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. G. A. Anderson, *Sacrifices and Offerings in Ancient Israel: Studies in Their Social and Political Importance* (HSM 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987); J. Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel* (LAI; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995); B. Childs, *Old Testament Theology in a Canonical Context* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985); R. E. Clements, *God and Temple* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1965); A. Cody, *A History of Old*

Testament Priesthood (AnBib 35; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969); F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973); F. H. Gorman Jr., *The Ideology of Ritual: Space, Time and Status in the Priestly Theology* (JSOTSup 91; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990); G. B. Gray, *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice* (LBS; New York: Ktav, 1971 [1925]); M. Haran, *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1985); P. P. Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (JSOTSup 106; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992); Y. Kaufmann, *The Religion of Israel: From Its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1960); H.-J. Kraus, *Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament* (Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962; repr., Richmond, VA: John Knox, 1965); B. A. Levine, *In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel* (SJLA 5; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974); J. L. McKenzie, *A Theology of the Old Testament* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974); J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1—16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991); idem, *Numbers* (JPSTC; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1990); idem, *Studies in Levitical Terminology*, vol. 1: *The Encroacher and the Levite: The Term 'Aboda* (University of California Publications. Near Eastern Studies 14; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970); R. D. Nelson, *Raising Up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993); G. von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, vol. 1: *The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962); H. H. Rowley, *Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967); L. Sabourin, *Priesthood: A Comparative Study* (SHR 25 Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973); R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (2 vols.; New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961); J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1983); G. J. Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979); D. P. Wright, "The Spectrum of Priestly Impurity," in *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, ed. G. A. Anderson and S. M. Olyan (JSOTSup 125; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

R. K. Duke

PRIMEVAL HISTORY. See GENESIS, BOOK OF.

PROGENY. See GENESIS, BOOK OF; PROMISES, DIVINE.

PROMISED LAND. See LAND, FERTILITY, FAMINE.

PROMISES, DIVINE

Divine promises play an important role within the Pentateuch. They occur frequently, take a variety of forms and are important factors in the development of the plot that unites the books of *Genesis through *Deuteronomy. Moreover, because certain major promises remain unfulfilled by the end of Deuteronomy, this orientates the Pentateuch toward the future.

The diversity of divine promises found within the Pentateuch makes it impossible to examine all of them. Almost inevitably whenever God speaks his words, they contain elements that may be labeled promises; those that convey a negative expectation are more commonly called threats. By their very nature, covenants initiated by God contain divine promises. Immediately after the *flood, for example, God promised that he would never again strike down every living creature as he had done on this occasion (Gen 8:21-22). Yet while divine promises permeate the whole of the Pentateuch, the promises associated with the patriarchs are especially important (e.g., Gen 12:1-3; 22:16-18; 26:2-5; 28:13-15; 35:11-12; 46:3-4). Focusing chiefly on the concepts of land, descendants and blessing, God's promises to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob play a special role in the plot of not only the Pentateuch but also the books of Joshua to Kings.

1. Divine Promises and the Patriarchs
2. Obstacles to Fulfillment
3. Beyond the Pentateuch
4. Conclusion

1. Divine Promises and the Patriarchs.

Within the Pentateuch the divine promises associated with the patriarchs have attracted the most attention from scholars. In part this reflects their frequency, for as J. Blythin observes, almost all of the divine speeches in Genesis 12—50 include promises. Biblical scholars, however, diverge in two main ways regarding their assessment of these promises. First, opinions vary concerning the number and content of