A gender perspective on male and female sacrificial animals in Leviticus 1-7.

By

Monique Paschen

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

MTh Old Testament Studies

In

Faculty of Theology and Religion

Department of Old Testament and Hebrew Scriptures

University of Pretoria

September 2020

Supervisor: Prof. Esias E. Meyer

Full names and surname of student: **Monique Paschen**

Student number: **15352804**

Topic of work: **A gender perspective on male and female sacrificial animals in Leviticus 1-7.**

Declaration

I, Monique Paschen, declare that:

1. I understand what plagiarism is and am aware of the University's policy in this regard.

2. The dissertation titled "A gender perspective on male and female sacrificial animals in Leviticus 1-7" which I hereby submit for the degree MTh Old Testament Studies at the University of Pretoria, is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed source, Internet or any other source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.

3. This dissertation has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other tertiary institution.

SIGNATURE

30 September 2020

DATE

Summary:

This dissertation attempts to look at the value of animals found in the blood sacrifices presented in Leviticus 1-7 from a feminist/gender perspective. The dissertation shows that from an economic perspective, female animals seem to hold more value than male animals. However, on a symbolic and metaphoric level, male animals dominate.

The first objective was to find a feminist approach which fits with an analysis of animal values; as a feminist/gender approach often uses multiple methods. Overall the feminist historical approach highlights the understanding that patriarchy is at the root of most misinterpreted values, misinterpreted social, class, gender, age and agricultural values. Thus, an understanding of the cultural, societal and agricultural structures is necessary.

The analysis on culture, society and agriculture provided the understanding that the Ancient Near East's society operated within an interactive domain. Each sector (environmental, religious, economic, etc.) acted in accordance with one another, influenced each other and to an extent, mirrored one another. The analysis also emphasised the fact that Ancient Israel was a patriarchal, patrilocal and patrilineal society, which inevitably deemed females as of lower status in public, private and political spheres. However, the analysis of female animals illustrates that they had more abilities to produce commodities which should elevate their value.

A further objective was understanding how the ordering of sacrifices in Leviticus 1-7 portrayed and possibly influenced the value of animals. When accepting the natural order of Leviticus 1-5 as it stands in the text, the emphasis on male animals as superior is subtle but evident. However, Leviticus 6-7 presents one with a different order; this has been coined as the administrative order, which motivates and emphasises male animal superiority as well as the social hierarchy. Another aspect of influence is what significance the victim holds when presented alongside certain members of the community. In Leviticus 4, the חַטָּאת offering, allocates specific

animals, with their specific sex to certain individuals. The internal ordering of the חַטָּאת leaves female animals with a lower social status as they are always described alongside low-status individuals.

Entering the final stage of the dissertation, with a feminist historical approach one can show that the value of male and female humans were superimposed onto the value of male and female animals and that male animal's value was elevated due to its connection with patriarchal societal constructs. Thus, sacrifices acted as a form of communication which claimed ultimate authority. Connecting social hierarchies subtly into the sacrificial system through the displacement of animals values helped implement and maintain the societal values which the patriarchal society had by justifying its authority based on Yahweh's holy instructions for the Israelites.

Key Terms:

1. Gender approach

2. Feminist approach

3. Gender/Feminist Approach

4. Leviticus 1-7

5. Blood Sacrifice

6. Purification/sin offering

7. Peace offering

8. Burnt offering

9. Reparation offering

10. Ritual

11. Patriarchy

12. Economic value

13. Symbolic value

14. Order of sacrifice

15. Animal Husbandry

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction

In this dissertation, I would like to deal with the significance of the sexes of sacrificial animals. Ruane (2013:2) makes a compelling argument that sacrificial laws are quick to emphasise gender but lack explanations when it comes to female roles within sacred acts such as sacrifice. Thus, leaving one to wonder whether there is a differentiation between male and female animals as a result of the social status of gender in the Ancient Near East?

The sacrificial laws are found in Leviticus 1-7, which offer a list of sacrificial instructions. Kiuchi (2003:523), Gorman (2008:646), Levine (1989:3), Sklar (2013:27-29) and Milgrom (1991:1) all note that Leviticus was also taught to the nation, to follow as a guideline for sacrifices.[1] Within the sacrificial instructions, mentioned explicitly in Leviticus 1-7, there are clear instructions as to what the sacrifice should be. These detailed instructions include what species and which sex the animal should be and whether this animal is pure or impure to be given as a sacrifice. As the instructions have demarcated, most of the animals should be without blemish, hinting to the perfect or the best animal which one owns for sacrifice.

A crucial concept for this dissertation is the meaning of sacrifice and its role in society; therefore an understanding of sacrifice, or an understanding of the theories of sacrifice and to an extent ritual theories is necessary. A distinction needs to be made between "sacrifice" and "ritual" as some scholars tend to use them interchangeably (Watts 2011:4-5). As Watts (2007:2-3) and Bell (2009:14-15)

---

[1] Kaiser (1994:987) notes that Leviticus is usually presented as a divine word specifically for the Aaronide priests. They are mentioned roughly 200 times within the text. However, when looking at וַיִּקְרָא and וַיְדַבֵּר יְהוָה אֶל-מֹשֶׁה לֵּאמֹר within Leviticus 1-7, there are nine divine addresses made (Lv. 1:1, 4:1, 5:14, 6:1, 6:8, 6:19, 6:24, 7:22 and 7:28). In these divine addresses, the sacrificial procedures are present, of which four of the nine times, the priests are directly addressed (Lv. 4:3, 6:9, 6:20, and 6:25).

understand, one can identify that sacrifice is only a portion of the broad term ritual, it falls under the category of ritual but cannot be used interchangeably because there is more to ritual than just sacrifice. However, in this dissertation, I use the meanings or theories applied to ritual, which seem relevant for sacrifice, interchangeably with theories and meaning of sacrifice. For example, with Watts' (2007:2-3) ritual theory, ritual means to take mundane routines and turn them into significant practices by establishing specific manners and times of performing such routines and emphasising the importance of such routines. This theory fits in well with Rooker's theory of sacrifice below but also with the broader argument of applying significance to certain animals (and their sexes) all to elevate their importance or status.

Rooker's (2000:48) understanding of sacrifice in the Ancient Near East world view was that the gods were similar to that of humans and therefore needed sustenance which the humans would supply to them. This understanding of sacrifice was a give and take, self-service "relationship" with the gods, with the understanding that when humans gave the gods a sacrifice, the gods would be compelled to give something back to the humans. In a sense, these people believed that their gods needed them.

However, the Israelites' sacrificial system is somewhat different. Ruane (2013:1) notes that in the Old Testament, the supreme ritual act is a blood sacrifice. With sacrifice as this supreme act, Rooker (2000:48-49) argues that the Israelites engaged with many sacrifices to please Yahweh; this would allow for a relationship. Yahweh was not compelled to return the favour once being given a sacrifice, and the Israelites were in need of Yahweh, not the other way around.

According to Ross (2002:73), Fleming (2004:409), Reeve (1988:408) and Anderson (1992:871) sacrifices were known for being the most important and valuable form of worship within the Old Testament. As sacrifice having such a significant status within

9

the building, forming and maintenance of a relationship with Yahweh, the sacrificial victim needed to be costly, valuable and perfect (Merrill 1991:57).[2]

1.1 Research Problem

The problem I am attempting to deal with is the fact that in Leviticus 1-7 blood sacrifices, it would seem that female animals are viewed as less valuable. However, when viewing their role in agriculture it would seem that they are more valuable in terms of their secondary produce. This statement is based off the understanding that one would need multiple females (alive) and only need one male (alive) for breeding purposes, leaving the rest of the males who are born with no value. The first part of my problem has to do with understanding culture, society and animal husbandry of ancient Israel, which leads to questions such as: Are male animals portrayed and taught to be viewed as more superior than that of female animals? The second part of my problem has to do with the effect culture, society and animal husbandry have on Leviticus, leading to questions like how does the characterisations of animals in Leviticus contribute to such an understanding? Moreover, does the sacrificial victim then solely reflect the social values such as the patriarchal system which humans followed in the Ancient Near East? It is for this reason that one should understand the significance and role of the sexes of the animals within a sacrificial ritual. As patriarchal projection may have been incorporated into the sacrificial system and taught by the priests to the nations, one should then also enquire what the priest's benefited of such projections on sacrifice?

1.2 Method & Research Approach

A synchronic approach as noted by McKenzie (2010:26) is a literary critical method, which focuses on a study of the literature at hand, aiming to find the intertextual

---

[2] This statement can be justified by viewing three different texts. Firstly 2 Samuel 24:24, where David had said "I will not offer a burnt offering to the Lord my God which cost me nothing". Secondly Deuteronomy 14:5 where wild animals are strictly forbidden to be given as an offering because it cost nothing. Lastly Malachi 1:7 & 13, which implies that the Lord will question your offering and not take it, if it were obtained through violence or if it were a lame or sick animal.

relations between texts in the Bible as it stands now. The Diachronic approach is quite the opposite, using a historical-critical method, which is more interested in the development of the text over time in different historical contexts.

Noble (1993:132) states that any text, in theory, could be analysed and interpreted with both approaches, but there are different "tools" used for different approaches, which yield different answers. Even though each approach yields different outcomes, neither of them can ignore each other, but one would possibly give more focus to one. Exchanging between the two approaches when analysing a text is an extremely flexible approach but one which would be very rewarding, especially for this dissertation.

There will be more of a diachronic approach taken here. As McKenzie (2010:29-34) states the diachronic approach includes source criticism, which will deal with the dating and authors of Leviticus. Engaging in a formalist approach will highlight the structure, style and imagery used within Leviticus to convey the sacrificial instructions and how these forms affect the interpretation of each sacrifice. I will be engaging with historical criticism as I will need to engage with the cultural and social context behind the text, as well as the context of the author who wrote the text, to understand what these sacrifices meant for ancient Israelites and what their animals meant to them as well.

Borowski (2006:159) states that when attempting to interpret the animals of the Bible, one should invest time into a linguistic analysis of the terms at question. Therefore, such an analysis will be taking place on terms such as הַבָּקָר, בְּהֵמָה, and שְׂעִירַת and שׁוֹר ,אַיִל ,וָעֵז ,כֶּשֶׂב ,פַּר ,בֶּן הַבָּקָר ,צֹאן.

According to Jenson (2004:27) there are four different perspectives which scholars usually explore when analysing sacrifices. Firstly, "the material of sacrifices", the object which will be offered. Secondly "the eating of the sacrifice", this outlines the differences between the order of who may and may not eat certain sacrifices. Thirdly, "the order of sacrifices", this shows that Leviticus 1-7 has a specific order for

the sacrificial system but that there are other texts which allude to a different order (texts such as Lv. 9:15-22 and Nm. 6:16-17). Lastly, "the procedure of sacrifice", which highlights that there are specific steps which need to be adhered to when engaging with sacrifices. These steps on how to sacrifice tend to change according to the type of sacrifice presented. Applying a diachronic and a synchronic approach to Jenson's (2004:27) perspectives on the analysis of sacrifice will be to the advantage of discovering:

1. If social values have been projected onto animals?

2. How social values have been projected onto animals?

3. Possibly why social values have been projected onto animals throughout the historical development of the text as well as the text that we have at hand.

An intratextual approach will be taken, looking at the similarities and lists of sacrifices within the context of Leviticus 1-7 (excluding chapter 2 and 6:7-16 – the grain offering). Intertextual approach, looking broadly at the Old Testament for different sacrifices, which hold relevance for this study (animal victims) and their specifications. Finally, an extratextual approach, as Gorman (2009:20) notes that a comparative analysis needs to take place when analysing sacrifice, this will broadly be looking at other cultures and their understanding of such sacrifices and their specifications.

I will also engage with a gender approach, more specifically a feminist approach, which according to Kennedy and Goia (1995:1802) attempts to emphasise different interpretations (non-patriarchal influenced interpretations) by examining sexual identity and its effects on the interpretation of the texts, social and cultural experiences, which still have an impact on society today.

With the help of feminist scholars, the problem which I have identified may be viewed from a different perspective which has ultimately been hidden by the patriarchal

social constructs which always seem to shape the interpretation of biblical texts. Ruane's (2013:41) understanding is that:

> the variation in sex selection for victims of animal sacrifice both illustrates and constructs underlying societal ideas about gender.

Ruane's understanding will be analysed and explained throughout this paper. Finding motivating and supporting arguments for Ruane's (2013:41) statement, which will inevitably accredit it as correct.

1.3 Hypothesis

This study may show that the patriarchal system of the Ancient Near East was in fact projected onto the understanding and value of the sacrificial victim, which may have changed the actual value of sacrificial victims, possibly to the benefit of the priests.

1.4 Chapter Overview

- In chapter 2, I will engage in a discussion on the "Gender approach". That will be followed by an analysis as to why one would need to engage with such an approach. I will also engage with several different lenses which are employed under feminist criticism; this will allow one to find the best lens to interpret Leviticus 1-7 (excluding chapter 2 and 6:7-16 – the grain offering), in the hope of a better understanding, a more inclusive interpretation.
- Chapter 3 will investigate the Culture, Society & Agriculture of the Ancient Near East. The main aim of this investigation is to understand how culture, society and agriculture influenced certain sacrifices. This will involve a discussion on the household structure, and the value of livestock, as well as the patriarchal influence placed on them.
- Chapter 4 will present one with a general overview of the Book of Leviticus. Firstly with a more synchronic approach, discussing the title, purpose and literary setting of Leviticus. Secondly using a diachronic approach, engaging in a discussion about the author and dating of Leviticus; this

13

leads to an analysis of the Priestly source. Along with an analysis of the structure of Leviticus as a whole; narrowing into the structure of Leviticus 1-7. Lastly, an introduction and comparison of Leviticus 1-5 and Leviticus 6-7 specifically in terms of the ordering of sacrifices in Leviticus 1-7.

- Chapter 5 will give a detailed analysis of the blood offerings in Leviticus 1-7. The analysis of Leviticus will identify how Leviticus 1-7 (except grain offering) portrays the victims of sacrifice and the people performing them. The analysis is also done to emphasise the detailed explanation and specification of the sacrificial victims required.

- Chapter 6 will explore sacrifice across the Ancient Near East in general, but also focusing more on the sacrifices mentioned within Leviticus 1-7 (burnt, well-being, purification and reparation offering's). I will be looking into the theories of sacrifice in general as well as the theories which have been based on the interpretation of Leviticus 1-7. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the relationship between sacrifice, the sex thereof and the social values of the Ancient Near East and to gain a better understanding of why details of victims are so specific, how could this have influenced the relationship between women and men, women and Yahweh.

Chapter 2

Gender (Feminist) Approach

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I set out to explain the feminist movement, starting with the history of feminism and the types of feminists which initially emerged. This will lead to a discussion on why there was and is a need for a feminist approach and how it merged to include a more general inclusive approach known as the gender approach. Lastly, feminist critics engage with different theological feminist approaches, with these approaches' feminist utilise multiple methods to support their arguments. Therefore, I outline the different approaches employed, which will help identify the methods that feminist critics use in order to recover the voiceless within the biblical texts.

As a dissertation for Old Testament and Hebrew Scriptures, I feel the need to elaborate on what some scholars might find a strange method or approach to Old Testament texts. Therefore I provide a summary on the Gender approach/Feminist movement, which will be implemented throughout the dissertation.

Before engaging with an in-depth gender approach, one should distinguish the difference between gender and biological sex as well as a feminist and gender approach. According to Klages (2012:33) one should note that there has been a universal distinction between male/female and masculine/feminine across all cultures. However, the term gender has been overlooked in society for many years; many people have naturally interchanged the terms gender and sex as if they refer to the same concepts. But sex is a biological concept, determined by "external genitalia, internal reproductive organs, chromosomal sex and secondary sex characteristics" (cf. Steinberg 2010:165 and Brayford 2009:323). Gender expression does not rely on the determination of biological sex. Gender expression is influenced by "sets of cultural signifiers that are associated with the signified of a particular

sexed body" (cf. Steinberg 2010:165 and Brayford 2009:323). Signifiers are known to be directly proportional to culture and society. This means as the culture and society form, change and stay constant so too do the signifiers (cf. Brayford 2009:323).

Bons-Storm (2005:46) indicates that feminism has been known for standing against the cultural understanding that men were the norm and that one's biology became one's definition and destiny (patriarchy). It created the understanding that women should not be "controlled by definitions of who or what they are and what they should be". Kennedy and Gioia (1995:1802) define gender criticism as an analysis of "how sexual identity influences the creation and reception of literary works". Castle (2007:102) states that since the 1980s, there has been a rise in theories of gender and sexuality. More scholars were probably intrigued as to who, why and what defined and constructed the subject of gender and sexuality. They came to the conclusion that the body became a "signifying system within social formations".

With this understanding that gender is a construction of society and culture, feminist scholars believe that culture, society and its literature have been solely created by males, influenced by males and focuses on the upliftment of males. Thus, according to feminists, there needs to be a balancing factor which analyses and combats patriarchal attitudes (Kennedy and Gioia 1995:1802).

2.2 History of Feminism

The term "feminist" according to Melanchthon (2014:106) usually refers to women and men who strive to terminate the subordination and marginalisation imposed on women. Feminism is then considered the realisation "that cultural 'common sense,' dominant perspectives, scientific theories, and historical knowledge are all androcentric constructs". Which, according to Steinberg (2010:168) was considered to be objective truth, but feminists attempt to eradicate this "objectivity" by emphasising the ideologies of the dominant social group which it reflects.

According to Bons-Storm (2005:46) the development of feminism has been attributed to *three stages or waves* which rose to include and helped feminists understand the

experiences of women, the oppression, the struggle for liberation and meaning of gender. However, Knellwolf (2001:194) reminds us that feminism was not a "new phenomenon" by the first wave and that there were other voices which were present from the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[3] The term feminism became popular in the 19th Century, which was attributed to the struggle of women for political rights (rights to vote & own property) in Europe and North America (Rakoczy 2004:11-12).

The first wave of feminism started in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, where women contributed to reform movements. Castle (2007:95) and Rakoczy (2004:12) note that these reform movements were concerned with "social equality" and individual freedom, which focused on recovering human dignity for women, slaves, children and those who were considered outcasts (people with illnesses) because of the patriarchal structures which were enforced by society and the church.

Knellwolf (2001:196) notes that the second-wave's main objective was to form a detailed analysis of "difference", why is there a difference and from where did this difference originate. Baker-Fletcher (1996:68) adds to Knellwolf querying why "difference" is viewed as bad or as an issue which must be dealt with. The analysis of the difference is of importance because this "difference" has been concealed and disguised as a societal and cultural norm which affects the private and public spheres.

The second-wave of feminism started during the 1960s once women realised they still have not obtained their full human dignity; thus Rakoczy (2004:12-13) notes they started to fight for and attain "greater political and social equality". Rakoczy (2004:13) argues this wave started to influence religious institutions mainly because of political and social rights. Rights which included but were not limited to the same opportunities in the workspace, recognition of women in laws which confirm their human dignity and rights to procreation decisions; either for procreation,

---

[3] The most famous British scholars were Mary Astell and Mary Wollstonecraft (Knellwolf 2001:194).

contraception or abortion. The second wave, according to Knellwolf (2001:198) accompanied a rise in literary works from as well as of women. This increase can be attributed to the growth of equality which women may have been experiencing within institutions, colleges and universities.

The third wave of feminism emerged during the 1970s and 1980s. According to Castle (2007:99) this wave was dedicated to the women who did not fall under the classification of "straight, white, middle class intellectuals". This wave then drew a clear distinction between the other two waves. The first two waves, according to the feminists of the third wave can be identified as "western feminism" as it was majority straight, white, middle class women fighting for political and social equality. However, these feminists did not take into consideration the different levels of oppression which was imposed on different individuals not only according to their gender but race and class too.

The third wave recognised that one could not ignore the race and class classifications, because both these classifications are fundamentally interconnected with sexism. These classifications can be seen as interconnected on the basis that it was the same society, culture and traditions which created them. In order to obtain equality, all forms of classifications need to be dealt with. According to Kirk-Duggan (2014:267) this was the rise in the womanist approach, where women stood against all forms of oppression due to "gender, race, class, age and ability".

Although there were distinctive differences between the waves of feminism, feminists all stand in agreement that there needs to be an end to sexism.

The waves of feminism were undoubtedly necessary, that continuously gave rise to more feminists who emphasised the level of oppression placed on women but also emphasised their liberation struggle. However, Bons-Storm (2005:46) notes that recent feminists acknowledged that women are not the only ones affected by the patriarchal system. Therefore, gender criticism started as a kind of feminist criticism focussed on women, females and feminine perspectives, but recently gender

criticism has expanded and branched off to include male/ men's movements. Kennedy and Gioia (1995:1802) note that this branch's approach then "explored the impact of different sexual orientations on literary creation and reception". Thus, the inclusion of the men's movement into the gender approach was not to eliminate or discredit the feminist critics but rather to "rediscover masculine identity in an authentic, contemporary way". The gender criticism approach allowed for liberation from the patriarchal structure for all who were oppressed no matter gender, class or race.

Bons-Storm (2005:46) explains that feminism can be understood as a lens which is used to look at society, emphasising the central concerns of society between women and men. Lawrence (2009:333) similarly notes that Gender criticism also acts as a lens, not a method. As Gender and Feminist critics have a set of questions which are used to analyse texts, they do not have a singular methodology which is incorporated to answer these questions; which for example the Historical critics do. Rakoczy (2004:11-12) continues to elaborate, stating that "feminism is critical and constructive". Feminism is focused on changing the perspective created of women; this then requires a reconstruction of all structures of society to view women as equal to men.

All in all, the purpose of feminism is to see change to the current norm. There are, however, at least three types of feminist groups which push for specific changes. Thus, it is necessary to identify these types and what their focus is.

2.3 Types of Feminists

Throughout the different waves of feminism, various feminist groups appeared. According to Fewell (1999:268) feminist criticism focuses on the economic, political and social rights of women. However, not all feminists focused on economic, political and social rights, but all these feminist groups agreed that there needs to be a change, what type of change is where divisions took place within feminism. The types of feminism work either in conjunction with one another, were built off each

19

other or branched out from one type in order to create a more comprehensive and unique feminism interpretation. However, with each division that arose came conflicts and contradictions between the different types.

According to Ramazanoglu (1989:10) there are three main types of feminism, Liberal, Radical and Marxist but Walby (1990:5) argues for at least four main types adding Dual-System Theory to the list. Walby (1990:5) notes that this type is basically a mixture of Radical and Marxist feminism. In that case, both patriarchy and capitalism are to blame, and both systems need to be analysed and corrected.

2.3.1 Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminism is convinced that women are oppressed purely based on their biological sex which had been assigned gender roles. Ramazanoglu (1989:10) and Dreyer (1998:624) thus state that this movement of feminists are only focused on the struggle for equality (equal rights, education, health and employment). This seems like a good start, but this would merely place a band-aid over a broken finger. The source or origin of these injustices are not dealt with, which means they could slowly arise in other norms and only when it is too late will feminists have realised other forms of oppression and injustices have taken place.

Walby (1990:4) notes that the liberal feminists argued that women were being oppressed and discriminated against in two ways. Firstly, the "denial of equal rights", in terms of education, employment and health. Secondly, "sexist attitudes which sustain the acts of inequality".

The liberal feminists, according to Ramazanoglu (1989:10) began by fighting for rights and equal opportunity for women without directly or focusing on changing the societies structure. Liberal feminists were very much involved with politics but not to destroy it but rather change it to include women. This meant that they were using or engaging with "non-feminist" techniques with regards to social relations to address justice and equality. For this reason, Dreyer (1998:624) and Wably (1990:5) note that

liberal feminists were criticised for not dealing with patriarchy and inequality at its roots.

2.3.2 Radical Feminism

According to Walby (1990:3) radical feminism is distinguished from other types of feminism because they acknowledge and analyse gender inequality as a form of men attempting to dominate women and that in doing so the men benefit from the subordination of these women. Ramazanoglu (1989:12) explains that radical feminism attempts to destroy the understanding of a male-dominated society. They attacked the institutions of patriarchy and argued for a society which does not condone a norm that "unnaturally confine[s] and restrict[s] women".

Radical feminists engage with political, public, and private forms of gender inequality. Radical feminists came to the conclusion that women were being controlled, oppressed and abused at least in three ways Walby (1990:3): Firstly, women were confined in and to the household, specifically with regards to "working", women's occupation was housework. Secondly, in terms of women's identity, specifically her sexuality, men were in control of their "femininity", it was to the men's digression what a woman should be like and act. Thirdly, men controlled sexual intercourse, and sexual practices were only engaged in, for the benefit of men, the construction of society for men's purposes and the increase in male's social status. Then for men to keep their dominance, they needed to implement some form of authority. In this case, their authority was violence; men needed violence to keep women in fear so that their dominance over women's social, private and physical lives can reign.

Radical feminism is very well known for implementing the slogan "personal is political", by this they meant that the issues between the relations of women and men should be seen as a political problem (Walby 1990:3). They introduced sexuality, reproduction, rape and violence against women into the political arena. They pushed for private patriarchy to become a public and political issue which needed to be destroyed.

21

Radical feminists opposed the liberal feminists' strategies, in the sense that the liberal feminists were only fighting for justice and change in a social order which was never created to benefit or include women. Therefore, Ramazanoglu (1989:13) argues that the radical feminists rejected the legitimacy of the social order and struggled for its destruction. Radical Feminists attempted to create a universal feminism or at least a universal feminist step, which would have been able to help inaugurate or implement destruction to the oppressive social order and in turn truly liberate women all over the world.

2.3.3 Marxist Feminism

According to Walby (1990:4) Marxist feminism highlights that "men's domination over women is a by-product of capital's domination over labour". This then includes the analysis of class discrimination and economic exploitation. Marxist feminists argue that from the family sphere, one finds the basis for inequality. As women engaged with household duties which they were not compensated for but expected to carry out. Focused on compensation, it seems like the Marxist feminists were not necessarily concerned about the act of working itself but rather about the fact that women were being economically exploited. This meant their focus was more on a material than an ideological level.

Marxist Feminists according to Dreyer (1998:624) and Ramazanoglu (1989:13-14) falls under the category of socialism and "socialism is a struggle for the interests of a particular class at a particular historical stage of human development". Marxist feminists find themselves incredibly involved and focused on class, power and economic interests, which does not really fall in line with feminists focus on solely liberating women. One would think that the Marxist feminists take on more of a gender approach and not so much a feminist one because of the two struggles which they deal with other than fighting for women as a whole. First, the fact that they need to fight against the struggle of some women having been exploited more than other women pertaining to certain classes or positions of power. Second, they need to help

liberate people in the exploited class, which entails having to fight for some men and standing against some women.

Marxist feminists have been recognised as the movement which raised awareness about the differences which have been present between women, possibly motivated by a womanist approach. It raised critical questions concerning the levels of oppression implemented by the hand of some women towards other women (Ramazanoglu 1989:15). Marxist feminism allowed feminists to acquire more knowledge of the full picture of various oppressions which women have endured throughout history.

As an overview Ramazanoglu (1989:16) concludes that:

> Liberals struggle for reforms to the present system, radical feminists struggle for the overthrow of patriarchy and marxist feminists struggle for the overthrow of capitalism.

These types of feminism one could say are not literary focused but are rather directed towards institutions and societal norms which have been in control and possibly still are in control. Which leaves one to wonder how could such a movement be implemented into biblical criticism and is there even a need for it? According to Ramazanoglu (1989:9) "feminism implies a radical critique of reason, science and social theory which raises serious questions about how we know what we think we know". Thus, leading to the number one reason for a feminist approach when viewing the Bible. As many traditions, lifestyles, cultural structures, societal values, and agricultural norms stem from biblical inspiration and more often than not, are never questioned only accepted as "normal".

2.4 The need for a Feminist Approach when engaging with the Bible

It is necessary to engage with a feminist approach, as Exum (1995:65) highlights the fact that women have always been equally involved in building society as men have. The only difference is that women do not get an opportunity to be voiced and we

23

have only recently heard the voices of women; otherwise, it has only been men who have recorded history on women's behalf. Which excludes what women think is of importance and only highlights what men deem as necessary. This is why Walby (1990:2) argues that in order to understand the "depth, pervasiveness and interconnectedness" of all women's considered subordination to men, one needs to analyse patriarchy. Most feminist approaches deal with the patriarchy, as it can be laid out in the forms of gender inequality that has taken place over many years, in different classes, across all races, cultures and throughout all spheres in society. Feminist approaches highlight the effects which patriarchy has had on the text and the repercussions it has on the interpretation of such texts as well as its influence in society. Such an analysis is necessary as this dissertation is focused on the significance of the exclusion or less used female animals in Leviticus 1-7 as sacrificial victims. Thus a discussion of patriarchy follows, as patriarchy is one of the main reasons for the existence of the feminist movement.

2.4.1 Patriarchy

Meyers (2014:8) acknowledges that the term "patriarchy" as it stands, is not present within the Hebrew Bible. There are only terms which designate family units. Therefore, it should not be considered a biblical construct, but rather a social science theory. The term patriarchy is derived from the Greek terms πατήρ meaning "father" and ἄρχω meaning "rule". Meyers (2014:9) therefore concludes that the Greek terms mean the father as the ruler in a family, a male-dominated family (cf. Ruether 1996:205). Patriarchy, according to Bhasin (1993:3) is a structure which was implemented into the social system which would exploit, discriminate, oppress, violate, and place women under the full control of men. Women were and, in some circumstance, still are treated as inferior to men. Ruether (1996:205) acknowledges that patriarchy was implemented in Hebrew, Greek and Roman societies. Patriarchy was not only enforced on women as wives, but on all dependents of a family, this would include young or unmarried daughters, young sons, and slaves. However, males were able to outgrow or be emancipated from the patriarch's rule and become

the leader of his own household, whereas a woman would never be able to reach such a status.

Many scholars have attempted to give patriarchy a fixed definition. However, Rowbotham (2006:52) and Ruether (1996:205) explain that patriarchy over the years has been used in many different ways, thus not allowing for a simple, fixed definition or structure of the system. Patriarchy has, however, been identified as an ideology and social system which makes women seem inferior to men as noted by Exum (1995:67) and Rowbotham (2006:52). Ruether (1996:205-206) and Rowbotham (2006:52) state that there are however similar characteristics which patriarchy consistently portray:

1. Fathers or males hold power.
2. Women have low status (in the household, societal, political, and economic spheres).
3. Lineage pass through the father (Patrilineal).
4. Male children are praised and preferred.
5. Men owned women's bodies (especially husbands owning their wife's bodies) specifically their sexuality, fertility and reproductive abilities.
6. A wife is considered a property of her husband. He has the power to physically abuse her and even to an extent, able to sell her into slavery.
7. Women's education was limited to household duties, as they were not permitted into the public sphere.
8. Women were not allowed to obtain their inheritance; a male relative would administer the inheritance she was supposed to get.
9. Males would be considered elite based on this patriarchal system, but also because they were educated, and they could own property.

Patriarchy is of much relevance in relation to the gender approach, specifically in terms of biblical studies or theological studies. Many biblical, theological and feminist scholars such as Haas (1995:321) and Daly (1985:5) would argue that the Bible

25

more commonly the Old Testament is very much a patriarchal construction, as such it was created in a patriarchal context and the text itself bears witness to this. Jay (1992:148) argues specifically in terms of the blood sacrifices there are a few principals of patriarchy which are implemented, but that it took new forms on how to control women (in terms of religious meaning). Ruane (2013:21) similarly adds that with the "patriarchal and patrilineal nature of the sacrificing priesthood" and the community members which followed it, women were more frequently left out. With this in mind, when engaging with a gender approach more specifically the feminist approach one would need to unlock the patriarchal constructions, presumptions and assumptions which was placed on the text, weaved with the creation of the text to find a more acceptable interpretation or a new interpretation of biblical texts.

As feminists began to realise their societies, cultures and churches had been very much influenced by patriarchy, they began to rise against such ideologies and learnt to "create" their own. Schneider (2004:50-53) noted that according to feminists and most historical critics the Bible was written over many centuries, in different places with different and changing societies and cultures as well as by different authors leading to the conclusion that the "Bible is literally the word of human beings about their experience of God". The Bible can now be identified as a reflection of experiences of God, then whom does one accredit this piece of work too? As it was a patriarchal society, only men's experiences were documented or better yet only certain men's perspectives of everyone's experience was documented. This alone calls for a feminist approach in order to unlock and attempt to reveal all or at least the majority's experience of God.

2.4.2 Purpose of Feminist Biblical Critics

Even though Meyers (2014:8) argues that the term patriarchy is not found in the Hebrew Bible, Exum (1995:67) defines patriarchy as an ideology and social system which makes women seem inferior to men, both Meyers and Exum acknowledge that such ideologies and social systems are found within the Bible. As the Bible is still

relevant for believing communities, Exum argues that the ideologies and systems have a considerable influence on western culture. Thus, the Bible should be addressed through "a critical feminist perspective".

The feminist approach, as noted by Bowen (2007:448) should actually be recognised as a feminist interpretation. Fewell (1999:269), Lawrence (2009:333), and Bowen (2007: 449) all agree that feminist critics use many critical interpretative methods. As a result feminism approach is not as per se a method on its own. With a variety of approaches (as will be discussed below) each critic has its own personal goals; thus, a feminist approach cannot be refined into one method, they see this diversity as a significant strength for their movement.

As there are different approaches with different agendas[4], Fewell (1999:269) states that feminist critics all agree to at least one thing, that texts have been written with gender in mind or at least in mind when translating it. The differentiation between gender is seen as an academic issue as well as a personal issue (cf. Brayford 2009:313). This emphasises that gender is not just a difference in the actual sex of people, but it shows the difference as to who has the power and how culture has structured itself according to which gender has power. This so-called hierarchy has been seen as normal over centuries, but it is not a natural law and is in actual fact a cultural construct or as Exum (1995:65) has said "Historical Process". In order to reconstruct this norm, some feminist critics strive to reveal how culture was created and by whom, in doing this it shows that women never had the opportunity to voice their experiences it was always written by a male, this means the wisdom, the perception and the history of women have been lost.

---

[4] Feminist criticism as an umbrella term seeks to liberate women. However, each approach (which will be seen below) and the different types (which was already discussed above) portray that each feminist has a goal which they set out to achieve. As an example, a Marxist feminist attempts to overthrow capitalism, whereas a liberalists attempts to change the present system and a rejectionist either rejects the Bible or at least the authority of the Bible, but a loyalist acknowledges the authority of the Bible but attempts to remove past interpretations which are deemed oppressive.

Even though one finds that some women are mentioned in the Bible, it seems they still have no value because their experience is not recorded but rather a lesson which must be learnt or a reward for being a good woman in terms of the patriarchy system. Exum (1995:67) thus, believes that the Bible was made for men and by men, and even if there was a female who wrote something, it was still influenced by the patriarchal system. Another attempt of understanding is to reconstruct what it was like for a woman in the ancient days or to find the power which women had or the lack thereof, by analysing women's lives in those days. An analysis of the context helps us understand women's religious experience and the roles they played in society.

Feminist Literary criticism as per Brayford's (2009:313 -314) account, attempts to diminish the hierarchical structure, which controls how readers interpreted the text as well as how culture has been structured when doing this. Exum (1995:69) states that they focus on three main categories 1. One-sided gender interpretations. 2. Women as the characters 3. Women as the readers. Bowen (2007:449) states that a feminist interpreter's goals are to highlight women's oppression and the role of patriarchy. By doing this, we will notice the traits the Bible portrays in favour of patriarchy. Two of the main issues feminist interpreters face is the appropriation of the text and the translation of the text. With respect to the appropriation, what is it that gives the Bible authority and to who is this authority given to. Because the exact same text that inspires and gives authority to men also oppresses women. With regards to the translation of the texts are the feminists to highlight the norms in the text or should they attempt to change them. Feminists have come up with one strategy, and that is to retell the Bible stories in a light that promotes equality amongst gender and other classifications of discrimination. The conclusion to the approach then is basically that the text is interpreted by the questions which are brought forward, for example: whose interests does the text have in mind and whose interests are actually being served. Literary Criticism is the most prominent form of methodology used by

feminist critics as there is almost always emphasis on the final form of the reading the text (Lawrence 2009:336).

Feminist historical critics, according to Fewell (1999:270) and Brayford (2009:314) focus on anyone who was discriminated against, primarily focusing on recovering and reclaiming the voices, lives and values of women. Scholars such as Ester Fuchs, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Nancy Jay, and Nicole Ruane are well known for using the feminist historical approach. Lawrence (2009:336) notes that Historical Criticism is the method less used, as most scholars assume that Ancient Israel was patriarchal; therefore it is not necessary to engage with the history of the texts any further. Bowen (2007: 449) also exposes the fact that feminist interpretations have the ability to highlight how women are virtually non-existent in many biblical interpretations. Another concern for feminist critics is "recovery". Fewell (1999:270) and Bowen (2007:449) both agree recovery is concerned with finding new texts which have not been interpreted before or reinterpreting texts which have already been interpreted by men. When looking at the Bible, finding new texts may be tricky, but this should not stop women from trying to read behind what men have already written. Reclaiming encourages women to find texts or to write texts themselves. The feminist interpretation would like to give a voice to those who were not heard and a name to those who were never named. Recovery and reclaiming can then be viewed as two sides of the same coin, each lead to the other and both are used by feminist historical critics.

When interpreting texts, a feminist critic will note the emphasis on the role which gender plays. Bowen (2007:449) continues to explain that feminism is a political stance and that men and women should be viewed as equal. Feminist interpretation is seen as a liberation movement, the need for a transformation in society and relationships. For a feminist's interpretation, the Bible should be analysed according to feminism (political stance) this is used to analyse interpretations of the text and the text itself. They acknowledge that the Bible itself might not be constructed for males but that interpretations by males may have been used to oppress women.

The difficulty in doing this, Fewell (1999:270) notes is that the texts, feminist critics are now to examine were never written by women or even for women and that the text to women is like an alien to humanity. Still, by feminists examing texts feminists help the other women whose voices were never heard and women who were never seen. The ultimate goal of a feminist critic with regards to the Bible would be to reveal women out of their patriarchal contexts. This is done by looking at the world behind the text, looking at the world of the text and reinterpreting the text all with a feminist perspective, emphasising women and others who were oppressed. For this dissertation, a feminist perspective would be applied to recover the value of female animals. To recover and reclaim, feminism as an interpretation applies various methods from different disciplines (as noted above), with that in mind an understanding of the feminists' various approaches and usage of these methods is necessary.

2.5 Understanding the Various Feminist Approaches to the Bible

It is crucial to understand that there is not a single approach across all disciplines, including those rooted in feminist thought that can approach a text without having preconceived thoughts, emotions and desires for its outcome, as Schüssler Fiorenza (1996:5) has argued.

Thus, all these preconceived ideas about the text will influence one's interpretation of the text. According to Osiek (1997:960) there are at least five ways in which feminists can approach the Bible and society once they come to realise the influence of the Bible and social context which contributed to patriarchal systems (cf. Jeong 2002:117 and Schottrof 1996:20).

Before moving on, its worthy noting Masenya (2005a:180) Bosadi approach. Masenya (2005:181) attempts present her approach as a tool which overthrows theologies and hermeneutics which have and still do exclude women. However, her Bosadi approach also tries to encourage and raise women to create their own theologies and hermeneutics. Specifically, for an African-South African women

context, which addresses their contexts of postapartheid racism, sexism and classism (Masenya 2005:183-184). According to Masenya (2005:184) the Bosadi approach attempts to liberate but also "challenge and resist oppressive" elements of the Bible. She notes her approach does not only focus on the biblical text's elements of oppression but also the African culture itself.[5]

2.5.1 Rejectionist

According to Osiek (1997:960), Jeong (2002:117), Brayford (2009:314), Schottroff (1996:20) and Dreyer (1998:626) the rejectionist feministic approach rejects the Bible as "authoritative or useful" which ultimately rejects the traditions within it. Rejectionists, therefore, view the Judean and Christian traditions as "sinful, corrupt and unredeemable" and view that patriarchy cannot be converted or removed from the Bible because it is based on these traditions and their characteristics.

The rejectionists approach attempts to leave out the traditions which have been influenced only by men and aim at creating a "new post-Christian faith" which can overcome the patriarchal structures which have a negative impact on society (Osiek 1997:961).

However, Osiek (1997:961) states that this principle gives the impression that men are viewed as evil, and the women are viewed as good, which still represents a form of hierarchy, which seems like one is just replacing one hierarchy (patriarchy) for another one. Thus, "Rejectionist hermeneutics is the most extreme theological form of radical separatism" (Osiek 1997:961 cf. Dreyer 1998:626 and Jeong 2002:117). The weakness in its interpretation, Osiek (1997:961) argues, is because it rejects the proclamations of redemption in Judean and Christian structures; it then also rejects its followers. Which means it is completely disconnected from the Bible's historical past and is only based on the "hypothetical" understanding of history for the present.

---

[5] Masenya (2005b:742) argues that Old Testament studies still "rely heavily on the West" and her argument holds true for this dissertation, as I have not engaged with much African perspectives.

31

Scholars such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Mary Daly are supporters of this approach (Dreyer 1998:626 and Jeong (2002:117). Mary Daly 1985 *Beyond God the Father: Towards a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*, clearly shows that she supports the rejectionist approach. According to Brayford (2009:315) Cheryl Exum is an example of the less radical rejectionist approach, which rejects the Bible as authoritative but not as a whole.

2.5.2 Loyalist

A loyalist approach seems to be an opposite approach to that of the rejectionist. Osiek (1997:961-962), Brayford (2009:315) and Jeong (2002:118) note that the loyalists view that the Bible is the word of God and that it is not oppressive by nature, but rather that the oppression which it may reflect is a direct influence or cause of the interpreter as well as his tradition. Schüssler Fiorenza (1996:6) adds that past interpretations were distorted to the benefit of individual people. They argue that the contents of the Bible portray freedom and humanisation, which is a part of God's divine plan, not that of a human plan.

Osiek (1997:962) explains that the loyalist's attempt to remove the past interpretations and traditional understandings from the text. This can be done in two ways; first, by carefully undertaking a critical exegesis of texts, then countering one text with another which disproves previous rigid interpretations of any one passage, this attempts to resolve the problem of close-minded interpreters which influence the understanding of Bible (cf. Jeong 2002:118). The second, one must accept the past traditions, for what they are but also look for space for transformation from within them because these traditional interpretations have been created by imperfect humans.

Osiek (1997:963) indicates that this approach is seen as a commonly used exegetical method. It not only focuses on the historical data of the biblical texts but also incorporates experiences and theologies, which has influenced a person. However, Jeong (2002:118) and Osiek (1997:963) both agree that this

interpretation's weakness is that there are a variety of contexts; thus, there are a variety of histories and text interpretations. Brayford (2009:315) also acknowledges that the loyalists at times give too much authority to the texts and overemphasise a woman's role by giving the text an overemphasised positive view. Jeong (2002:118) argues that a number of American Scholars support this approach.

2.5.3 Revisionist

Revisionist can be seen as the middle point between the rejectionist and loyalist approach (Brayford 2009:315).

According to Knellwolf (2001:197), Schottroff (1996:20), Jeong (2002:118) and Osiek (1997:963) the revisionist's understanding of patriarchy is historically determined not theologically, meaning patriarchy was influenced by the social and historical factors of a tradition which held males as superior which is most definitely separable from the Judeo-Christian tradition. Revisionist's note that the Bible and its traditions are capable of reformation, by looking in the text for all the sources which were once ignored. Revisionists also blame the writing, reading and interpretation of the biblical texts for corrupting the initial integrity (Brayford 2009:315). One then needs to reconsider the text's previous interpretation, by searching for the women in them, identify what one already knows about them and then acknowledge their contributions towards the formation of history.

Osiek (1997:963) and Jeong (2002:118) acknowledge that this approach sometimes requires a "read between the lines" outlook when reinterpreting in order to encounter the positive roles of women in the Bible. Therefore, Osiek (1997:964) states that revisionists do not do away with patriarchy, but rather highlight the role of women, their dignity and importance within patriarchy. The weakness of this approach is "it reforms and challenges the symptoms more than the illness".

Scholars such as Phyllis Trible and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza are supporters of this approach (Copeland 1996:285, Dreyer 1998:628, and Brayford 2009:315). According to Schüssler Fiorenza (1977:30) in this approach, there is no need to

change the existing traditions as a whole but rather to integrate women into these traditions.

2.5.4 Sublimationist

Sublimationist's focuses on the separateness of female and male but in a reverse sense from patriarchy, where feminine and masculine rules and principles operate in different realms. Therefore, Osiek (1997:964) suggests there is no concept of equality, but rather of females being superior to males in the feminine realm or that these genders are too different to even compare which inevitably makes social equality extremely difficult if not impossible.

Women have certain roles which need to be followed, this is the same for men, and the concept of interchanging these roles is against nature. A sublimationist therefore, according to Jeong (2002:118) and Brayford (2009:316) seeks for scripture which honours women in symbolic feminine imagery (such as the bride of God, Israel as a virgin). More recently, even making claims of more female attributes associated with God, Christ and the Holy Spirit.

In the approach, Schüssler Fiorenza (1996:5) states that one needs to look at the text, the community or the interpreter and the interpretation or the effects of an interpretation. This displays what the text 'natural' form is, what was placed onto it and the effects of such a combination allowing for a new mixture to take place, inevitably leading to a new interpretation.

Sublimationists do not engage in a battle against patriarchy, but rather emphasise the importance of the symbolic understanding of a text. Osiek (1997:964-965), Jeong (2002:119), and Brayford (2009:316) all agree this approaches weakness is the tendency to be excluded and separated from the social-political dimensions and focuses more on the dogmas in terms of roles of women and society.

Rosemary Radford Ruether has been identified as a supporter of this approach (Jeong 2002:118).

2.5.5 Liberationist

Liberationists, according to Osiek (1997:965) and Jeong (2002:119) are known for being "radical re-interpreters of biblical eschatology". Their aim is to be liberated from the patriarchal domination so that all humans can be equal and form partnerships in one common task.

Brayford (2009:316) and Osiek (1997:965) acknowledge that the liberationists understand that oppression of women due to patriarchy is but only a piece of the puzzle because the central message of the Bible is human liberation, which is emphasised by focusing on salvation.

Osiek (1997:965) states that this theme of liberation can be mostly found within the prophetic traditions. Prophetic traditions focus on proclaiming a change from unjust social situations which cause oppression in some form in order to construct a just and free society. Ruether (1982:59) acknowledges that this approach needs to deal with changing contexts constantly, and thus one needs to discern new strategies for each context, the prophetic tradition cannot and should not be viewed as a static principle. Therefore, this approach does not necessarily only direct attention to texts with women in, but most definitely deals with texts which are patriarchal and androcentric at times. However, Brayford (2009:316) argues against Ruether's understanding stating this approach can quite easily turn into a "canon within a canon" by only using and reflecting on the texts which are applicable to this liberating salvation theory. Whilst ignoring and rejecting those texts which seem to contradict it.

Liberationists maintain the understanding that the message of the Bible liberates the community from its own historical and cultural traditions which have caused oppression, this understanding is then extremely relevant for today's context (Osiek 1997:965). The new interpretation the liberalists provide as noted by Jeong (2002:119), and Osiek (1997:966) is not about revising patriarchy but rather about confronting them with the possibility of salvation and new creation which does not

35

only change the biblical perspectives but goes beyond it, into social structures in households straight through to nations.

Letty Russell, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Rosemary Radford Ruether, are well-known supporters of this approach. According to May (1996:108) Letty Russell and Rosemary Radford Ruether both agree that the liberating approach serves as a transformation for the texts, oppressing structures as well as the Christian traditions.

In my understanding feminists explicitly referring to the approaches mentioned above can be divided between using a historical-critical method and literary critical method. Rejectionists seem to use a historical-critical method as it analyses the past traditions, identifying the texts inherent patriarchal principles. Therefore, rejecting the authority of the biblical texts or even as extreme as reject the parts of the Bible altogether. Similarly, loyalists employ a historical-critical method but also make use of a literary-critical method. Historical-critical method, because the loyalist's analysis the history of the text which they argue proves that the Bible is not inherently patriarchal. But a literary-critical method is employed as it analyses the text as one has it acknowledging its authority but also claiming that some interpretations presented with it are considered patriarchal. Revisionists portray a historical-critical method as it analyses past traditions and emphasises women's role within those "existing" ancient traditions. Sublimationists seem to strictly use a literary-critical method as it emphasises feminine imagery in the text as it stands. Liberalists take to a historical-critical method to highlight silent women and attempt to change or at least revise social structures which were once implemented to oppress or exploit in ancient societies.

2.6 Conclusion

Though there are different types of feminism and different approaches in feminism, they all have common ground in a couple of aspects. In light of the above discussion on the types and approaches of feminism, Ramazanoglu (1989:8-9) sums these aspects up as follows:

- First, they all agree that the portrayal of the relationships between the sexes is not acceptable, as women are seen as subordinate to men, and that needs to change.
- Second, each feminist group challenges the norm; this is the areas which many take for granted as standard in a society which was created by someone in a particular culture or society for a specific purpose.
- Third, feminist movements all raised fundamental questions about history and the future in order to achieve some form of explanation to the issues raised.
- Fourth, feminism was the vessel in which all logical ideas were formed to change the world so that male and female can successfully reach their potential without having to break through any barriers on the way.
- Fifth, each feminist movement takes part in some form of political practice in order to help women gain control over their own lives.
- Sixth, each feminist group falls short in one way or another and therefore runs into some kind of resistance.
- Lastly, all feminist groups take part in asking questions formulated around knowledge, what one means by knowledge and why there are forms of knowledge which seem more valid or accepted than others.

Feminist and Gender criticism usually take on a literary or historical approach, most often a literary approach. The literary approach focuses more on the interpretations of the texts and the reading of the texts with a feminist lens, acknowledging the women in the texts and emphasising their roles. Whereas the historical approach, with a feminist lens, looks behind the text for the roles of women and how their roles may have been initially misinterpreted or even ignored.

The gender approach and feminist approach seem very similar. One should note that the gender approach can be considered a branch of the feminism, where more questions are raised. Questions relating to race, social class, economic status, political status and of course, gender. Gender studies acknowledge that one needs

to understand the cultural context of a text in order to engage with the gender constructs within the texts.

Before engaging with the blood sacrifices presented in Leviticus 1-7 with this perspective, one should first identify the culture, social structures, and agriculture of the Ancient Near East. Using a gender and feminist historical approach, I will attempt to reconstruct the cultural, social, and agricultural systems of the Ancient Near East. Eventually, leading to a reconstruction of the values of women and its effects or reflections on the value (symbolic and economic) of animals (specifically female animals).

Chapter 3

Culture, Society and Agriculture

3.1 Introduction

The overall purpose of this dissertation is to justify why the text portrays males (animal and human) as are more valuable than females (animal and human) specifically when viewing the sacrificial texts. This chapter then presents one with an analysis of the cultural context of the Ancient Near East, the social context of the Ancient Near East and their understanding of agriculture. This analysis may justify why male animals have been portrayed as more superior than that of female animals. Furthermore, this understanding will show the common factor between the supposed values of animals and the social values of humans. This chapter then takes on a revisionist feminist approach which attempts to look behind the text, to reinterpret the texts so that certain voices may be heard (in this case, the value of female animals). This chapter involves a process of discussing what social values women and men had and what economic values the animals according to their sex had. Moreover, an analysis of these two topics may highlight the fact that a male animal's economic status may have been overstated due to the patriarchal system.

According to Deist (2000:102) cultural anthropology over the years has discovered that cultures may be studied and described according to various interactive domains. These interactive domains can be described as the relation and interaction between humans, their environment, the materials they make and use (tools and art), their understanding of an economic system, their social constructs, their political organisations, their language and literature, their religion and their world view.

When using a gender or feminist historical approach, one would need to get a clear understanding of the ancient Israelites' historical context. This can be done according to Deist (2000:102) by engaging with their culture, language and the meaning that is connected with such concepts. By engaging with the Ancient Near

Eastern historical context, one may be able to identify what significance Leviticus' instructions have; specifically, with regards to the sex of animal required for certain sacrifices, the gender roles applied to them and their economic value.

Deist (2000:102) argues that modern society no longer has "interactive" domains, but rather a construction of segregated domains, where each activity is acted out solely in one domain (only for an economic purpose or only for a religious purpose). However, for most ancient cultures and societies, these domains, were involved continuously in and integrated with each other, meaning one activity is acted out and has an effect on more than one domain. It is for this reason that Morgan (2010:33) argues that one needs to acknowledge the text in its original context as one is crossing cultural divides, entering into cultures which contemporary scholars are not familiar with. Firmage (1992:1109) gives an example of how animals are used between these interactive domains, stating that in Ancient Near Eastern societies, animals were a form of wealth. However, these animals also had roles to fulfil such as being used in sacrifice in some circumstances food, secondary produce (e.g. milk), working the fields, and as livestock currency for trading. This shows that humans used animals in the economic, religious and political domains.

3.2 Lifestyle

One should first start off by explaining the household dynamics which extend into the social lives of the Israelites. The role of the household in Ancient Israel was, as Meyers (1988:140, cf. McVan 1993:71-72 and Borowski 2003:25) claims:

> The household remained the central institution for most economic, social, political, and cultural aspects of human existence.

When looking into the discipline of archaeology, one will also note that the layout and fragments of "domestic buildings" was one of the most common findings (Meyers 1988:139-140). As Carr (2010:36) explains within the tribal state, the Israelites lived a very minimalistic lifestyle, which consisted of small villages ranging between 50-300 people (cf. Orlin 2007:57-59). This justifies the understanding that Israel did not

have many formal political institutions or public social system but initially operated out of the household unit. However, when the monarchy rose, political institutions and more centralised social systems needed to be implemented. Villages merged, and the population count continued to grow in Judah ranging between elite, local farmers and other individuals (Ortiz 2014:247, 259). With such demographics, Israel could be considered a territorial state which, according to Ortiz (2014:241) initially had "fragile social organisation and tribal allegiance" influenced by former traditions. Even with a growing state, the implementation of political institutions, social systems and a collective administration order, the concept of kinship which held tribal societies together as Ortiz (2014:259) states still had a crucial role to play "in the administration of the monarchy". However, Van Der Veen (2014:403) explains with the Babylonian exile the population decreased, the land was described as desolate. This meant that when the exiles were able to return, they needed to build a central social system again, probably leaning on the concept of kinship, which once built their society before.

The landscape according to Ortiz (2014:243) consisted of hill country, coastal line and desert which Carr (2010:36) argues had very minimal rainfall and only in their winter seasons thus leaving them with very little water supply (cf. Firmage 1992:1110). Even though the land did not seem very agriculturally friendly, and barren at times, it was situated in the heart of the major trade routes. Adams (2014:18) and Borowski (2003:19) discuss that the Israelites' living spaces were simultaneously their work areas and that their daily aims were to produce food or sustain the food already produced. Stager and King (2001:29) note that the houses in the villages were pillared houses. These consisted of two to four rooms. These rooms would be spread across a double story house. Where the family would mostly stay upstairs, for sleeping and entertainment purposes and the storage (reserved crops, tools and jars) and animals living quarters would be downstairs on the ground floor. According to Borowski (2003:28-29) growing crops and grains was the most crucial form of occupation, and herding was considered the second most important.

North (1994:5) argues that that Israelites "economic boundaries" were built on the concepts of "geography (land laws), tribal membership (seed laws), and ritual requirements (laws of sacrifice)".

Looking at the household structure through different perspectives (gender, economic and social status) may provide more understanding to what the purpose and structure truly was.

3.3 Social Constructs

3.3.1 Structure of Household

The function of the father/husband/male is known to be more important than that of a female. Adams (2014:8) states:

> The possibility of healthy offspring, financial stability, a good reputation and in some cases, survival remained much higher if an individual had a place in an established household with a living patriarch.

The Ancient Near Eastern family system was patrilocal, patrilineal and patriarchal; which meant that it was expected of a woman to stay with her husband's family, descent and inheritance were calculated along the male line, and the males in society had the ultimate authority (cf. Duling 1993:173, Malina 1993:111, Perry 2016:6-7 and Borowski 2003:22).

According to Cundall, Bruce, Mellor and Rowe (1982:69) Israelite males were able to marry more than one wife; this is considered polygyny and was not frowned upon (cf. Wilson 1996:330).[6] Polygyny is understandable when one takes into consideration that the whole purpose of marriage, which is to create a family, a lineage. If one's initial wife was barren, then one would seek another to continue the lineage. However, many Israelites were bound to one because they could not afford another one. Marriage was therefore considered a business transaction and parents

---

[6] See Genesis 4:19; 16:1-2; 22:20-24; 25:1,6; 29:15-30.

arranged these marriages as well as the contract between the two families. The groom's father would give the bride's father a "bride price" (cf. Unterman 1996:332). Which seems as if this wife was bought as one would expect a slave, to be property but Cundall *et al.* (1982:69) argue it is rather viewed as compensation for the family who will be losing a daughter.

Although there is a focus on the male's function and his status is portrayed as more important, Borowski (2003:22) argues that the participation of men, women and children, all contributed to the welfare of the family and larger society. There were, however, biological limitations as well as clearly defined gender-based roles.

When investigating the function of the mother/wife/female one will observe that there is little to no attention given to women and children in ancient sources and to an extent our study of these ancient sources/societies supports that observation, even if women actually played a significant role in the households and the wider society (Adams 2014:41). However, with the rise of gender studies, gender scholars are and have been (over many decades) attempting to correct the neglect of women and children in texts. Women were specifically responsible for the daily life necessities, with regards to preparing food, looking after children, maintaining the household and were responsible for the household's worship (Pilch 1993:129; cf. Adams 2014:41). Other scholars such as Meyers (1988:49) would regard this work as mundane activities, however, when describing such activities in detail one should note that these roles played out by women actually guaranteed the survival of the household and in some circumstances increase the value of the household (cf. Adams 2014:41).

Women, however, were under immense control and oppression and were subject to men (Ex. 20:14,17; 21:7-11). Some texts leave the impression that women were able to contract impurities more regularly than that of a man (Lv. 15).[7] Women had no

---

[7] One should note that in the text of Leviticus 15 there is an equal amount of discussion on male and female uncleanness because of discharge. While women's discharges are a natural, unstoppable (not a choice) monthly occurrence, with men the debate is slightly more complicated, as it is not a

authority to divorce their husbands (Dt. 24), and they had to wear clothing which was notably different to that of a man's wardrobe (Dt. 22). Women were even expected to wear specific attire which would show prospective husbands the wealth of the family (Es. 2:17, Ezk. 16:11-12; 23:42). McVann (1993:71) further notes that even though mothers and fathers are mentioned side by side in texts as "authoritative" figures to specifically children, the males had more authority than that of a woman (Nm. 1:2-3, 17-19; 27:8). Osiek (1993:156) adds that women were only viewed as productive assets, to the benefit of either her father or husband. Tischler (2006:384-385) explains that women were given as brides by the fathers and taken by her husband, as an exchange and usually at young ages in their early teens. Therefore women had to endure arranged marriages, which were regulated by the Mosaic laws. Marriage thus was viewed as an economic matter, not a romantic connection, where reproducing was of most importance, specifically having boys (cf. Ruane 2013:19).

---

reoccurring event, but rather a choice or a sickness. Milgrom (1991:916) notes that this section is not only focused, solely on genital discharge as ejaculation and menstruation but focuses on any fluids which are excreted as a flow/discharge. Milgrom (1991:935) further notes that menstruation should not be viewed as an abnormal discharge, which contains more impurities. Rather, there are other genital discharges which are considered abnormal and therefore more impure. Nihan (2007:317-318) agrees with Milgrom, noting that one could consider male gonorrhoeic discharge as more impure than that of menstruation, thus both male and female discharge should be viewed as equally impure. Nihan (2007:309) notes that there are scholars who argue for an obvious explanation as to why menstrual blood is connected with disease which therefore associates it with death. It can be connected with the loss of life (as women does not menstruate whilst being pregnant) and "antithetical to fertility" (monthly menstruations shows inability to conceive). Another major symbolic aspect of menstruation blood is the understanding that blood is considered the ultimate concept of life. Eilberg-Schwarts (1990:179) argues that blood can have many meanings all relating to where it comes from and how it emerged. Thus, noting only some types of blood are considered to have contaminating characteristics. However, Nihan (2007:311) disagrees with this contaminating understanding as sex plays a small role in this section and is not even mentioned in Leviticus 15:32-33. Milgrom (1991:949-950) importantly notes that primitive societies had viewed menstrual blood as a source of power which should be feared and could contaminate anything which she touches. Milgrom (1991:1002) however, argues that this is not the case for the Ancient Israelites but rather states that menstruation and ejaculation were entered into the list of impurities because many diseases were associated with them in Ancient Israel. Specifically, with its overall connection with death, loss of semen or blood equals the loss of life. See Eilberg-Schwarts (1990:179-186), Milgrom (1991:902-1009) and Nihan (2007:305-310) for full discussion on the impurities of Leviticus 11-15.

Turning to the function of the children, Pilch (1993:128) states that children were taught from a young age to respect and submit to authority, especially the patriarch of the family. Adams (2014:41) adds to Pilch's understanding that the children of a household would follow their mother's instructions to a certain age. Pilch (1993:129) and Borowski (2003:22) argue that the mother was responsible for the children until they were seven to nine years old. At those ages, the children would be divided; male or female and then get responsibilities accordingly. McVann (1993:71-72) argues that this sort of structure is taught to children to imbed the traditions of the culture into them and continue the cycle of respecting the authority of the patriarch and exclusivity. This family tradition then extends into the wider society and the nation, where all are to respect the higher authority (priests, leaders, judges, kings). This can then be argued as an analogy of parents to children with the leaders to a nation. Parents bring life, protection, comfort and food, so to do the leaders. If one wanted to rebel against such traditions, one would find themselves "lifeless" as an over-exaggeration but definitely excluded from the family, society and nation as well as the advantages that family connections bring.

Cundall *et al.* (1982:65) argue that in Israel children were regarded as a blessing or a gracious gift from God as well as considered very valuable, and a large family was ideal (cf. Wilson 1996:176).[8] Having a large family would be useful to the family and broader society, it would be even better for the father and his status in the community if he had more sons. Children were also considered to be their fathers' property, and if the family was in need of money, the father had the right to sell children as slaves. However, this was not the first resort as the Israelites believed that one would live on through their offspring, especially their sons, thus without a son, the family would come to an end.

To summarise, men were portrayed as more superior than women and children. Men were the public figures for the whole family and were more important to society.

---

[8] As seen in texts such as Psalms 113:9; 127:3; 128:5-6.

Whereas women needed to be controlled and limited to the private spheres of the household. Children were considered valuable, but as property that also needed to be controlled. Now I will turn to an analysis on animals, specifically their usages, economic value and significance in ancient Israelites society.

<u>3.3.2 Animals</u>

According to Firmage (1992:1109) domestic animals "played a significant role in the cultural history of the Near East". Borowski (2006:159), Cansdale (1970:41) and Firmage (1992:1114) show that a domestic animal is an animal which has been confined to human interference and is then entirely dependent on humans for shelter, food, water and breeding. This then allows humans to manipulate the procreation of certain animals, choosing fitting matches and possibly how many years an animal will live for procreation. Baker (2003:22) and Ruane (2013:57) add that animals were domesticated for two reasons: first for pulling purposes and second for their secondary produce or materials created from animals (milk, skin, meats). Borowski (2006:159-160) lists goats, sheep, cows, bulls, donkeys, camels, dogs and cats as domestic animals in the Ancient Near East. For the purpose of this study in relation to sacrifice only goats, sheep, and cattle are relevant.

Leviticus 1:2 shows that one is to bring domesticated animals. Even though Milgrom (1991:145, 232) acknowledges that בְּהֵמָה is a term used to include all types of animals (pure and impure), it acts as an apodosis along with הַבָּקָר and צֹאן which supports the idea that these animals were domesticated. Milgrom continues to note that הַבָּקָר is the generic term for all forms of cattle. בֶּן הַבָּקָר would then be a used to designate "son of the herd", meaning a young bull. However, the generic term for bull is פַּר. Milgrom (1991:145) notes that בֶּן הַבָּקָר and פַּר were probably used to emphasise the sex of the burnt offering's victim. צֹאן is the generic term used for sheep and goats, translated as "flock". If an offering needed to be specified, the individual terms for "sheep" (כֶּשֶׂב) and "goat" (וְעֵז) were used. One can also find terms such as אַיִל, designating strictly rams which according to Clines (1993:210) is

designated for any male from the flock, as it has been used interchangeably in texts such as Deuteronomy 8:6, 20 referring to rams horn (goats having horns) and Leviticus 5:15, 25 referring to the rams wool (sheep having wool). Clines (2011:312) notes that שׁוֹר is another term which can be used as a bull, ox, steer or even a general reference to cattle.

Interestingly enough Leviticus 1-7, barely uses the female designated terms for animals (only שְׂעִירַת "she-goat" in Lv. 5:6). The rest of the text where females are present, the male term is used with the addition of נְקֵבָה, indicating that this specific animal should be female. The addition of זָכָר is also seen throughout Leviticus 1-7, possibly acting as a clear indication to the specific sex of the animal needed for certain offerings.

According to Simmons and Ekarius (2001:6) sheep farming is suitable for small property owners. One can have a couple of ewes on a small piece of land and be considered a farmer and sustain oneself. With regards to the Israelites' animal husbandry and agriculturally based lifestyle, it would make sense as to why the Israelites commonly farmed sheep, as they had relatively small households which needed to accompany all the family members and animals. Vancil (1992a:1040) notes that sheep and goats were valuable in Ancient Near Eastern society and would usually be referenced as flocks together in the Old Testament.[9]

Miles (1992:132) states that sheep were one of the first animals to be domesticated, once a sheep has been domesticated the chances it attempts to escape is very little, they would only wander slightly because they acknowledge they would not survive without the shepherd. Culture and society created this mind-frame which believes that sheep need human care just as children need adult care, this is based on the understanding that once sheep were domesticated, they require human assistance and intervention.

---

[9] Term for Flock/small cattle: צֹאן. Examples include: Genesis 4:2, 4, 12:16; 13:5; Exodus 10:9; Psalm 144:13; Job 1:3; 42:12.

According to Cansdale (1970:50-52) sheep were domesticated for meat and fat and then became important in sacrifice and on special occasions. Cundall *et al.* (1982:134-135) state that sheep would feed on grass and were known for their pale white woolly coats, their "wool was shorn regularly and was the commonest material for clothes" (cf. Cansdale 1970:50). Eventually, sheep's milk became more valuable than the meat or the fleece, considering it was more used in the Israelites' diet (cf. Kohler-Rollefson 1996c:1008).

One should note that goats were probably the easiest to herd, considering their ability to climb and survive in all terrains, but also because goats were able to defend themselves (Cansdale 1970:46). Vancil (1992a:1040) argues that goats were known for being very destructive to the surrounding vegetation because of their feeding habits. Cundall *et al.* (1982:135) state that goats fed on twigs, leaves and shrubs, which would allow for roots to die and ground to shift. Borowski (2003:30) states that "goats are hardier than sheep", but were also domesticated for their milk and meat as noted above (cf. Vancil 1992a:1040, Cansdale 1970:46, Kohler-Rollefson 1996b:381, Ruane 2013:57). Goats were also used for their hair as well as their hide to keep milk, oils, wine and water (cf. Baker 2003:23).[10] The goat's horn is also known to have been widely used as tools or bottles (Cansdale 1970:52). Milk from sheep or goats could obviously not be kept for long periods of time because these commodities could not be refrigerated, but the Israelites would turn the milk into curds either yoghurt or different types of cheeses (Borowski 2003:66, cf. Firmage 1992:1120, Borowski 2006:159). After cows' milk was introduced, Cansdale (1970:48) argues "the goats main purpose eventually became sacrifice".

Firmage (1992:1119) and Cundall *et al.* (1982:135) argue that cattle were not only produced and used for their meat and milk, but also for their leather, their ability to carry heavy loads and as an important sacrifice (cf. Cansdale 1970:58, Kohler-Rollefson: 1996a:172 and Ruane 2013:57). For purposes of raising a meat-

---

[10] Examples include: Genesis 21:14; Josh 9:4, 13; Judge 4:19; 1 Samuel 1:24; Psalm 119:83.

producing bull, one would rather buy a steer (already castrated bull before he is sexually mature). Thomas (2009:64,68,198) notes that steers are calmer and not focused on breeding. In a herd, one would naturally have more cows or heifers than that of bulls and if one only had a few heifers, outsourcing a bull would be advised, to get the perfect sire for one's heifers.

Firmage (1992:1116) makes a good point, by asking how significant secondary produce was for Ancient Near Eastern society? According to Carr (2010:36) animals were mainly used for their secondary produces or the by-products (milk and clothing) and only in desperate times would they be used for their meat or when sacrificial rituals were necessary (cf. Borowski 2003:67 and Firmage 1992:1120). Firmage (1992:1116) states that the animal remains leftover at sacrificial sites were mainly young animals bones, but also mostly male remains, therefore leading to the conclusion that female animals "survived in greater numbers, indicating their use". This adds to the understanding that secondary produce was of great importance, and female animals were mostly responsible for secondary produce.

In terms of economic value, Vancil (1992b:1188) states that "Possession of these animals (goats, sheep and cattle) indicated power and wealth." Simmons and Ekarius (2001:21-22) argue that the younger the sheep, the more valuable the sheep, thus the older the sheep, the less valuable. However, one should not disregard older ewes as they have a production life expectancy between the ages of 10-12 years old, and they are used to birthing lambs. Vancil (1992a:1040) makes an argument that "kids meat was highly prized" and could this have added to the reason for lambs and kids being more valuable in terms of the sacrificial system because they tasted good? Cansdale (1970:50-51) and Vancil (1992b:1188) present similar views; that farmers would cull their excess males once they reached full size (a farmer would keep one ram for twenty ewes). However, culling results in the loss of protentional food and income. It would make more sense if a farmer sold off his young rams to other farmers or used as a sacrifice in order to save money.

For economical and reproductive purposes, Thomas (2009:76,190-191) argues that "Older cows are already proven producers: they will calve more easily, and you know they will mother their calves". This is obviously great for-profit purposes and for sustaining the continuity of the cattle. Heifers (young female cows, who have not had a calf yet) at first heat are not as fertile as they would be by their third heat and one would not want their heifers to have calves younger than the age of two.

Firmage (1992:1119) understands the currency to work as such the "relative value of cattle and sheep was typically ten to one", which means that cattle would cost a person ten shekels and a sheep would cost a person one shekel. Sheep and goats were considered equally useful and common; however, a goat, on the other hand, costed two-thirds of a shekel. This is possibly because a sheep held more value in its secondary produce of wool whereas a goat would only have to offer hair as Firmage (1992:1119) argued that in order to use the hair of a goat one would need to slaughter it, which is not the case with sheep.

Cansdale (1970:45-46) states that "it is likely that goats were first kept as milk producers. The meat of an adult, especially of a male, is tough and strong-smelling, but the kid is very edible". However, a "sheep's meat is better at all ages" and sheep became more valuable because of their wool, it was considered better than the coarse hair of a goat. However, as goat's milk was known to be richer than sheep's milk, this continued to give goats a purpose. Cansdale (1970:46) argues that when cows arrived, its milk proved to be even better than goats' milk as was discussed above and it was larger in size giving more meat which reduced goats economic value to the cheapest of the three. Cundall *et al.* (1982:132) state that bulls were very pricy and the average Israelite probably did not own any cattle, other than its hefty prices; the land was also somewhat unfit for cattle to survive, which meant a lot of maintenance and expense was involved in herding cattle. Boer (2015:63-64) states that cattle need around 50+ litres of water to survive which places the survival of humans in jeopardy, but sheep only need about 2-3 litres of water which is easier to sustain in an environment of scares water. Cattle also needed to be in close

50

proximity to their water source, which is around 16 km, whereas goats could be further from water supply around 30 km.

According to Mattingly (1996:331) farmers would be busy with animal husbandry all year round and tending to crops never ceased to stop for preparation of coming harvests or planting. However, farming ventures were mostly controlled by seasons. A smart farmer would only calf around springtime for feeding purposes, later in the year food is scarce, and conditions are challenging for a new-born (Cansdale 1970:59).

In terms of choosing mating partners, Simmons and Ekarius (2001:26) note that there is an old saying which still holds true until this day for sheep: "The ram is half of the flock", thus choosing a ram would affect the whole flock in terms of the quality of offspring. According to Simmons and Ekarius (2001:265) "One good ram can handle 25 to 30 ewes" therefore rams have the responsibility to breed with most, if not all the ewes on one's farm or in one's flock. Some ewes can have multiple births at once; this is a ewe having a twin or triplets. This could bring one more profit; however, it is more time consuming and can cause many complications with both mother and baby (Simmons and Ekarius 2001:35). Even though the ram is considered half the flock Simmons and Ekarius (2001:264) note it is important to understand that rams which come from a multiple birth (ram which is a twin) does not have the capabilities to create multiple births (twins do not depend on the male sperm). This is all the ewes doing (depending on the amount of eggs available for fertilisation); however, a ram who comes from multiple births has the ability to pass these generic traits to the ewes he produces which can increase his value and his ewe offspring. These chances can be increased by choosing a ewe who is also prone to having twins.

The saying for rams proves to be the same for cattle, with regard to bulls. Thomas (2009:352-353) states that one only needs one good bull; choosing a bull should be in connection with what heifers one has. Both the heifer and the bull play an

51

important role in what calf is produced. More cows would influence one to buy a bull, which may also bring about a male calf, but one would need to wait a year before continuing to breed with him, therefore buying an older bull would be perfect for immediate breeding. However, an important distinction from lambs and kids is that calf's genetics, according to Thomas (2009:31-32,197) are made up of half its mother's and half its father's genes. If one trait is more dominant, it will show; however, the recessive gene which did not show in this calve lays dormant until genes are mixed again. If there is no other dominant gene in the next process of mixture, then the recessive gene (negative gene) will be the most predominant one. This then suggests that one would want specific heifers to breed with a bull who sires similar calves; this helps with the birthing of calves. The older the cow gets, the bigger the sire could be as the cow would be used to birthing, the younger the cow, the higher possibility of her birthing a small sire.

In terms of sheep's health, Simmons and Ekarius (2001:237-260) explain that rams are known for not having as many problems as ewes; however, if a ram were to have a problem, this can hinder your whole flock. There were about four diseases or problems which could affect one's ram. Ewes alternatively suffer far more from disorders, and this can also be because they are the ones who hold and birth lambs. Ewes can suffer from about six different disorders of which one of them is miscarriage and miscarriage can be caused by six of its own types of diseases/disorders. Lambs are more susceptible to diseases than that of an older sheep; however, this does not exclude older sheep from retracting such diseases. Lambs are able to contract about 11 different types of diseases. These diseases are usually contracted within the first ten days of life.

A ram's productive life expectancy is about six years; this is all depending on their health. Yet, rams need to be sold, swapped and borrowed for inbred purposes, showing how easily they are replaced. Simmons and Ekarius (2001:19, 265, 270) emphasise the fact that one needs to remember that one should not inbreed, a ram cannot breed with his daughter, grand-daughters or great-granddaughters. For small

flocks, it is not necessary to buy a ram, but rather lend rams for the purpose of breeding with one's ewes. "No single ewe has a major impact in your production, but as a collective body, these animals are crucial to success".

Interestingly, Thomas (2009:354, 369-379) notes that in modern-day animal husbandry a mature bull is more expensive than a younger bull as well as more expensive than a female cow. However, I presume that most scholars would think that the same applies to ancient animals. The bull's productive life expectancy is estimated between four and eight years; however, when breeding with the same heifers, one would need to change one's bulls at least every two years because one cannot inbreed cattle. A mature bull can breed with about 25 cows at a time; however, a yearling bull can only manage between 15-18 cows (Thomas 2009: 369-370). The difference between a yearling bull and mature bull in terms of how many cows he can breed with at a time, is probably the reasoning behind a matures bulls' higher value.

As an overview, the domestication of animals became another way of controlling assets and property. Thus, animals would have been placed into a value system of their own, used as currency and possibly a bartering tool. The value system based on the information above from ascending to descending value was cattle, sheep and goats. Within each species of animal, males were respectively important for the reproduction of the herd or flock and needed to be chosen wisely. However, even though offspring were considered valuable for repopulation of the herd or flock, an excess of males led to culling as farmers only needed a few or even one male to repopulate, which resulted in selling or slaughtering of one's males. Female animals, on the other hand, young or old, held consistent value as most secondary produce came from a female animal. Fewer females would be used to slaughter or sacrifice as they could be used for repopulation of herds or flocks, for their by-products or rarely but possibly sold.

3.4 Conclusion

In the preceding chapter, I argued that gender and feminist critics focus on the recovery of ignored or misinterpreted roles of women. Taking this into consideration, one might wonder what the social constructs' relevance is with sacrifice. The Old Testament clearly emphasises maleness, specifically when referring to social status. Ruane (2013:21) acknowledges that this emphasis of maleness can also be seen in rituals and more specifically in the sacrificial laws. In the text, one finds the officiators or priests are all males, the most commonly used animal in sacrifices are male, and the offeror for most sacrifices is male. This comes as no surprise as reflected above males are in charge, in their patrilineal, patrilocal and patriarchal society. Therefore, the frequent omission of women is expected. Just as ritual status reflects males' social power so too does the inclusion of women in ritual enactments reflect forms of power in women's social and ritual status or the lack thereof.

It would seem that female animals have been subjected to the same neglection as women for the following reasons. One can clearly see the connection between the treatment of animals, women and children in terms of the social, economic and political spheres. Women, children and in general animals were viewed as property and controlled by their owners (the patriarch). The lineage of women and children ran through the father's bloodline, and patriarchs also controlled the lineage of animals through the process of domestication. In terms of reproductive purposes, one would have more ewes than rams, just as one husband can have more than one wife. Female animals were known for having more issues in terms of health; this can be related to women who are seen to have "more" impurities, both according to reproductive abilities. Children were divided at certain ages according to gender and so too are animals divided (sold, traded or slaughtered) at specific ages according to sex. Children were viewed as blessings or gifts and valuable to an extent, especially the sons, so too are male animals (the young ones specifically) viewed as sacred gifts of offering and are valuable.

In summary Ruane (2013:20) notes that women, as well as male and female animals' involvement in cultic activities, frequently changes with their age, marital, reproductive and economic status, whereas a man's cultic activity was mostly unchanged, with a few exceptions.

So, what is the significance of the sexes of animals? One could possibly argue that the social status hierarchy influenced the economic value of animals according to their sexes. Female animals are notably more useful or valuable alive than that of male animals, also providing more in terms of secondary produce and vital in terms of quantity for reproductive abilities. Over and above the fact that female animals provide more, they are also kept in better living conditions than that of males and not outsourced like males are. I would have to acknowledge the fact that some scholars would argue that the one male kept for reproducing purposes is more valuable than each individual cow, however, for the purpose of this dissertation one should question what use do the excess bulls and rams have, in turn what value do they hold and how does that affect male animals value as a group? I would argue for less value and in a sense need to be given a purpose, therefore sacrificing a female (cow or ewe) means a bigger price is paid, but the text seems to reflect otherwise. It would seem that the text applies a symbolic worth to animals which does not accurately represent the economic value that the specific sexed animal can bring to the table.

Concluding on this section one would wonder what was the actual value of male animals, and what happened to the surplus males which were born? As females had a fixed place in the reproduction process, all females were used, but only a few males were needed. The sacrificial system needed victims, and with a surplus of males, it was the perfect opportunity to accommodate males. Sending them to the altar would have given them some form of value. A more detailed discussion on the significance of the similarities and differences of the relationship between animals and humans as well as the relationship between Israelites themselves will follow in later chapters.

The further question that we need to address is the role metaphors played in determining the value of animals and humans alike. As Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:1) notes it is not a new concept that scholars have found reasonable evidence to believe that metaphors have a significant effect on shaping social practices. Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:1) argues that:

> the root metaphors of Israelite thought, which are drawn from animal husbandry and agriculture, gave rise to a number of religious practises and provide the interpretative context in which these practices can be understood.

With that in mind dominating metaphors which Israelites lived by, probably influenced their ritual practices, beliefs and thus shaped their social identity. Before such a discussion can happen, a discussion on Leviticus is necessary, specifically emphasising the use of animals in the sacrificial texts. Ruane (2013:19) notes that women or female animals are not mentioned nearly as much as males are, as most root forms of Hebrew words are morphologically male.[11] Scholars presume only males are included or referred to when a term is morphologically male however, females could be included too. Furthermore, even though some female animals have specific terms in Hebrew, in Leviticus 1-7, most female animals are specified by adding נְקֵבָה to a grammatically male root form of the animal. Without the addition of נְקֵבָה or explicitly using a grammatically feminine term, women and female animals alike are not recognised in ritual and ritual laws which adds to the socio-cultic gender role which the texts emphasise.

---

[11] Ruane (2013:19) states that males have been read into the texts, however in some instances it is possible to read terms as "neutral", it would seem that translators and commentators automatically assign these terms to males. For example, terms such as בְּנֵי and אָדָם can be read as neutral terms such as "children" and "people" instead of their masculine form's "sons" and "man".

Chapter 4

Overview of Leviticus

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents a general overview of the book of Leviticus. Ska (2006:33) notes that it is a necessity to start with Leviticus' literary context to investigate smaller units in Leviticus. Ska continues that Leviticus is placed, in terms of the larger Pentateuchal narrative, between the period of leaving Egypt and entering the promised land. That the book is freeing Israel from slavery, separating the Israelites from other nations and sanctifying them to enter the promised land and dwell with Yahweh. Therefore, I start with a short comment on the title and purpose of the text. I will attempt a synchronic overview of the final text and where Leviticus fits into the Sinai pericope and the larger exodus narrative. Then I will look from a more diachronic perspective and focus on Priestly material found within Leviticus 1-16, concluding with a brief introduction to the blood offerings presented in Leviticus 1-7.

4.2 Title & Purpose

According to Bellinger (2012:3) and Hartley (1992: xxx) the title of the book Leviticus in Hebrew is the first word used in the Hebrew text: וַיִּקְרָא "and he called." The word refers to Yahweh calling Moses, who is presented as the mediator, who will present what the Israelites need to do to remain in a covenant relationship with Yahweh. Similarly, Ska (2006:32) points out that Leviticus is a set of prescribed requirements for the Israelites to be pure and holy so that Yahweh to dwell amongst them.

Bellinger (2012:3), Hartley (1992: xxx) and Milgrom (1991:1) note that the English name originates from the Vulgate which means it originally came from the LXX Λευϊτικὸν meaning "the Levitical book" and in the Hellenistic era, the term Levites meant priests. One should note that references to the Levites within the Old Testament are rare and as Gorman (2008:645) notes mainly occur in the book of Numbers. Still, this reference to Levites fits very well, considering the Levites were a

group of Israelites commonly associated with worship and priestly matters. However, Milgrom (1991:1) argues that Leviticus has nothing to do with the Levites and that they are only briefly mentioned in verses 32-34 of chapter 25. Milgrom continues that the Levites not being the main focus does make some thematic sense. Taking into consideration Leviticus' canonical context, Exodus which according to Milgrom (1991:1) is about:

> the priestly texts which describe the construction of the cultic implements,
> Leviticus has a static picture of scenes of a living cult and Numbers which follows
> the cultic laws of the camp in motion.

Milgrom (1991:1) argues that the activities in Numbers are concerned with cultic laws which involve the primary function of the Levites. From this, two points are clear: firstly, it makes thematic sense that the Levites are mostly mentioned in Numbers as their primary functions are spelt out in that text. Secondly, it makes perfect sense why one could note that Leviticus acts as a continuation of the Pentateuchal narrative considering its canonical placement between Exodus and Numbers (Watts 2013:21).

According to Hartley (1992: xxx), Wenham (1979:3) and Watts (2013:21) the book of Leviticus is most concerned with sacrifices, pure worship and holy living for which the priests (sons of Aaron) give guidance. North (1994:34) similarly argues that:

> The book of Leviticus is above all the book of holiness. It is the book of
> boundaries: ethical, familial, tribal, liturgical, cultural, and geographical. It is the
> book of ownership, property and sacrifice.

Wenham (1979:3), Gorman (2008:645) and Kaiser (1994:988) state that Leviticus' sole purpose was not only for the priests but for the whole of Israel.[12] The laws and

---

[12] Such references can be found throughout Leviticus, in 1:2 "Speak to the Israelites and say to them"; 4:1-2 "The Lord said to Moses, Say to the Israelites"; 7:23 "Say to the Israelites", 7:29 "Say to the Israelites"; 11:2 "Say to the Israelites"; 12:2 "Say to the Israelites"; 15:2 "Speak to the Israelites and say to them"; 17:2 "Speak to Aaron and his sons and to all the Israelites and say to them"; 18:2

58

instructions given to Israel are all for the purpose of being in a relationship with Yahweh, but what are the benefits of this "relationship"? The benefits of following the law and having a relationship with Yahweh would bring about blessings for the nation. This connection with blessings highlights the covenant, which was established with Abraham.[13] Analysing the purpose of Leviticus with Abraham's covenant in mind, one identifies that Leviticus' laws or instructions as Kaiser (1994:988) acknowledges were created to "train, teach and prepare the people to be God's instruments of grace to others."

כפר is another vital aspect of Leviticus mentioned about 50 times throughout. The ancient Israelites believed that blood could affect sin. Kaiser (1994:988) notes "blood outside the flesh is equivalent to death; however, blood in all creatures makes possible life." A more extensive discussion of כפר will follow in my chapter on Leviticus' blood offerings.

4.3 Literary Setting

To understand the setting of Leviticus, according to Sklar (2013:27) a literary (which will be seen below) and historical analysis of its context is necessary (which will be discussed in the next section). Wenham (1979:53) points out that many want to categorise Leviticus as just a compilation of laws, but this is incorrect. One should note that Leviticus is much more than just a compilation of laws, it is embedded in the exodus narrative, Israel's expedition from Egypt to the promised land which holds one of the most important events; the "law-giving". Moreover, Sklar (2013:28) notes that Leviticus acts as an answer to what one would assume the questions the Israelites were left with after Exodus 1-15 and 20-24.[14] Thus, Leviticus is part of the

---

"Speak to the Israelites and say to them"; 19:2 "Speak to the entire assembly of Israel and say to them".

[13] The Abraham covenant stipulated in Genesis 17, which also falls under the Priestly material.

[14] Exodus 1-15, and 19-24, being the exit of Egypt by the grace of Yahweh and then the establishment of a covenant with Yahweh, thus needing to fulfill the requirements of being a holy nation and kingdom of priests. How do they obtain this and maintain this?

larger Sinai pericope which is embedded in the exodus narrative. This pericope, according to Sklar (2013:27) stretches from Exodus 19 to Numbers 10:10.

According to Hartley (1992:xxx) the book of Leviticus' placement within the Old Testament seems to be a perfect fit in terms of chronological order between Exodus and Numbers as Milgrom (1991:1) has noted before. The book can also be seen as a continuation of the Mosaic Law which was first revealed to Moses by God in Exodus, because of Leviticus' "legal treatise" which are seen as the regulations of religious and social life which needed to be followed by the Israelites (Rooker 2000:39). As Rooker (2000:39) puts it: Exodus thus ends with where God is to be worshipped – in the tabernacle and Leviticus focuses on how God is to be worshipped – by offering sacrifices.

Dozeman (2017:387) argues that there are similar themes such as priests, worship and ritual compliance, between Leviticus and Exodus, especially with regards to Leviticus 8-10 and that there is structural parallelism between Leviticus 8 and Exodus 29. One could argue that which is instructed in Exodus 29 in terms of material, vestments, the sin offering, burnt offering and ordination is fulfilled in Leviticus 8.[15] Similarly, Nihan (2007:150-153) compares the texts of Leviticus and Exodus with each other, finding: Firstly, the description of the offerings found in Chapters 1-3, which can also be found within Exodus 29:15-18 - a description of the burnt offering, Exodus 29:22 - a description of the well-being offering and Exodus 29:2, 23 - a description of the grain offering. Secondly, the structure of Leviticus 1-9 closely aligns with that of Exodus 24-40, as indicated by Nihan (2007:158-159) in Table 1 below.

Table 1:	
Exodus 25-40	Leviticus 1-9

---

[15] See Dozeman (2017:387) for the table which outlines the relation and structural parallelisms between Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8

1	Exodus 24:15-18 יְהוָה dwells on Mount Sinai for six days, and calls (וַיִּקְרָא) Moses from inside the cloud on the 7th day.	Leviticus 1:1 יְהוָה dwells inside the tent (מוֹעֵד) and calls (וַיִּקְרָא) Moses from inside the tent.
2	Exodus 25-29 יְהוָה speaks to Moses (אֶל־מֹשֶׁה) about the detailed instructions for building the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד.	Leviticus 1-7 יְהוָה speaks to Moses (אֶל־מֹשֶׁה) about the detailed instructions for קָרְבָּן.
3	Exodus 35-40 Completion of the instructions.	Leviticus 8-9 Inauguration of the sacrificial cult and offering of the first sacrifices.
4	Exodus 40:34 The וּכְבוֹד יְהוָה leaves Mount Sinai and filled the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד.	Leviticus 9:23-24 Public manifestation of the כְּבוֹד-יְהוָה in front of the אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד.

The table indicates that the revelation of sacrificial instructions which one finds in Leviticus 1-7, has been strategically constructed to fit that of the instructions for building in Exodus 25-29, with noticeable differences in the content of instructions and the place/location. Leviticus 1-7 being in a sanctuary and Exodus 25-29 being on Mount Sinai, both are considered prerequisites for Yahweh's presence (Nihan 2007:159).

According to Bellinger (2012:3) the Exodus setting for Leviticus is as follows: Yahweh has already delivered the people from slavery in Egypt. Yahweh and his people then form a covenant at Sinai, which concludes with the Lord stating "I will be your God" and Israel responds with "we will be your people" found in Exodus 19. Bellinger continues, stating within Leviticus, the Lord is portrayed at Sinai giving guidelines through his mediator Moses, to the Israelites on how to live within the covenant. Of all the instructions and guidelines given, worship is portrayed as the most important. One can see this by noting that these instructions for worship already started in Exodus, chapters 25-27 and 31. Moses is instructed to build a

tabernacle which will be the portable place of worship for this community in the wilderness. Moving to Exodus 28-30, Moses is informed of Yahweh's concerns about the ordination of the Aaronic priests who are supposed to lead the worship at the tabernacle. In Exodus 35-40 the tabernacle is built according to specifications. Yahweh eventually approves of the tabernacle allowing it to be a place of worship as well as fills it with his glory.

The instruction for worship, as seen above, proceeds throughout Leviticus. Bellinger (2012:4) notes that within Leviticus 8-10 the Aaronic priests are finally inaugurated. Leviticus 1-7 are the instructions for sacrifice which need to be followed, and Leviticus 11-27 are the instructions for preparing for worship. The instructions for worship even enter into a small section of the beginning of Numbers. With the connections between Genesis, Exodus and Numbers, Hartley (1992: xxx) notes that it was not a coincidence that Leviticus is placed in the middle of the Pentateuch and one should see the contents of it as a sign of utmost importance for the existence of Israel.

4.4 Author & Dating

Hartley (1992: xxxv) notes that there are two main reasons for differing opinions on the authorship and origin of Leviticus. There is not a lot of material to reconstruct the history of worship and priesthood for the Israelites, and there is an increase in diverse methodologies for interpreting ancient texts.

The consensus about dating and authorship amongst scholars is that there are three primary opinions: the conservative approach, the Kaufmann school approach and the more traditional historical-critical view of Wellhausen.

Hartley (1992: xxxvi) starts by explaining the conservative view of Leviticus' authorship, namely Mosaic authorship. According to Bellinger (2012:5) Leviticus maintains ancient traditions which are connected to the authority of the Mosaic covenant. Scholars of this opinion base this mainly but not solely on the fact that "Yahweh spoke to Moses" which can be seen throughout the book. This is known as a speech formula which is used to give the text authority. However, some conservative scholars would admit that some work which had initially been done by Moses was modified and reshaped. They base this on the fact that most "writings"

we have now were once only orally circulated. Therefore, when such teachings were written down, they may have changed or been adjusted for a specific community in a specific time period.

For centuries scholars have argued that Moses was the author for all the books in the Pentateuch at least by the older generation of Jewish and Christian interpreters (Rooker 2000:23). However, the European Enlightenment brought new perspectives, which were highly sceptical of the Mosaic authorship claims. Scholars argued that there is too much evidence which motivates the understanding that the Torah was composed by different people, sources (Friedman 1992:609).[16]

According to Ska (2006:102-107) there were a number of scholars (Henning Bernhard Witter, Jean Astruc, Karl David Ilgen and Wilhelm de Wette) who realised that there was more than one source for the Pentateuch, usually by identifying the different names for God in Genesis namely Elohim and Yahweh. However, Julius Wellhausen then presented the "documentary hypothesis" with its four sources.

Ska (2006:110), Watts (2013:41) and Bellinger (2012:5) described these four sources which make up the Pentateuch as follows: The Yahwist source (J), The Elohist source (E), The Deuteronomic source (D) and The Priestly source (P). Even though there are distinguished sources used and dated to specific periods as will be discussed below, Ska (2006:112) argues that the final form of the Pentateuch, as one finds it today, was composed in the second temple period. A brief discussion of the sources will be made, but the main focus will be placed on P.

J Source

Rooker (2000:23) explains that the name of the J document is based on the usage of Yahweh in the texts and "Jahwe" in German hence the usage of "J" as the acronym. The J source is assumed to have originated around 850 B.C.E. and is noted to be a depiction of the early stage of Israel's religion, using anthropomorphic language to

---

[16] To name some examples of evidence: 1. Doublets, where one story is narrated twice, with different focal points and slight changes. 2. Terminology, certain names (of places, people or deity), phrases or idioms, which significantly have constant change within given texts or doublets emphasizing unity. 3. Contradictions, one can clearly see between the doublets and with the use of terminology that some texts where written seemingly independent or by a different hand. See Friedman (1992:609-618).

explain Yahweh, worshipped him without a location or specific formation and associated with "substantial primaeval history". Ska (2006:110,112) explains it to have originated from the southern kingdom's monarchical period, 9th Century B.C.E. De Pury (1992:9566) adds that the focus of J is mainly on Judah, leaders, the explicit use of the term "Sinai" and is responsible for most of Genesis.

E Source

Jenks (1992:2446) states that P and E were initially recognised as a source together; however, in the mid-19th century scholars realised P and E have different dating periods and different traits. Rooker (2000:23) claims that the E source was composed around 750 B.C.E. or as Ska (2006:110,112) notes the northern kingdom monarchical period, a century after J (8th Century B.C.E.), which predominantly used the name Elohim. Rooker (2000:23) and Jenks (1992:2446) note that the E source is known for its association with dreams, visions, prophecy and less personal direct encounters (than that of J source), describing the interaction between Elohim and the Israelites.

Jenks (1992:2448) points out that texts ascribed to E are found in Genesis 12-50 which do not fall under the J source, parts of Exodus, Numbers, and a small portion of Deuteronomy. Most scholars agree with J and E's dating and composition; however, Ska (2006:132) notes that E's existence was questioned because it does not seem to have a "complete or independent account of Israel's origins", which led scholars to believe that E was just a subdivision of J or even a Deuteronomistic addition.[17] The existence of the J source was also later questioned and directly rejected by R. Rendtorff and G. von Rad (Ska 2006:133).[18]

D Source

The D document was associated with the book of Deuteronomy; it is also known to have been composed around the time of Josiah's reform dated to about 621/622

---

[17] Ska (2006:132) mentioned P. Vols and W. Ruldolph as the scholars with this opinion.

[18] Ska (2006:133) notes that these scholars had an issue with the different outcomes when form criticism or source criticism is applied to J. Ska (2006:133) also noted that Rendtorff rejected the source theory in general because it destroys the theological intent and structure of the Pentateuch. Ska (2006:142-145) provides a detailed explanation of how the J source theories are unconvincing.

64

B.C.E. (Rooker 2000:23, Ska 2006:110 and Collins 2018:166). Weinfeld (1992:171) and Collins (2018:163) state that the D source is noticeably unique compared with the J and E sources as it does not follow a narrative formula instead shows a sequence of sermons and speeches which deal with the law. These laws are aimed at how one acts towards the community at large, and the focus is placed on moral behaviour. One can also identify the focus on the central shrine, by the clear, strict instructions and specifications for its erection.

However, when it comes to D and P there are two different views: The traditional historical-critical view more inline with Wellhausen, which Nihan, Dozeman, Ska, Meyer, Rendtorff and Kamionkowski seemingly follow and the Kaufmann school, of which scholars such as Milgrom, Weinfeld, Hurvitz and Knohl follow.

<u>P Source</u>

Rooker (2000:23), Meshel (2014:19) and Friedman (1992:611) note that the P source is known as the Priestly material, attributed to the priestly elite in Israel. Most of the content about priesthood and sacrifice within the Pentateuch is attributed to the P source. Thus, the P source is of most relevance for this dissertation as most scholars' attribute Leviticus 1-16 to this source. The P source is interested in genealogies, dates and covenants between God and Abraham, Noah and Moses and has no interest in angels, talking animals or dreams (cf. Collins 2018:143). As Milgrom (1992:454-455) notes, P argues for one supreme God and that there are no contenders to this supreme God, the only evil is that which resides in humans. Milgrom also explains that the P source is very focused on the cult. With Milgrom's opinion in mind, one needs to have an understanding of P, as there are several aspects which influence the way in which Leviticus is interpreted. Namely, the dating of P allows for one to acknowledge the social constructs of such a period, which allows us to make summaries on lifestyles and the treatment of female animals. The dating of P will also help with the understanding that Leviticus was written in a period which was consumed by rebuilding a cult and state that was once destroyed. This has a few implications on how one views social order and who created such social orders within the sacrificial system.

Ska (2006:146) notes that there are at least five major problems with the Priestly source: "the nature of the Priestly narrative, its conclusion, its relationship to the 'Holiness Code' (Lv. 17-26), its theology, and its date" (see Meyer 2010:1-2,5). Primary emphasis will be placed on the dating of P and relevant portions of the Holiness Code.

Watts (2013:41), Meyer (2010:1-2) and Ska (2006:147-151) argue that Leviticus, large sections of Exodus, some parts of Numbers and a small portion of Genesis can be attributed to the Priestly source. Nihan (2007:20) is of the opinion that Genesis and Exodus is coherently P with a few gaps but have reasonably "preserved their own version of several central episodes in Israel's history of origins". The conclusion of P has been under much debate, with both Nihan (2007:31) and Ska (2006:147-148) each offering an outline of scholar's possible conclusions:

1. T. Pola, M. Bauks and R.G. Kratz argued for Exodus 40, where the tent is being built.
2. A.G. Auld argued for the understanding of Exodus 40 as an initial conclusion to P but that Leviticus was then later inserted.
3. E. Zenger suggested Leviticus 9, the inauguration of the cult.
4. L. Perlitt ends in Numbers 27.
5. The traditional position ending in Deuteronomy 34 as per Wellhausen and M. Noth.
6. J. Blenkinsopp and N. Lohfink arguing for a conclusion in Joshua 18-19.
7. E. Aurelius noting P concludes where the Sinai pericope ends.

One needs to know what P's purpose is to find its conclusion, however, to find its conclusion Ska (2006:148) argues that one should start with an analysis of texts which are undeniably attributed to P, in this case, Genesis 17 "priestly program regarding the patriarchs" and Exodus 6:2-8 "summary of Israel's history reaching from Abraham to the entry of promise land" (argued on the basis of their vocabulary and theology). Both texts reference land extensively.

Ska (2006:148-149) notes that there are a few scholars (e.g. F. Kohata 1986) who refer to Exodus 6:8 as being attributed to D. But this approach is weak. As scholars

66

would not be able to remove verse 8 from the section as it would "destroy the structure and meaning of the entire passage". Exodus 6:2-8 starts with God connecting Yahweh to the fulfilment of this promise made to the Patriarchs and the commitment to this promise is made in Exodus basically recalling the covenant made in Genesis 17. The theme of land appears in P texts such as Genesis 17:8; 28:4; 35:2; 48:4 and Exodus 6:4, 8. By referring to these references to land in P, it then seems that P was not only focused on the cult but also land. Ska (2006:149-150) furthermore argues that the cult is significant, but P still needs to provide an explanation on "why Moses, Aaron and the entire generation of the Exodus did not enter into the land", which texts attributed to P like Numbers 13-14; 20:1-13; 20:22-29 and 27, describe.

Nihan (2007:21) states in terms of the new documentary hypothesis, P ends in either Joshua 13-24 (Wellhausen) or Deuteronomy 34 (Noth) in rejection of such a Hexateuch hypothesis. Deuteronomy 34:1, 7-9 vocabulary is not P and verses 7-9 cannot be separated from the context. Ska (2006:150) argues for a late addition and attributes it to a post-D or post-P, making Wellhausen and Noth's conclusion null and void. Neither of these theories seems satisfactory, and Nihan (2007:22-25) elaborates in detail why.

Ska (2006:150) asks if P's focus was on land then why could one not argue for Joshua 18-19 as a conclusion as Blenkinsopp had argued? If one were to view Exodus 6:8, it would seem that it persuades one in this direction for a Joshua ending (both concerned with land). Scholars who use Exodus as a motivating factor for Joshua as conclusion use the parallelism between Genesis 1:28 and Joshua 18:1 as the root of the argument (Genesis 1:28 acts as an inclusio with Joshua 18:1, also concerned with land). But there are other promises of land which fit well with Joshua 18:1 not only Genesis 1:28, which is considered P material. The only characteristic which P and Joshua share is the fact that Joshua 18-19 contains a "tent of meeting". P also alludes to at least two histories; the promise to the patriarchs and the fulfilment of that promise. With that in mind, Moses is seen as a hinge from the first

67

part of history (the promise) with the second (the fulfilment). But Joshua 18-19 does not mention Moses, which breaks its connection with Exodus 6:8. Thus for Ska (2006:150) Joshua can be dated to a post-P, and Numbers 27 is the best fit for a conclusion. Nihan (2007:30) agrees with E. Aurelius, who argues for P's ending in the Sinai pericope. However, Nihan (2007:30-58,66) notes there are discrepancies in the reconstruction of P in Exodus 19-40, which he gives an extensive discussion on, but finally concludes that P ends with the "story of Israel's origins at Mt Sinai" Exodus 40.

Even though there has been much debate as to where P ends, what is important in this section is the fact that Leviticus falls under P, with the exception of Leviticus 17-27 that will be discussed later (Watts 2013:41, Meyer 2010:1-2 and Ska 2006:147-151).

Nihan (2007:20), Ska (2006:146) and Meyer (2010:2) agree with Wellhausen's theory that P was initially an independent set of material, that circulated without the other sources. P was only later added into the larger group of sources and the Pentateuch. However, Nihan (2007:20) continues arguing that there has been some debate about such conclusions by Rendtorff in 1976 and Dozeman in 1989.[19] Nicholson (1998:197), Milgrom (1992:7097) and Ska (2006:146) note that there is much criticism around P's work (as an independent set of material) which they argue seems more of a redactional layer as if an editor had reworked older texts to such an extent that it became additional material. Nihan (2007:20) adds that the Priestly material could be argued to have priestly stratums based on the different language, syntax and theology. Meshel (2014:20) agrees with Nicholson (1998:197), Milgrom (1992:454), Ska (2006:146) and Nihan (2007:20) but adds that this is all relative to the dating of P and that there is no full consensus on either the author(s) or dating.

---

[19] Nihan (2007:20) notes Rendtorff, R., 1976, Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch (BZAW 147), Berlin/New York especially pp.162-163 and Dozeman, T.B., 1989, *God on the Mountain: A Study of Redaction, Theology and Canon in Exodus 19–24*, Atlanta, GA, especially pp.87.

Before discussing the dating of P, the issue of P and H needs to be addressed. Meyer (2010:2) and Ska (2006:151) both note that A. Klostermann (1877/1893) was the first to refer to the "Holiness Code", otherwise known as "H". H became known as a form of later laws that eventually became a part of the P material (cf. Watts 2013:42). Most scholars would agree that Leviticus 1-16 is purely P material. In contrast, Leviticus 17-27 is attributed to H. Meshel (2014:19) states that H shares characteristics with P in terms of sacrificial literature but noticeably different in other P materials in "its symbolic, thematic and legal peculiarities". According to Collins (2018:152) and Ska (2006:151-152) H incorporates concepts of or corrections of P and its vocabulary is very similar to D. Therefore, Meyer (2012:2) notes that most scholars from both the Kaufmann school and the traditional historical critics argue that H and P are basically both written by different generations of priests and P is slightly older than H. The main difference between the two schools is that the Kaufmann school dates both P and H to the pre-exilic period and while the majority of historical-critical scholars still date P to the exilic or post-exilic periods. We will venture into this debate now.

Dating of P

According to Ska (2006:159) there are basically three groups of critical scholars which argue the dating of P. I have just mentioned the first group which is called the Kaufmann School, mostly Jewish exegetes such as Avi Hurvitz, Menahem Haran, Israel Knohl and Jacob Milgrom (cf. Meyer 2010:1). They argue for a pre-exilic date or as Watts (2013:41) notes a monarchic period date, defending this argument based on "the language and the fact that the first temple must have had ritual laws" (cf. Blenkinsopp 1996:497). Milgrom (1991:243) dates P in the period of Hezekiah based on the Hebrew having some terms in P which do not feature in other post-exilic texts or have different meanings in later texts. However, Meyer (2010:2) and Collins (2018:177-178) note that Wellhausen had already accused P of archaising. Collins (2018:178) adds that it is not uncommon for P to keep liturgical language and terms in its continuing ritual context even if such language and terms are no longer used.

The second group, according to Ska (2006:159) argues for an exilic or early post-exilic date, specifically closer to the time of the first returnees. They based this argument on the idea that P is some form of blueprint, which the community in transition needs. This blueprint will be implemented once Israel has made it back to the land, and when they start rebuilding the temple, it should be viewed as a "utopia". Bellinger (2012:6) speculates Leviticus was written in the 6th century nearing the time of the end of the Babylonian exile. This would mean that the Israelites would have the freedom to return home. A group of priests realised they were going to be returning home and would need to rebuild what was lost. Thus, leading the priests to form a foundation for the Israelites to reaffirm their identity, by relooking at earlier traditions and supplementing these traditions to produce Leviticus and other books.

The third group argues that P originated in the post-exilic period, but closer to the reconstruction of the second temple. They based their argument on the fact that P attempts "to justify and legitimise the "hierocracy" of the second temple" (Ska 2006:159). P can then be viewed as written after a new temple had been established so it may provide its "etiology".

Ska (2006:160) argues that if P were written in a pre-exilic period then, why does it have more content reflecting a post-exilic date? And should it not have fewer inserts of more recent texts? Thus, Ska agrees with what Wellhausen had argued, P can be dated to after Josiah's reform and the first Deuteronomy. Collins (2018:178), Blenkinsopp (1996:499-500), Kamionkowski (2018:lii) and Ska (2006:160) list the reasons one would argue for a post-exilic date:

1. P has many similarities with prophets such as Ezekiel and Second Isaiah, sharing theologies and themes. Both materials can be dated to the end of exile or even to the start of the post-exilic period.
2. Centralisation is not seen as a focus for P, as it was reflected in Deuteronomy.
3. In some circumstances, P finds itself in dialogue with Deuteronomistic literature with a specific focus on the covenant.

4. In terms of slaughtering of animals and its connection with sacrifice: P focuses on the slaughtering of animals in sacrificial contexts, but it does not explicitly address profane slaughtering as H (Lv. 17) does in connection with D's slaughtering for food purposes.

5. The Levitical cultic calendar is more detailed than that of D.

Ska (2006:159) acknowledges that the second group is very similar to the third group as they both agree on an exilic or post-exilic dating, but they disagree on the exact purpose of the Leviticus text. For the sake of this dissertation, I acknowledge that Leviticus 1-16 specifically 1-7 forms part of the Priestly material; this is based on the understanding that it compliments the Sinai pericope. As for the dating of P, I will follow Wellhausen's initial exilic/post-exilic dating, which as a broad overview, the second and third group agree with (Watts 2013:41). This dating seems more appropriate for the text, and I follow those scholars who argue that Leviticus, filled with regulations, was created with the rebuilding of the second temple.

4.5 Structure

Nihan (2007:19,108-110) argues for three main sections in Leviticus, Chapters 1-10, 11-16 and 17-26(27), in accordance with Leviticus fitting into the Pentateuchal narrative. However, the more common opinion which Sklar (2013:77), Dozeman (2017:407) and Kamionkowski (2018:l) follow is that Leviticus as a whole is basically split into two sections, based on the potential sources used to create Leviticus. Leviticus chapters 1-16 is attributed to the P source, and Leviticus chapters 17-27 is attributed to the H source.[20] Meyer (2013:2) argues that the most significant difference between these two sections is that chapters 1-16 focus specifically on rituals usually related to the tabernacle, the cult and its maintenance. Chapters 17-27 focus more on social justice and ethical issues. Meyer (2013:2) however, does state that chapter 17 acts more like a hinge to the two sections, as it still treats a cultic

---

[20] Note that Ska (2006:32) argues that the two main sections are Leviticus 1-10 (the organization of the cult and its inauguration) and Leviticus 11-27 (what Yahweh expects from this cultic community).

issue but then transitions to social issues.[21] Sklar (2013:77-78) notes that even though there are distinguishing factors between these two sections, there are also connecting themes present. This makes it hard for scholars to indefinitely separate these two sections. However, one should not focus solely on the division of these two sections but rather on the thematic divisions which one can clearly see.

There is still an extensive debate around the segmentation of Leviticus. Bellinger (2012:2-3), Wenham (1992:3-5) and Milgrom (2000:1267) all agree that it can be split into four parts, Ska (2006:32) agrees with this understanding with an added appendix,[22] whereas Childs (1979:182) notes that it should be divided into five sections.[23] Hartley (1992: xxxiv), Kaiser (1994:1003-1004) and Rooker (2000:45-46) argue that it should be split into six sections,[24] with Harrison (1980:36-37) arguing for seven sections[25] and lastly Sklar (2013:78-84) dividing the book into eight sections.[26]

However one was to divide the book of Leviticus as a whole; this dissertation is more interested in chapters 1-7 since the blood sacrifices are found here. Milgrom (1991:v-vi), Watts (2013: vi-vii) and Rooker (2000:67) provide a detailed outline on Leviticus 1-7 structure, whereas Grabbe (2001:91-92), Hartley (1992:xxxiv), Sklar (2013:78-79), Bellinger (2012:2-3), Wenham (1979:3-5) and Harrison (1980:36-37) present a summarised outline which will be presented below.

Milgrom (1991:v-vi), Rooker (2000:67), Grabbe (2001:91-92), Hartley (1992:xxxiv), Bellinger (2012:4), Wenham (1979:9-10) and Harrison (1980:36) point out that

---

[21] Meyer (2013:2) does mention that H, softly appears towards the end of chapter 16 but is very clear from chapter 17 onwards.

[22] Bellinger (2012: 2-3), Wenham (1992:3-5) and Milgrom (2000:1267) argue that Leviticus segmentation should be Leviticus 1-7, 8-10, 11-16 and 17-27. Ska (2006:32) Leviticus 1-7, 8-10, 11-16, 17-26 and 27 as an appendix of "various offerings in the sanctuary".

[23] Childs (1979:182) notes its segmentation should be Leviticus 1-7, 8-10, 11-16, 17-26 and 27.

[24] Segmentation of Leviticus according to Hartley (1992:xxxiv), Kaiser (1994:1003-1004) and Rooker (2000:45-46) is Leviticus 1-7, 8-10, 11-15, 16, 17-26 and 27.

[25] Harrison (1980:36-37) argues for Leviticus 1-7, 8-10, 11-15, 16, 17-25, 26 and 27.

[26] Sklar (2013:78-84) insists Leviticus 1-7, 8-10, 11-15, 16, 17, 18-20, 21-24 and 25-27.

Leviticus 1-7 is concerned with and can be described as the laws, regulations, manual or system for sacrifice.

4.5.1 Outline of Leviticus 1-7

As noted by Rooker (2000:79) and Milgrom (1991:v-vii):

Laws on Sacrifices and Offerings – Leviticus 1-7

Sacrificial Instructions – Leviticus 1:1-5:26

Introduction – Leviticus 1:1-2

The Burnt Offering – Leviticus 1:3-17

Sacrifice from the Herd – Leviticus 1:3-9

Sacrifice from the Flock – Leviticus 1:10-13

Sacrifice from the Bird – Leviticus 1:14-17

The Grain Offering Leviticus 2:1 - 16

Raw Grain Offerings – Leviticus 2:1-3

Cooked Grain Offering – Leviticus 2:4-10

Injunctions Concerning Grain Offerings – Leviticus 2:11-16

The Fellowship Offering – Leviticus 3:1-17

Sacrifice from the Herd – Leviticus 3:1-5

Sacrifice from the Flock – Leviticus 3:6-11

Sacrifice from the Goats – Leviticus 3:12-17

The Sin Offering – Leviticus 4:1-5:13

Introduction to the Sin Offering – Leviticus 4:1-2

Sacrifice for unintentional Sin of High Priest – Leviticus 4:3-12

Sacrifice for unintentional Sin of Community – Leviticus 4:13-21

Sacrifice for unintentional Sin of Ruler – Leviticus 4:22-26

Sacrifice for unintentional Sin of Commoner – Leviticus 4:27-35

Sacrifice for Specific unintentional Offenses – Leviticus 5:1-13

<u>The Guilt Offering – Leviticus 5:14-5:26</u>

Sacrifice for unintentional Sin – Leviticus 5:14-19

Sacrifice for Deliberate Sin – Leviticus 5:20-26

Administrative Order and Disposal of the Sacrifice – Leviticus 6:1-7:38

Introduction – Leviticus 6:1-2a

The Burnt Offering – Leviticus 6:2b-6

The Grain Offering – Leviticus 6:7-11

The High Priest's Daily Grain Offering – Leviticus 6:12-16

The Sin Offering – Leviticus 6:17-23

The Guilt Offering – Leviticus 7:1-10

The Fellowship Offering – Leviticus 7:11-21

Eating of Suet and Blood – Leviticus 7:22-27

Priests share of the Fellowship Offering – Leviticus 7:28-36

Summary – Leviticus 7:37-38

4.6 Overview of Leviticus 1-7 Blood Sacrifices

We will now be focusing mainly on Leviticus 1-7 for this dissertation, but I leave out Leviticus 2 and 6:7-16 because these texts concern the grain offering. A discussion on the grouping of the offerings along with a brief introduction of each offering presented in Leviticus 1-7 will follow below. However, a further detailed study will be done in chapters to follow. The ordering of offerings is also somewhat complicated as we will see below because Leviticus 1-5 presents us with the initial order of

sacrifices. In contrast, Leviticus 6-7 presents us with a very different ordering of the sacrifices.

According to Gorman (2008:646) and Kiuchi (2003:525) Leviticus 1-5 is considered the first set of instructions given about sacrifice and offering, these sacrificial offerings are the burnt offering (עֹלָה), the grain offering (מִנְחָה), the peace offering (שְׁלָמִים), the purification offering (חַטָּאת) and the reparation offering (אָשָׁם). This is also how Leviticus 1-5 initially orders the offerings. Leviticus 6-7, are considered to be additional instructions regarding the five offerings presented in Leviticus 1-5.

The sacrifices in Leviticus 1-5 are usually divided into two groups: the first three chapters' sacrifices are considered to be grouped together because they are considered a "soothing aroma" for the Lord, meaning these sacrifices are food offerings (Wenham 1979:47; cf. Gorman 2008:646). Dozeman (2017:382) notes that the last two sacrifices (the purification and reparation offering's) are mainly known as atonement offerings, in contrast, the previous three (the burnt, the grain and well-being offerings) are considered to be gift offerings. Wenham (1979:84) acknowledges that the reparation and purification offerings are similar with regards to their structure. The structure of the purification and reparation offerings, emphasises the type of sin one has committed (inadvertent sin or deliberate sin) as well as the rank of worshipper but not necessarily on the arrangement of the value of the victim for sacrifice. Dozeman (2017:382) also notes that these two offerings are categorised together because each have specific times and reasoning for the sacrifice. In comparison, the burnt offering, the grain offering, and the well-being offering are not specific as to why such an offering would be made or when it is appropriate to give such offerings.

Just by attempting to group the offerings presented in Leviticus 1-5; one can note the complexity of Leviticus' sacrificial system. Viewing Leviticus 6-7, one is presented with more complications as Sklar (2013:126) notes that there are at least three main differences between chapters 1-5 and 6-7:

1. Chapters 6-7 focuses on "handling of the various offerings portions", in terms of one's ritual state when "touching or eating the offerings" (Lv. 6:25, 27, 29; 7:6, 19-21), how each section of sacrifice is to be distributed (Lv. 6:16, 18; 7:6-10) and how one is to discard any remaining portions of the offering (Lv. 6:10-11, 22-23). Kamionkowski (2018:48) and Watts (2013:380) understand that these are crucial laws in order to stay pure in Yahweh's holy sanctuary and for the offering to be accepted.

2. Chapters 6-7 introduce new elements. Kamionkowski (2018:48) argues that one of the new elements is "time". The instructions now discuss a continual עֹלָה offering in Leviticus 6:2-6 and a "continual grain offering" in Leviticus 6:12-16. When engaging with Leviticus 7:12-15, one will see that there are three different types of שְׁלָמִים offerings; thanksgiving, free-will and vow fulfilment (Sklar 2013:133, Kamionkowski 2018:53 and Watts 2013:413). Watts (2013:380) simply argues that this section just placed more emphasis on how rituals are to be performed. That the priests needed to maintain the עֹלָה fire and clean the altar as well as avoid consuming their own offering's. Worshippers needed to know which offerings accompanied each other, and all participants needed to stay pure by not polluting the offerings and by consuming them in the correct time frame.

3. The order of the sacrifices are now different. Kamionskowski (2018:48) notes previously the order of sacrifices were as follows: חַטָּאת, שְׁלָמִים, מִנְחָה, עֹלָה and אָשָׁם. Now in Chapters 6-7, they are structured as אָשָׁם, חַטָּאת, מִנְחָה, עֹלָה and שְׁלָמִים. Whereas, Sklar (2013:127) notes that the offering's order should be recognised as Continual Burnt offering, Grain offering, Continual Grain offering, Purification offering, Reparation offering and Well-being offering.

In chapters 1-5, the sacrifices are ordered according to voluntary (Lv. 1-3) and mandatory (Lv. 4-5). However, in chapters 6-7, Sklar (2013:126) states the sacrifices are still divided into two groups; but now according to "most holy" (Lv. 6:1-7:7) and simply "holy" (Lv. 7:11-36). Rainey's (1979:487-488) "administrative order"

understanding goes hand in hand with the change in the order of sacrifices in Leviticus 6-7. Rainey argues that the administrative order can be explained as follows; the burnt offering is wholly burnt for Yahweh, only Yahweh "consumes" this offering, Yahweh is of utmost holiness and cannot be categorised in social status ranking thus making the burnt offering the most important. In comparison, the priests all get a piece or portion of the grain offering, sin offering and guilt offering, along with the burnt portion for Yahweh. These offerings are then considered to have secondary value to that of the burnt offering. After all, a priest who is not as holy as Yahweh is also allowed to participate in the consumption of such offering. Thus, leaving the peace offering at the lowest rank of importance because Yahweh, the priest and the community consume portions of this offering. This is, however, a disputed matter, which no consensus has been reached.

In terms of the structure, Kamionkowski (2018:47) and Milgrom (1991:382-383) argue that there are initially five Torah (law) addresses directed at sacrifice (offerings) and the last five addresses directed to impurity. In comparison, Watts (2013:380) argues that the chapters are united based on the theme of priest prebends which is emphasised throughout, which he also argues could be the reason for the change in the order of the sacrifice (hierarchy of consumption).[27] As a unity, there are eight paragraphs, and six have specific offerings discussed, whereas the last two focus on the "peoples personal responsibility for presenting offerings and preserving their sanctity". Watts continues to explain that the income for the priests ranges from the hide of the עֹלָה, to the right shoulder and brisket of the שְׁלָמִים, a scoop of grain from the grain offerings and basically everything except "the fat, kidneys, liver lobe and blood" of the חַטָּאת and אָשָׁם offerings.

---

[27] Compare Rainey (1979:487- 488) who makes the same argument for the order of the חַטָּאת offering.

4.7 Conclusion

North (1994:34) states that "The Book of Leviticus is above all the book of holiness." The overall purpose of Leviticus is to help the Israelites obtain or remain in a holy state to be connected with Yahweh. Therefore, Leviticus set up several boundaries, as previously mentioned by North (1994:34) probably to maintain this holiness. These boundaries can also be identified in the preceding chapter on culture, society, and agriculture. In terms of the authorship and dating, Leviticus 1-16 is considered priestly material and dated to at earliest the exilic period or latest post-exilic period. Nihan (2007:110) notes, Leviticus is the continuation of the Pentateuchal narrative; it allows for the transition between Exodus (answering the supposed issues) and Numbers (setting the stage, showing the move from Exodus' context to the new context found in Numbers) (cf. Nihan 2007:69-74). The structure of Leviticus can be laid out in two main sections, (chapters 1-16 and chapters 17-27). The focus for this chapter and the following chapter is Leviticus 1-7, which is considered the sacrificial instructions. For the purpose of this dissertation, there is only a focus on the blood sacrifices within Leviticus 1-7. One can note with the overview of Leviticus 1-7 (excluding 2), that all the sacrifices have similarities but also significant differences, which make each sacrifice unique and set apart, allowing scholars to assume its intended purpose. The following chapter will give an extensive discussion on the blood sacrifices in Leviticus 1-7.

Chapter 5

The blood sacrifices of Leviticus 1-7

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will focus on the four blood sacrifices found in Leviticus 1-7, as this dissertation is concerned with the animals used in offerings and what meaning these animals portray. Therefore, I will emphasise the usage of animals; which animal is used in what sacrifice. An analysis of each sacrifices internal structure is necessary, as each offering uses different animals for different reasons. One should note that someone always benefits from the offering; this could affect what animal is chosen for sacrifice as well. Many scholars have disputed the overall ordering of sacrifices, and this ordering of offerings also plays a significant role in portraying animals meaning specifically their value.

The different orders, the individual structures of offerings, the different animals used and whom the offering benefits all portray different animal "hierarchies". It is essential to analyse each of these factors as they will pave the way for the next chapter, which discusses how this impacts the meaning of animals. As noted in chapter 2, the gender/feminist approach accompanies multiple methods to achieve a new interpretation. However, there is definitely a focus on the historical-critic methods, and there are a few scholars which should be highlighted as main contributors to this interpretation. Namely Jacob Milgrom, Baruch Levine, Tamar Kamionkowski, James Watts and Christophe Nihan. Thus, this chapter mainly attempts to use a gender/feminist approach which critically engages with these scholars who employ historical-critical methods.

As mentioned towards the end of the previous chapter scholars such as Levine (1989:3), Milgrom (1991:134,163), Gorman (2008:646), Watts (2013:18-19) and Dozeman (2017:375, 382) divide the blood sacrifices of Leviticus 1-7 into two groups. The first three (following the order in chapters 1-5) are the burnt offering,

grain offering and well-being offering which are considered gift offerings, optional or voluntary sacrifices. The last two sacrifices the purification offering and reparation offerings are considered atonement or compulsory expiation sacrifices.[28]

The difference between these two categories as Gorman (2008:646) and Levine (1989:3) argue is that the optional offerings are "food offerings" presented to Yahweh, in times of thanksgiving. These are also very commonly used offerings in public or private settings, whereas the compulsory offerings needed to be given when an individual or a community had done something wrong and were seeking forgiveness. Kiuchi (2003:525-526) agrees with the understanding that the purification offering and the reparation offering were given in accordance with sin, as it is spelt out within the text. However, Leviticus 1-3 do not spell out why or when one would engage with the burnt offering, grain offering or well-being offering, and scholars are only left to speculate. Watts (2013:157) notes that not limiting these three offerings to a specific time, place or function "gives their instructions a timeless and universal quality."

> In most cases, the sacrifice served to remove the charge against the offenders and to restore them to a proper relationship with God and to fit membership in the religious community (Levine 1989:3).

Milgrom (1991:143) notes that within ancient Mesopotamia, qualified people were set apart to perform rituals but also to be the only ones who would know about and know how to perform such rituals. This is significantly different from Leviticus 1:2, which clearly commands the priests first to learn and then teach all the Israelites about the

---

[28] Milgrom (1991:176) argues that the purification and reparation offering were later additions than the burnt, grain and well-being offerings because the first three do not have detailed explanations as to why such offerings needed to be given. However, the last two give detailed accounts of why one needs to partake in such an offering and its considered compulsory. This shows that they were new to the tradition and needed explanation. Whereas the latter were well-known possibly old and thus obvious, not needing any explanation.

sacrificial system. Thus, when observing the sacrificial process, one can identify all the roles played by priests and commoners alike.

As discussed at the end of the previous chapter, one should note that each offering is discussed at least twice throughout Leviticus 1-7. An initial introduction with instructions to the offering (Lv. 1-5) with slight differences of later additions giving more explanation on the offering found in Leviticus 6-7.

5.2 Burnt Offering (עֹלָה)

Leviticus 1 deals with the burnt offering. The עֹלָה was probably derived from the understanding that the whole sacrifice "ascends" (עלה), this offering was wholly burnt, and neither participants nor priests could eat of it (Levine 1989:3; Milgrom 1991:146). Levine (1989:5) adds that the sacrifice would be wholly consumed on the altar by the fire which symbolically showed that Yahweh would breathe in the smoke and only Yahweh would have been able to consume this offering. Watts (2007:71) states that neither priests nor worshippers will consume or "benefit" from this offering, and this is seen as a selfless act. Rainey (1979:488) and Watts (2007:71) argue that this restriction of consumption for this sacrifice is what validates it as the most important sacrifice.

The עֹלָה was considered an initiating offering, one which would grab the attention of Yahweh in order for his worshippers to get a response from him (Levine 1989:5). This is probably also why the עֹלָה is frequently mentioned first in lists of offerings and worshippers would continue to offer other offerings, the burnt offering thus acted as "bait" to attract the attention of God. Thus Wenham (1979:55-58) argues this offering should be viewed as a "general" offering: to introduce other offerings, for atonement, for thanksgiving or even as an act of obedience; showing that the Lord has fulfilled his faithfulness to the worshiper and now the worshipper is giving back to the Lord in front of witnesses.

Wenham (1979:55-58) states that scholars usually downplay the significant role a burnt offering plays in terms of atonement, this is probably because the purification

and reparation offerings play a more prominent role with regards to atonement.[29] Expiatory, being one of the reasons identified, brings much debate because why are there other sacrifices for expiatory reasons if the burnt offering would suffice? Milgrom (1991:176) argues that when the tabernacle/temple arrived, it was of utmost importance to define specific offerings for cleansing the tabernacle/temple, which either the priest or Israelites could be held responsible for its contamination and desecration. Therefore, purification and reparation offerings were implemented. Once these two sacrifices were added, they became the new expiatory sacrifices and relieved the עֹלָה of such function.

In verse 2, one finds a subordinating conjunction, כִּי usually translated as "if" or "when" (Van der Merwe, Naudé, Kroeze 2017:56, 432). כִּי, according to Van der Merwe *et al.* (2017:432) can also act as a "modal adverb and discourse marker." כִּי, as subordinating conjunction in relation to a main clause, has three distinctive usages as Van der Merwe *et al.* (2017:432-434) has indicated of which the first one is applicable here:

1. כִּי can express a conditional clause; thus, כִּי introduces a dependent clause that expresses a condition usually being translated as "if" or "when". Watts (2013:160) and Van der Merwe *et al.* (2017:432-434) agree that in legal texts כִּי introduces the main or general conditions, whereas אִם focuses on sub-points; more detail about the general conditions (cf. Levine 1989:5).

This grammatical structure is typical of case law as indicated by the scholars above. Thus, in verse 2 one finds a summary of what animals may be accepted within this offering namely; הַבָּקָר "herd animal, cattle or cow" and הַצֹּאן "small cattle, sheep or goats". There is a differentiation between big animals which are cattle and smaller animals which are flocks. Wenham (1979:51-52) and Levine (1989:3) state that the victim must be a domestic animal. There is also a list of suitable animals for private offerings: bulls (Lv. 1:3-9), sheep, goats (Lv. 1:10-13) and even pigeons or

---

[29] Milgrom (1991:176) notes one can find evidence of the burnt offerings atoning abilities in Leviticus 14:20, 16:24 and slightly different in Genesis 8:21.

turtledoves (Lv. 1:14-17) which were permitted. North (1994:51) notes that "God deserves the best we have to offer: a blemish-free male sacrifice". All victims listed in Leviticus 1 needed to be perfect and a male although for the instruction on birds, there was probably an exception to the sex as it was not stipulated.

Verse 3 is introduced with a conditional particle אִם, which as Van der Merwe *et al.* (2017:432-434) indicated above now introduces a "sub-point". Similar "sub-point" are found in verses 10 and 14. Thus as Levine (1989:3) points out the victim is now specified, the accepted victim in this offering is to be a male (נְקֵבָה) from the herd (הַבָּקָר), and needed to be "without blemish". תָּמִים, however, for Milgrom (1991:147) means "to be complete" not necessarily "without blemish." Both translations would, however, refer to the same quality of the animal. For Milgrom, this instruction seems to be a requirement throughout all nations in Mesopotamia who participated in sacrificial rituals. For the Israelites, it was the priest's duty to check that all adhere to such regulations. Within the priestly texts, תָּמִים solely refers to the physical appearance, which must be perfect, of victims (sacrificial animals/object). The conditional particle conveys the idea that the worshiper has an option in choosing what sacrifice to participate in and which animal he would like to bring as a burnt offering (Levine 1989:5).

Verse 3 is very clear on what the worshiper needs to do in order for his offering to be accepted by Yahweh. According to Milgrom (1991:146) and Levine (1989:6) the function of the עֹלָה in this instance is to obtain favour from the deity; therefore whomever the donor or owner of the sacrifice would gain the favour, and the opposite will incur if the sacrifice is not acceptable. רָצָה can be found in the burnt offering, and it is no coincidence, that such a term does not feature in the purification or reparation offering. This is probably because the latter sacrifices are not for the offerer to gain favour but rather to bring about the forgiveness of sin.

Verses 4-9 layout the sacrificial process. Gorman (2008:646), Kiuchi (2003:525-526), Nihan (2007:152), Sklar (2013:88-90), Wenham (1979:49, 53) and Dozeman (2017:380) all agree on the process which boils down to the following:

The participant who starts the ritual, probably a member of the community, would bring the animal (victim) to the sanctuary. Next, the participant would place his hands on the animal, and finally, the participant would need to slaughter, flay and wash the victim. This is where the priest steps in and manipulates the blood, as well as burn the offering. Whatever leftover's of the victim remains, the priest would need to discard. Between the five offerings in Leviticus, the person bringing the offering usually participated in the same way in all sacrificial rituals, however in some offerings their job slightly differs. In contrast, the priestly duties changed continuously according to the different kinds of sacrifice.

As stated above, the offerers' duties are laid out in verses 4-6, of which the act of "leaning his hand" (סָמַךְ יָדוֹ) first needs to be discussed. Sklar (2013:90) notes that the part of the process is commonly used in sacrifices and well known as the "hand leaning rite". סָמַךְ יָדוֹ is very different from the meaning to "place the hand" (שִׂים) (Milgrom 1991:150). To place one's hand is usually used in reference to placing a blessing on something, specifically in conjunction with placing a hand on the head. Milgrom (1991:150) argues that סמך implies pressure by referring to Amos 5:19, Judges 16:29 and 2 Kings 18:21. However, following tradition, specifically, when festivals take place, no work is to be done. If one were to translate סמך in the passage as placing pressure, it would constitute as working on a festival day. In terms of the Amorite sages, סמך was also intended to mean place pressure with "all one's strength" or at least very forcefully. However, in Hittite rituals, laying, placing or leaning of hand physically onto the object was prohibited. Instead, they would "place the hand from a distance" showing their hands would be over the object but never coming in contact with it.

Milgrom (1991:151), Levine (1989:6), Wenham (1979:60-61) and Sklar (2013:90) outline at least four possible functions of סָמַךְ יָדוֹ:

First, transference or transaction: transference implying that the sin from the offerer is placed on the animal or object and transaction, imply ownership changes from

84

human to Yahweh. Levine (1989:6) seems to agree with the transfer function, noting that in Numbers 8:10, 27:18-23 and Deuteronomy 34:9 laying of hands transferred some form of authority from Moses to Joshua, from the Israelites to the Levites. According to Wenham (1979:60-61) transference could be that the worshipper and the victim before being sacrificed, form a close relationship. The relationship probably expresses that the animal will now take the place of the worshipper in terms of being sacrificed, showing that the worshipper is "giving himself" to the Lord through this animal. Wenham (1979:60-61) adds that Numbers 3:40-51 and Leviticus 16:21; 24:14 are also examples of a symbolic transference. As well as in the Hittites ritual of Tunnawi, women would touch "the horn of a fertile cow", then expect to become fertile themselves as the animal would transfer its fertility (Levine 1989:6).

Second, identification: when the animal is burnt, the offerer can approach Yahweh. Becoming one in identity or receiving unique characteristics which enable the offerer to draw nearer to Yahweh. Levine (1989:6) states in Leviticus 24:10-16, one can also recall the identification function as the community place their hands on a convicted person which would identify them as the guilty person. Sklar (2013:90) argues that leaning of the hand will establish some form of relationship between the worshipper and the animal, which would allow the animal to be accepted on behalf of the worshipper. Levine (1989:6) continues to note that this function of the laying of hands was probably initially a legal procedure before being incorporated into the sacrificial process.

Third, declaration: the act of the offerer declaring his purpose of the sacrifice or the proclamation/confession of innocence before the offering is made (Milgrom 1991:151). Wenham (1979:60-61) states it acts as a prayer tradition to use one's hands (see Lv. 16:21 and Dt. 21:6-9), this could mean that placing one's hands on the offering would constitute as the worshipper praying. Sklar (2013:90) states that declaration could be another function other than identification, where the worshiper would supply reasons for the sacrifice before moving to the actual slaughtering of the animal.

Lastly, ownership: which showed the difference between the owner and the offerer of the sacrifice, which seems very much like the identification function (Milgrom 1991:151).[30]

Wenham (1979:60-61) engaged with at least two possible functions for such instruction as seen above; however, he argues that these two reasons need not be separated but instead could work together as one process. Wenham's argument could hold true for all the possible functions, as neither of them explicitly reject each other. However, Milgrom (1991:151) argues that identification and ownership seem like a more fitting function for the עֹלָה offering.

The ending of verse 4, seems to indicate that the acceptance of a victim has now changed from the animal being blemished or without blemished to the fact that the owner must סמך and if not done, Yahweh will not accept the offering, leaving the sacrifice invalid (Milgrom 1991:153). כפר was achieved if the offering was accepted. Scholars such as Sklar (2013:90) and Levine (1989:19) mention that the definition of כפר has been hotly debated. According to Sklar (2013:90) it means "atonement", which has two main functions namely to "ransom" and to "purify".[31] Sklar (2013:90-

---

[30] As Milgrom (1991:51) points out סָמַךְ יָדוֹ does not feature in the reparation offering. This is however, also the offering where one could use money as an offer as well. One should not overlook the idea of סָמַךְ in the reparation offering just because it doesn't specifically state it. The act of סָמַךְ was probably obvious and in terms of money the money would have already been in the hands of the offerer, the same can be said for the grain-offering and the offering's which involve birds.

[31] Sklar (2013:50-52) acknowledges that כפר can be used as "atonement as ransom", "atonement as purification", or "atonement as 'ransom-purification'". Atonement as ransom, one would find a variation of כפר which is the noun (כֹּפֶר). Atonement as ransom can constitute as a legal payment, used to deliver a guilty party but also to repay the offended. Milgrom (1991:1082) and Sklar (2013:50) state there are clear instances where כפר is used in context of ransom for example Exodus 21:30, Exodus 30:12-16 and Numbers 31:50. Atonement as purification, obviously refers to the purification of something, which has been defiled. Milgrom (1991:1079-1080) and Sklar (2013:51) both note that כפר is used alongside terms such as טהר (Pi, to purify) and חטא (Pi, to cleanse) seen in Leviticus 14:48, 52, 58 and Leviticus 16:30. Scholars who choose this rendering of כפר usually translate it as "to purify" for ritual impurity purposes and "to atone" in sin contexts. Atonement as ransom-purification, according to Sklar (2013:51) is most appropriate as "sin and impurity both endanger (requiring

91) and Levine (1989:7) mostly agree on the function, that the burnt offering is not considered an expiatory sacrifice, but acts as protection against Yahweh's wrath and judgment or possibly even the cleansing of sin or impurities in order to become one with Yahweh again. However, Kiuchi (2003:257) argues that כפר is frequently used in expiatory sacrifices, in purification offering referenced nine times, the reparation offering referenced twice. In Leviticus 7:7, the term is used in conjunction with both the reparation and purification offering, but in the burnt offering only mentioned once.

In order for atonement to take place, a victim's life needed to be taken because the symbolism of its blood is needed. Sklar (2013:91) argues that verse 5 starts with the process of slaughtering; however, he notes that no one is specifically named to do such but scholars assume it is the offerer. Watts (2013:167) and Gorman (2008:646) argue it is clear that the worshiper is to slaughter the animal, and only when the priest is mentioned; is his (the priest's) job description set out. The worshiper is to slaughter the animal, after which the priest is to scatter its blood on the altar (Levine 1989:7 and Sklar 2013:91-92). According to Sklar (2013:92) זרק is used in connection with large amounts of liquid, therefore meaning "splashed" on the altar whereas נזה is preferably used for small quantities of liquid meaning to "sprinkle". Verse 6 continues with the worshiper's duties even though Sklar (2013:92) once again comments that no one is specified, its assumed since the priest is not directly mentioned as he is before all his other duties are set out. The worshiper is now to skin and section the animal and Levine (1989:7) notes that the hides of animals were not consumed in the burnt offering, but cut into specific pieces. The only exception to this ritual style is the paschal lamb which was wholly burnt. It would seem that whilst the worshiper was sectioning the meat the priest would prepare the fire in order to lay the offering on it, in verse 7. Verse 8-9 deal with the placing of the offering as well as the cleaning of its torso and legs as its stomach fluids may have contaminated it,

---

ransom) and both pollute (requiring purification)." Sklar's (2013:59) "ransom" argument for כפר in the burnt offering or purification offering is not likely but not totally impossible. As for the reparation offering one is able to bring money to expiate for sins.

being contaminated would render it unfit to be served as an offering (Levine 1989:7, Milgrom 1991:160, Watts 2013:167 and Sklar 2013:92).

Verses 10-13 (introduced by means of another אִם) deal with the exact same process as the herd animal offering above but is shortened, and the herd animal is now replaced with a flock animal (Sklar 2013:92). Milgrom (1991:163) claims that sheep are the most commonly used animal for the עֹלָה. North (1994:51) adds to Milgrom's claim stating specifically a one-year-old male lamb. Milgrom (1991:163) notes they feature in the daily sacrifices, Sabbath and festival sacrifices; in the inauguration ceremony for chieftains and impure persons as well as the "desanctification of the temporary Nazirite."

Verses 14-17 (also introduced by means of אִם) deal with a bird as a victim, either a turtle dove or a young pigeon. The option of birds in the עֹלָה seems strange; however, Milgrom (1991:166-167) provides a reason for the birds' insertion by quoting the Midrash, regarding the King Agrippa's story of a poor man who only had four doves and wished to sacrifice two of them under the instructions to give daily sacrifices. It was then noted that this poor man's sacrifice was more valuable (in terms of what he could give) then of a man who had cattle and flocks which he could offer up and not be jeopardised by such a sacrifice. Levine (1989:9), Sklar (2013:93) and Watts (2013:218) all agree with Milgrom (1991:166-167) that the option of a bird as a burnt offering is solely for the purpose of people who cannot afford to sacrifice cattle or sheep but still want to participate in the ritual.

The specification of male and unblemished is not mentioned in the bird offering. Milgrom (1991:167) argues not because such an instruction should be overlooked but for inclusive purposes, because the reasoning for a bird sacrifice is for those who are poor specifying male and unblemished may hinder one's ability to sacrifice as well, which was the sole reasoning for the allowance of a bird offering. Milgrom also adds that it would be rather challenging to identify the sex of a bird and finding blemishes may be tedious considering the feathers.

Initially, the עֹלָה is presented in Leviticus 1, to the whole community (addressing the laymen but with references to priests alike). It outlines the handling of the offering rites, including the specific instruction to bring a male animal, from the herd or flock including birds. However, there are more details regarding the burnt offering presented in Leviticus 6, as mentioned in chapter 4.

Watts (2013: 390), Sklar (2013:127) and Kamionkowski (2018:48) all agree that Leviticus 6:1-2a is the introduction to the section where Yahweh addresses Moses to address the priests, excluding the general community.

Sklar (2013:127-128) notes that Leviticus 6:2b-6, presents one with a continual burnt offering, which is first described in Exodus 29:38-42, but Kamionkowski (2018:48) states it was first mentioned in Exodus 27:20-21 as אֵשׁ תָּמִיד "perpetual fire". Milgrom (1991:383) and Watts (2013:393) both note that the burnt offering fire must be kept alive; this is then considered the perpetual burnt offering, which is the final offering of the day. Watts (2013:394) explains this as the priest being able to use the same lit coals for the next day's offering.

For Sklar (2013:128) this continual burnt offering poses two practical consequences. Firstly, the priest would need to clean the altar in the morning, obviously being in the sanctuary would need to wear holy clothes, to exit the sanctuary would need to wear regular clothes so that he could remove the ashes outside the camp at a ceremonially pure location. Kamionkowski (2018:48) sees the cleaning of the altar as a form of housekeeping, where the priest is to wear linen clothing, clean off the ash in the morning. He is to place the ash next to the altar, then change from his initial linen clothing into other clothing and remove everything outside the camp. However, Watts (2013:394) views this concept of "housekeeping" in a somewhat negative light, that cleaning ash is usually a servant, child or slave job but he concludes in a positive light that this shows that the priest is a servant of Yahweh. This shows that Watt's negative view of the priestly duties as a housekeeper is based on the social status of the priest.

There is uncertainty regarding the removal of the ash, whether it is considered to be a part of the ritual or the clean-up thereof. Kamionkowski (2018:48) states that רום (hif) is usually translated as "remove" but has more of a meaning to "dedicate" and rabbis referred to this removal as תרומת דשן which can be understood as a ritual the "offering of the ashes". Milgrom (1991:385) acknowledges that there are two stages in the removal of ashes, one within the sanctuary where the priest wears his linen and the other outside the sanctuary in regular clothes. Milgrom argues that it should be viewed as a ritual act based on the priests clothing, however one could argue that priests always needed to wear the sacred garments whilst being in the sanctuary but needed to change them when exiting. If Milgrom's (1991:385) assertion of this cleaning act is correctly considered a ritual, Kamionkowski (2018:48) notes this ritual would then be like the "ritualisation of housekeeping". Kamionkowski also asserts Alice Pecks' and Janet Marder's understandings, the former showing an analysis of how housekeeping can connect spirituality and religion. The latter showing that priests were like housewives to Yahweh; dressed in skirt-like robes, occupation to cook and clean in Yahweh's dwelling.

The second practical consequence which Sklar (2013:128) points out, is that one would also need to keep the fire burning, which would imply the priest stay up and, in the morning, add more wood to lay the burnt offering. Verses 2, 5 and 6 all emphasise the demand for a continual עֹלָה. Watts (2013:395) argues that maintaining a fire throughout the night was a "normal" activity because, in such areas, specifically in winter months, a fire was a heating system. But once again, Watts acknowledges that these are jobs set aside for low-status citizens like children, slaves and servants.

Leviticus 6's contribution to the burnt offering is the details regarding the cleaning of the altar and the priestly roles thereof. Setting aside all the uncertain details, there is significance to a continual עֹלָה, as Sklar (2013:128-129) puts forth that the עֹלָה presented in Leviticus 1's "purpose was to seek the Lord's favour", this law in

Leviticus 6 "taught the priests that they and the Israelites were to have a posture of continual dependence and worship before him."

In terms of the animals required for the burnt offering, Milgrom (1991:146) initially claimed that "cattle" were the most valuable of all animals to be sacrificed. He then justified his argument on the fact that it is mentioned first of all the other animals, just as the burnt offering is mentioned before all the other offerings. But now Milgrom (1991:163) notes that the most used animal is a sheep. So, could one argue that cattle are considered to be more economically valuable as stipulated in Chapter 3, but sheep are more symbolically valuable as they are commonly used as victims? Furthermore, could one connect this concept of economic and symbolic value to female animals being more valuable in terms of secondary produce but the males having symbolic value as they are more commonly used or just because they are males in a patriarchal society? This will be discussed further in Chapter 6. Requirements for the victim in the well-being offering is notably different from the burnt offering as only males are accepted for the burnt offering. The well-being offering seems more accepting of female animals as will be seen below.

5.3 Well-Being Offering (שְׁלָמִים)

The שְׁלָמִים can first be found within Leviticus 3, and is then again mentioned in Leviticus 7. A discussion of the שְׁלָמִים name, its instructions presented in Leviticus 3 and 7 as well as the significance of the animals used, will follow.

Watts (2013:4) argues that there are a number of ritual terms found in Leviticus which present translators and interpreters with "methodological and practical problems." Levine (1989:15) adds that these terms have been problematic since antiquity. Watts (2013:4-5) states that there are at least three methods to which a scholar could translate or interpret complicated ritual terms:

First, to completely ignore any English rendering of such a term and simply transliterate its Hebrew form; שְׁלָמִים which is transliterated as Selamim. Second, would be to translate its verbal root form, which Milgrom (1991:220-221) notes is

etymological guesses to find the best translation for שְׁלָמִים.[32] A third option would be to analyse the offering, as each offering has distinct characteristics and based on what was observed, one could translate the offering according to the function it has.

זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים is then translated by Watts (2013:7) as "amity slaughter offering." Similarly, Levine (1989:15) argues that שְׁלָמִים is better translated as "a sacred gift of greeting" and זֶבַח in its verbal form translates "to slaughter". Gorman (2003:646), Milgrom (1991:203) and Dozeman (2017:377) translate it as "well-being offering", this is probably based on the offerings characteristics. Sklar (2013:101) translates as "fellowship offering" and Kiuchi (2003:526) as "peace offering" which Levine (1989:15) argues that is the LXX rendering θυσία σωτηρίου of שְׁלָמִים, usually relating to peace or harmony in connection with offerer and Yahweh.

Levine (1989:14) and Milgrom (1991:218) argue that because זֶבַח can be found within and outside the Priestly texts, with or without שְׁלָמִים by its side, this supports the idea that שְׁלָמִים is only a variant of זֶבַח along with the "thanksgiving offering" (תּוֹדָה זֶבַח), the "annual offering" (הַיָּמִים זֶבַח), the "clan offering" (מִשְׁפָּחָה זֶבַח) and the "paschal/Passover offering" (זֶבַח־פֶּסַח). What sets the זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים apart from the others is the fact that it can be used as a general term for all the other "variants" because it incorporates all their components into one offering and it can be accompanied by other offerings when Israelites were celebrating something.

---

[32]E.g. Milgrom (1991:220-221) Salom – "peace", because the שְׁלָמִים is an offering which all parties benefit from, it can be said to bring about peace among the priest, the deity and the offerer. Salem – "whole, sound, harmonious", someone who feels these emotions would voluntary bring such an offering. 'Mystic union', because there is a meal which is conveyed as being eaten before the Lord many scholars assume this meal is consumed with the Lord and thus brings about an understanding that there is a connection forming between the participates and the deity. Sillem – "repay", this offering could be considered as a compensation to Yahweh, for what Yahweh has done for the offerer.

זֶבַח, according to Milgrom (1991:204,218) and Levine (1989:14) is a term commonly used for explaining that this specific slain offering's meat may be consumed and שְׁלָמִים, refers to the reason for such an offering.

Levine (1989:14), Watts (2013:269) and Sklar (2013:102) seem to agree that chapter 3 has a very similar structure to that of chapters 1 and 2. This simple structure also leads scholars to assume that these offerings may be grouped together. However, Wenham (1979:72) notes that the שְׁלָמִים has no set time in terms of when it needs to be given, and no specific occasion whereas the burnt offering and grain offering were compulsory for every morning and evening, at the temple. Sklar (2013:102-104) and Bellinger (2012:30) notes that in chapter 3, there are two laws which are mainly discussed: the well-being offering from the herd and the well-being offering from the flock, with a conclusion on what the participants may not consume.

As the majority of the structure is similar to the burnt offering, only the extra or different elements will be discussed in terms of the well-being offering. The *first* noticeable difference shown in verse 1, is the fact that the victim can either *be male or female,* and there is a no allowance for a bird. The text does not state why this variation is acceptable or why it has changed in this offering (Sklar 2013:102). The *second* noticeable difference is the fact that not the whole victim is burnt.

Leviticus 3, allows for a female animal to be brought as an offering. Milgrom (1991:204) argues that as the offering provides meat for the offerer, there should not be any attempt to limit the species or sex of the sacrificial animal. Hartley (1992:39) simply argues that the well-being offering was probably not so strict on regulations in terms of the sex of the victim, which reflects its assumed low status amongst the offerings. Kamionskowski (2018:20) argues that the acceptance of male and female animals as a sacrificial victim for the well-being offering in P (Leviticus 3), contradicts the mentions of sacrificial victims in other well-being offerings in P which explicitly use males. Ruane (2013:45) notes texts such as Exodus 24:5, Leviticus 9:4, 18 and Numbers 6:17; 7:17, 23, 29, 35, 41, 47, 53, 59, 65, 71, 77, 83 and 88 all explicitly

refer to male animals as victims within P. Hartley (1992:39) and Ruane (2013:45) present a similar view to Kamionkowski; however, noting texts outside of P such as Leviticus 22:21-24; 23:18-19; Numbers 15:8 and Malachi 1:14 which all mention the well-being offering but only use males. Ruane (2013:45) argues that the gender of a sacrificial victim possibly mirrors the gender roles found in the sacrificial rituals (cf. Kamionkowski 2018:20). Thus, if a male were to bring an offering, a male animal was necessary and vice versa for females.

With regard to the issue of no birds, Milgrom (1991:222) also notes that there is also no reason stipulated in the text as to why they are absent. This is strange, as the bird is acceptable for all other offerings. One should understand that this offering is a meal offering and that people were going to consume the offering, and that birds were an acceptable source of meat to eat. However, scholars have speculated that a bird may be too small to be given as a communal meal. But Milgrom (1991:222) argues that:

> all birds even domesticated ones, even sacrificial pigeons and turtledoves, were treated as game, provided they were intended for the table. Indeed, the priesthood would have frowned upon such an offering, as the infinitesimal blood and suet would have been an embarrassment for the altar.

Verses 3-4 make it very clear that the whole victim is not burnt, but that it is sectioned into pieces. Sklar (2013:102-103) notes that most of what was burnt was fat. This is an awkward concept for the 21st Century, especially as Western cultures view fat as negative with all the weight loss programmes, miracle diets and pills to burn fat all to avoid to the consumption of fat or lose the fat accumulated. However, for the Israelites the fat was considered the best part, to give Yahweh any other piece of the offering would be considered an insult, leading to the offering being rejected. Levine (1989:16) states that the fat was seen in the same light as the blood of the victim, sacred and not to be consumed.

The request to burn the fat on top of the burnt offering already on the altar in verse 5, alludes to the idea that before participating in a well-being offering the community would first partake in a burnt offering preparing the scene for the well-being offering (Sklar 2013:103 and Levine 1989:16). Bellinger (2012:30) argues that the mention of burnt offering in verse 5 indicates that the offering(s) and the texts had been modified over time.

Verses 6-11 and verses 12-16 (both sections are introduced with אִם presented in vv.6, 7 and 12) are basically a repetition of what verses 1-5 have conveyed, with the exception that in verses 6-11 a sheep is discussed and in verses 12-16 a goat is discussed (Bellinger 2012:32). Verses 6-11, also have a few additional comments in terms of what needs to be given to Yahweh in verses 9-10, "…the fat thereof, *the fat tail entire*, *which he shall take away hard by the rump-bone*; and the fat that covers the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the loins, and the lobe above the liver, which he shall take away by the kidneys." These additional comments of the sheep's tail to be included into Yahweh's portion of the offering are basically referring to the species of sheep which is being sacrificed, namely a broad-tailed sheep. These sheep's tails are different from other types of sheep because their tail area contains more fat than any other (Levine 1989:16 and Sklar 2013:104). Verse 11 makes a striking connection between food and the offering. לֶחֶם is commonly translated as "food, bread or grain"; however, Sklar (2013:104-105) argues this should not be seen as the Israelites feeding Yahweh because he is hungry.

As Levine (1989:17), Milgrom (1991:213) and Bellinger (2012:33) note most ancient societies (e.g. Egyptians and Mesopotamians) believed they needed to feed their gods as humans needed to be fed to survive. Rather the Israelites, as Levine (1989:17), Milgrom (1991:213), Bellinger (2012:33) and Sklar (2013:104-105) state the sharing of meals usually accompanied some form of a covenant. In this regard, it would be a covenant between Yahweh and the community, renewing or reaffirming the relationship between them, concluding with a meal as a celebration of the

95

relationship being confirmed. Thus, Yahweh was presented with לֶחֶם not to feed him, but to honour him, to once again show their devotion to Yahweh.

The concluding verse of chapter 3 is a prohibition against the eating of fat or blood (Bellinger 2012:34, Sklar 2013:105 and Levine 1989:17). Sklar (2013:105-106) argues that this is a very fitting conclusion to such an offering because the people were probably allowed to partake in some of the offerings. Still, emphasis needed to be placed on which sections of the offering was not permitted to be eaten. Gorman (2008:646) argues that the blood was not allowed to be consumed because it acted as the symbol for expiation. Sklar (2013:105-106) contends that the blood could not be consumed because blood was a symbol of life and all life belonged to Yahweh; therefore, all blood spilt rightfully belongs to the "creator of all life." Bellinger (2012:34) agrees with both Gorman's (2008:646) atonement reasoning and Sklar's (2013:106) precious life reasoning and adds that the fat was not to be consumed because only the best was sections of the animal was given to Yahweh. Levine (1989:17), Bellinger (2012:34) and Sklar (2013:106) all note that the verse clearly states there are no exceptions to this prohibition, this law is not bound by time, age, location or circumstances. Whether the offering is made privately or publicly, in the sanctuary or at home, in exile or the homeland, this prohibition is valid and should be followed.

The well-being offering in Leviticus 3 focuses on the instructions of the victim, the handling of the offering and the prohibitions against consuming certain parts of the offering. In terms of animals for this offering, the same animals as the burnt offering were acceptable besides the birds. This is probably because there is not enough meat on a bird to split into three portions of which one portion feeds a community. A significant difference between the שְׁלָמִים and עֹלָה is the fact that the offeror could eat of this sacrifice, the priest and community would eat of it, and there was a portion which would be burnt for Yahweh. In contrast, with the burnt offering, the whole offering needed to be burnt and with the cereal offering only the priest would have a hand full of grain to eat (Watts 2013:412, Kamionkowski 2018:53). Therefore, one

can assume that this offering was considered a festival meal offering. North (1994:50) argues that the sacrifice needed to be and is expected to be unblemished and perfect; it also needed to be "something of obvious value". Both male and female animals were accepted for this offering, which leads Wenham (1979:73) to suggest that this offering is then less important than the burnt offering. It is scholars' such as Wenham and North whose opinions drive my incentive to understand why they explain the שְׁלָמִים as a less valuable sacrifice based on the sex of an animal.

We find the שְׁלָמִים again in Leviticus 7, where it becomes clear that there are three possible subcategories for a שְׁלָמִים offering. As noted by Sklar (2013:133), Kamionkowski (2018:53) and Watts (2013:413) these three categories identified in Leviticus 7 are: the praise or thanksgiving offering (vv.12-15) where Wenham (1979:72) argues for confession offering, the vow or votive offering (vv.16-18) and the freewill offering (vv.16-18). Each can be identified because their ritual procedures differ; each have their own purpose and a specific time requirement for consumption.[33] Sklar (2013:133) also notes that this section focuses on the "proper handling, distribution and disposal" of the different well-being offerings which was otherwise left out in Leviticus 3.

Sklar (2013:133) notes that the extension on the well-being offering is the longest section of all the extended notes on the offerings in Leviticus 6-7. This offering is also only regarded as holy and not "most holy" like the other offerings were regarded. This section also changes from addressing the priests solely to addressing the community members as well, probably because they too were allowed to consume parts of the offering (cf. Watts 2013:412, 413).

---

[33] Even though the votive and freewill offering are described in the same verses and have similar processes, they are directly identified as separate offerings with the usage of "or" which describes each offering in the text like נֶדֶר or נְדָבָה.

5.3.1 Subcategories for the שְׁלָמִים offering

5.3.1.1 Praise or Thanksgiving (Lv. 7:12-15)

Sklar (2013:134) states that this offering, זֶבַח הַתּוֹדָה was brought when someone of the community felt the need to express praise to Yahweh, for either acknowledging his acts in their lives or for admitting that Yahweh had answered his prayers. Kamionkowski (2018:53) and Sklar (2013:134) both note the community is instructed to bring along leavened and unleavened loaves of bread to be consumed as well as a loaf for the priests. Watts (2007:414) acknowledges that the call for leaven and unleavened bread shows that some bread was to be offered on the altar, as only unleavened bread to be offered. Sklar (2013:134) continues to note that the praise offering seems to place more emphasis on the loaves of bread accompanying this offering than the other two well-being offerings do, which leads scholars to believe that this is the most important well-being offering of the three. There is also a need for the meat to be consumed on the day of the offering, whatever could not be consumed needed to be burnt in order to remain a pure offering, the time limit on the consumption of meat here is different from the other two as well (Kamionkowski 2018:53, Watts 2013:415 and Sklar 2013:134-135).

5.3.1.2 Vow (Lv. 7:16-18)

A vow offering (נֶדֶר זֶבַח) was made when an Israelite had promised to do something, the fulfilment of this vow would have initiated the vow offering. The fulfilment of a vow was determined by; if or when the Israelites initial request was answered by the Lord (Watts 2013:416 and Sklar 2013:134). Watts (2013:416) argues that it was not uncommon for Israelites to bring a gift offering to the Lord, outside of the fixed or scheduled offerings. Sklar (2013:134) notes that this type of offering should not be viewed as a means to buy the Lord's favour, but rather as a promise to continue the public offerings in worship to express Yahweh's faithfulness to him.

Sklar (2013:134) and Kamionkowski (2018:53) both state that this offering, in contrast to the praise offering, maybe consumed up until the second day, after that it needs to be discarded as it may contaminate the offering.

5.3.1.3 Free will (Lv. 7:16-18)

זֶבַח נְדָבָה, according to Sklar (2013:135) is considered a "freewill offering". He justifies the description of this offering on the basis that the term נְדָבָה designates "free will". Sklar (2013:135) also notes that such a word is present in texts which describe an offering; either those which are voluntarily given to the sanctuary where the offering is usually materialistic (Ex. 25:2; 35:29), or to differentiate the well-being offerings (Lv. 7:16-18) or describe a burnt offering (Lv. 22:18) where a community member would like to voluntarily express their gratefulness to Yahweh. Kamionkowski (2018:53) and Sklar (2013:135-136) both note just as the vow offering, this offering may be consumed on the second day but whatever was leftover on the third day needed to be burnt.

In summary, Watts (2013:416) notes that these offerings should not be seen as different types of offerings but rather as various reasons for bringing the same kind of offering. To sum up the distinction between the subcategories of a well-being offering, Sklar (2013:135) states that the:

> praise offerings were given for the Lords specific acts on the offerers behalf (although the offeror had not vowed to bring an offering); vow offerings were given for the Lord's specific acts on the offeror's behalf (and the offerer had vowed to bring an offering); and freewill offerings were simply presented voluntarily.

The main variations between the offerings are the different days for consumption the praise offering, needs to be consumed on the day, whereas the other two can be consumed within two days. The praise offering also has the added bread component for the sacrifice, which, Sklar (2013:133) argues, sets it apart as the more important offering compared to the other two variations.

Therefore Leviticus 7:11-18, according to Kamionkowski (2018:53), directly addresses the well-being sacrifices, which discuss the subdivisions of well-being offering and how they are to be consumed (as discussed above).

Sklar (2013:136) notes that the rest of this section (vv. 19-21) is concerned with laws dealing with the handling of the meat. Kamionkowski (2018:53) adds that it gives explanations on the importance of consuming the meat of the well-being offering in a state of ritual purity, as there will be divine punishment if this is not the case (cf. Watts 2013:417-418). There are at least two reasons, according to Sklar (2013:136) where meat should not be eaten. First, if the meat has come into contact with something ritually impure. Second, if the worshipper is impure, they are not to consume any of the meat.

Leviticus 7:22-27, according to Kamionkowski (2018:53), Watts (2013:419) and Sklar (2013:137) deals once again with the additional warning on the consumption of fat portions and blood (as seen in Lv. 3), as it is the most valued and best part of the animal thus devoted to Yahweh. Watts (2013:420-421) adds that this prohibition against blood is emphasised by the double addition of "any" in Leviticus 7:27, the ban on the consumption of blood was not a rare inclusion, it started in Genesis 9:4 in the flood narrative and continued throughout the Pentateuchal laws in Leviticus 3:17; 7:26-27; 17:10-14; 19:26; Deuteronomy 12:16, 23-26; 15:23.

As noted before, the Israelites were able to consume the well-being offering, which is unlike the other offering previously discussed and unlike the offerings which will follow. There then needed to be an explanation on which portions belonged to whom. Thus Watts (2013:421) acknowledges that Leviticus 7:28-34 once again gives such an explanation. Sklar (2013:138-139) however states that verses 35 and 36 are included in this discussion, which provides instructions for the Israelites portions of the offering and the priests prebends, acting as the concluding verses to the discussion on the well-being offering in Leviticus 7.

Watts (2013:425) acknowledges the opinion that verses 35-36 could be interpreted as the concluding verses for the Leviticus 7:11-34 on prebends and consumption regulations. However, he adds that Leviticus 7:37-38 act as a conclusion for this section on additional notes to well-being offering but also extends as a conclusion for the whole sacrificial system. On this understanding, Watts regards verses 35-36 as part of this entire conclusion as the prebends and consumption of offerings was an essential aspect of the whole sacrificial system, not just for the well-being offering. Milgrom (1991:439), Watts (2013:425) and Nihan (2007: 261-264) all understand verses 35-36 as a repetition of verses 37-38, acting as a double conclusion, which can be attributed to the understanding that the H authors had added or edited some these later texts.

Watts (2013:428) states that the last verses of this section emphasise the high authority of the instructions regarding the offerings. Sklar (2013:138) continues on this understanding by stating that these laws were never to be forgotten as it was laws given by Yahweh to Moses and directed to the priests and Israelites. The priests and Israelites alike needed to be cautious of the holiness they were dealing with and recognise the ultimate need to continuously praise or worship Yahweh through these offerings.

In summary, the שְׁלָמִים differs from the other offerings as it includes female animals (expect purification offering which also adds females) in its instructions as a victim; as well as the fact that not all of the victim is burnt. Gorman (2008:646) and Dozeman (2017:378) both agree that this offering has a pooled connection, that all participants are to consume a part of the offering. Yahweh receiving his blood and fat portion through burning it, priests receiving the breasts and a leg, and the rest of the offering given back to the offerer to consume (Gorman 2008:646, Bellinger 2012:31, Sklar 2013:102-103 and Levine 1989:16).

The next two offerings which will be discussed are the mandatory, atonement offerings, whereas the latter three are considered voluntary gift offerings. First

starting with the purification offering, which also uses female animals. However, the purification offering makes use of them substantially different from the well-being offering.

5.4 Purification Offering (חַטָּאת)

One is confronted with an introduction in Leviticus 4:1-2, where Yahweh, once again (since Lv. 1) speaks to Moses, and Moses once again needs to address the Israelites, this introduction indicates that this is now a new section (Milgrom 1991:228 and Bellinger 2012:39).

Scholars have had extensive debates about what this offering's name should be with Levine (1989:18) simply transliterating the Hebrew form, to *hatta't*. Gorman (2008:647) and Watts (2013:7) both argue for "sin offering" as חַטָּאת is a common Hebrew word for "sin". Bellinger (2012:38) and Sklar (2013:107-108) both use "purification offering" but both agree that "sin offering" was traditionally used and either translation is acceptable. They are both following Milgrom (1991:253) who argues that the חַטָּאת offering has been misinterpreted by many scholars and commentators in terms of its context, morphology and etymologic, commonly mistaken as "sin". Milgrom (1991:253) points out that the חַטָּאת offering is performed when a woman is recovering from childbirth (Lv. 12), when the Nazirite completed his vow (Nm. 6), and in Leviticus 8:15 and Exodus 29:36-37, a חַטָּאת offering was performed at the dedication of the altar which was newly built. Just in these three examples, one can identify that neither of these people have sinned; however, they partake in the חַטָּאת. חָטָא, the verbal Qal form is found throughout the purification section.[34] However, in terms of Leviticus 6:19, 8:15, 9:15 and Exodus 29:36, one is confronted with its Piel forms. The Piel form, according to Waltke and O'Connor (1990:354-355) places more emphasis on a specific action than a Qal form would. So, the Qal form can be translated as "sin, offend, to be at fault" which is different from its Piel form's translation "have to compensate, free from sin, make amends

---

[34] Leviticus 4:2, 4:3, 4:14, 4:22, 4:23, 4:27, 4:28, 4:29, 4:35, 5:1, 5:5, 5:6, 5:7, 5:10, 5:11, 5:13.

for". Milgrom (1991:253) argues that the Piel form means "to cleanse or expurgate" (cf. Levine 1989:20). One should note that in chapter 4, חַטָּאת refers to sin, but in general, the verb in the Piel is more closely related to purification. One should also note that sin can be the reason for the need to purify but not in all cases. Some חַטָּאת offerings are performed because of "specific physical impurities".

Milgrom (1991:254) argues that removing the misconstrued theological translation of sin from the term חַטָּאת reveals its purification abilities, which is what the sacrifice possibly portrayed in its Ancient Near Eastern context as purification was needed for people, buildings and most importantly for sanctuaries.

One would now need to ask why purify and who is being purified or what is being purified? Levine (1989:18) argues that the purification offering is considered an expiatory sacrifice which is performed to "secure atonement and forgiveness from God". A חַטָּאת is performed to purify one from inadvertent sin or if one unwittingly sinned (Sklar 2013:108, Levine 1989:18, Milgrom 1991:254 and Bellinger 2012:39). Milgrom (1991:253-256) and Dozeman (2017:383) both agree that just as one would wash themselves to get rid of physical impurities, so must the offerers bring an offering to cleanse the holy temple from its impurities which were incurred due to the consequences of the offerer's actions.

Sklar (2013:108) and Levine (1989:18) argue that the חַטָּאת can be divided into at least two sacrificial rites: first, the sacrifices which acquire a young bull which only apply to the high priest and community or congregation at large. Second, the sacrifice acquires a sheep/goat, which only applies to leaders and citizens or individuals.

Structure of Leviticus 4:1-5:13 (purification offering):

Each paragraph (vv. 4:3, 4:13, 4:27, 4:32, 5:1, 5:7 and 5:11 – excluding 4:22) begins with אִם, and this is similar to Leviticus 1 and 3 which also makes use of specifically אִם as an introduction marker, giving more detail on the כִּי conditional clauses. Rainey (1979:487- 488) makes a compelling argument; urges that the importance of this

offering is based on the consumption, in relation to the holiness of the offeror and possibly their social status. It would seem that the text of the purification offering is structured in such a manner that those who are considered more powerful are listed first, and it continues in this order until one is faced with the lowest-ranked person in society (Bellinger 2012:384 and Sklar 2013:110).

Verses 3-12 deal with the high priest's purification offering, when he has committed an inadvertent sin, the Hebrew term מָשִׁיחַ, translates as "anointed one" which gives the idea that this priest would have been of a higher ranking than other priests (Sklar 2013:110-111, Bellinger 2012:39, Levine 1989:20 and Milgrom 1991:231-232). According to Milgrom (1991:232) and Bellinger (2012:39) the role of the priests were to make atonement for the community members, the priests were probably considered the spokesperson for the community and this is perhaps why the priests are listed first in the instructions for the purification offering. Sklar (2013:110-111), Bellinger (2012:39), Milgrom (1991:232) and Levine (1989:20) all agree that the high priest's mistakes, impurities or sins all directly expose the community to danger. If the priest were to make an error whilst performing a ritual, the whole community would also be affected.

The high priest is to bring a פַּר בֶּן־בָּקָר. Milgrom (1991:232) states this expression is tautological because פַּר means "bull" and בֶּן־בָּקָר meaning "son of the herd" also referred to as a "young bull". Milgrom continues to note that the author may have been implying that the פַּר must come from the בָּקָר, which could imply the victim needs to be domestic cattle. Levine (1989:20) argues that בֶּן indicates the appropriate age which the victim needs to be. The author of the text-only stipulates פַּר בֶּן־בָּקָר in verse 3 which is the introduction verse for the high priest's instructions, which motivates the understanding that the author was attempting to be very specific with the type of victim needed. Therefore, these terms would be translated as "a young bull of the herd" (Milgrom 1991:2320).

Bellinger (2012:40) and Sklar (2013:111-112) both explain the process of the blood ritual in verses 5-7. First, the priest is to take the blood to the tent of meeting. There he is to dip his fingers into the blood and sprinkle (נזה) it seven times before the Lord and in front of the veil of the sanctuary, sprinkling the blood seven times is supposed to represent some form of completeness.[35] Next, the priest is to place some blood on the four horns of the altar, which represents the altar as a whole. Lastly, the priest is to take the remaining blood to the base of the altar so that it may be used with the burnt offering.

Dozeman (2017:384) uses "healthcare" as an analogy to explain that the purification offering; the altars, temples and sanctuaries basically being compared to a "hospital" and if a hospital was infected so too would the staff members be infected. Bellinger (2012:40), Milgrom (1991:254) and Dozeman (2017:384) argue that the blood is considered to be some form of "holy detergent" or "purifying agent".

It should be clear now why purification needs to take place, but who or what needs to be purified? Milgrom (1991:254-256) argues that the physical act of חַטָּאת offering or its sacrifice does not physically purify its offerer. Milgrom explains this understanding with the usage of Leviticus 8:15. The blood of the חַטָּאת is used on the horns around the altar; the altar is then deemed decontaminated. This then motivates the understanding that the "ritual detergent" is the חַטָּאת blood. This ritual detergent (the blood) is also not used on people but instead applied to the sanctuary and the objects therein. With this understanding, that the purgation is for the sanctuary and its sancta, it allows scholars to make a distinction between a חַטָּאת for impurities which supplies cleansing and a חַטָּאת for inadvertent sins which provides forgiveness.

---

[35] Sklar (2013:111-112) and Bellinger (2012:40) explain that in Leviticus the usage of the number seven represents a completeness or thoroughness, specifically in the context of Leviticus. Leviticus 12:2 and 14:8 one is to wait seven days in order to be cleansed from major impurities. Leviticus 26:18, 21 adequate punishment is to repeat itself seven times.

Once the blood ritual has been performed, the purification offering somewhat follows the well-being offering, with regards to burning the fat (Levine 1989:21 and Bellinger 2012:40). However, Levine (1989:21), Sklar (2013:112) and Bellinger (2012:40) note that after the fat portion is burned the purification offering differs, no one is allowed to consume any part of the offering[36] and the whole offering is to be burnt (the hide, its flesh, the legs, the head and all its insides) outside the camp, this is considered an extreme procedure. Levine (1989:21) argues that this specific victim is then viewed as a substitute, that all the sins or impurities are transferred to this victim and once the victim is slaughtered and sacrificed Yahweh's wrath is no longer upon the offenders. Bellinger (2012:40) and Sklar (2013:112) state that in most instances the community members were not allowed to eat of the offering but that priests would be able too, in this case, not even the priest may consume anything from this offering, which makes perfect sense considering it was the priest who made an error and now he would be gaining something for his own impurities or sin. Bellinger (2012:41) also notices that the conclusion of the first purification offering instructions ends differently to the rest. All the other purification instructions end with the priest confirming atonement. In contrast, it is omitted in the instructions for the priest, it does seem inconceivable that the priest plays the role of expiator and one being expiated, but no one else can perform or enter, sacrifices and rituals in the shrine (Milgrom 1991:232). So, because no one else could purge for him, he needs to do it himself, but he probably cannot confirm atonement for himself as this would seem like the priest consuming the meat of his own offering.

Verses 13-21 deal with the community's purification offering instructions. Scholars initially debate the meaning of the term עֲדַת, which is traditionally translated as the "community" (Budd 1996:86 and Levine 1989:22). Levine (1989:22) argues that the term is derived for the Hebrew verb "to meet", which shows that the people the text is referring to are a unified group which possibly share culture, traditions, religion and

---

[36] Sklar (2013:112) notes that if the blood of the offering is brought into the sanctuary specifically the holy of holies than the meat of the offering cannot be consumed.

history. Wenham (1979:98) and Bellinger (2012:41) argue that עֵדַת designates a specific group within a community, not the whole community at large, which probably refers to a congregation. However, Budd (1996:86) and Levine (1989:22) argue that עֵדַת and קהל "assembly" can be used interchangeably.

One finds the clause לֹא־תֵעָשֶׂינָה וְאָשֵׁמוּ at the end of verse 13, which has confused several scholars. Levine (1989:22) argues that these terms mean that the congregation was "unaware of their guilt", while Sklar (2013:113) basically poses the question: how is it possible not to know that you have sinned? This could possibly be some form of hidden material fact which has somehow polluted the sanctuary. But Levine (1989:22) argues that וְנוֹדְעָה shows that the people will eventually become aware of their guilt, and when they do, they are to expiate for their error.

According to Sklar (2013:113), Levine (1989:23) and Bellinger (2012:41) the ritual process for the community's purification offering in verses 14-19 is very similar to that of the ritual process for the high priest with the exception of two differences: first, that the hand-leaning ritual, was performed by the elders of the community, who are seen as the "leaders" in this context and perform the ritual on behalf of the community. Second, in verse 20, atonement or forgiveness is confirmed, the priest needs to partake in the sacrificial blood ritual because purification is only obtained from Yahweh's response to the performance of the offering. Otherwise, as stated above, the community's purification offering mirrored that of the priest's purification offering's requirements:

- The offering is to be brought to the tent of meeting (Lv. 4:4 and Lv. 4:14).
- Must be a male victim, a bull for the sacrificial offering (Lv. 4:3 and Lv. 4:14).
- Sprinkle the blood on the veil, and empty the rest into the base of the altar (Lv. 4:6-7 and Lv. 4:17-18).
- Remove the fat and burn the offering (Lv. 4:8-12 and Lv. 4:19).

The conclusion of the community's purification offering's instructions in Leviticus 4:20-21 explicitly states how the community's purification offering should mirror the priest's purification offering.

The leaders' purification offering instructions are found in verses 22-26. Levine (1989:24), Milgrom (1991:247), Budd (1996:90), Bellinger (2012:42) and Sklar (2013:114) all argue that leaders held some form of high position in the tribe, clan or community, that they had shared responsibilities but not in the sacred office, which is why his sins probably did not have a direct effect on the community. Leaders could refer to a king, but in this context, it is unlikely, but it could be a chieftain or father of a household.

The ritual process for the leader's purification offering is similar to the well-being offering, the high priest's purification offering and community's purification offering with a few exceptions (Levine 1989:24, Sklar 2013:114 and Bellinger 2012:42). In verse 23, one will notice that the victim is to be a male goat unblemished which is the first difference from the two offerings discussed before, which required a bull. Levine (1989:24) notes that the blood ritual also changes, that some of the blood is dabbed on the horns of the burnt offering altar which is situated in the courtyard and not in the inner sanctuary (the holy of holies). Bellinger (2012:42) and Levine (1989:24) indicate that this offering is seen as less severe than the previous two offerings based on the blood ritual. Sklar (2013:114) argues that the animal used in the leader purification offering is a "lesser" valued animal and agrees with Levine (1989:24) and Bellinger (2012:42) in connection with the blood ritual. However, Bellinger (2012:42) argued that one could see this offering as serious because of the animal used but not as serious as a priest or community err because a bull is not offered. Bellinger could be referring to the fact that the instructions call for a male goat instead of a female, showing the importance of the offering. Levine (1989:24) and Sklar (2013:114) also note that the priests were allowed to consume portions of this offering, but that it follows the well-being offering in terms of the burnt portions for Yahweh.

In summary, scholars above have argued that according to the animal used in the offering and the usage of blood, one can identify that this offering has a lower status than the two purification offerings discussed before. This is also the argument which Bellinger (2012:42) uses to recognise that the purification offering for an individual is of a lower status than the three offerings mentioned above.

The purification offering instructions for individuals of the community are found in verses 27-35. Verses 27-28 deal with the member being able to bring a female goat; this is unlike all the purification offerings discussed before. Otherwise, the procedure basically follows that of the leader's offerings instructions, with the addition of verse 31 "aroma pleasing to the Lord", which is only featured in this section of the purification offering (Bellinger 2012:42 and Levine 1989:25). Verses 32-35, offer another option for the individuals to bring a female sheep which is also the first time such inclusion is accepted in the purification offering. Levine (1989:25) cannot justify why females are allowed for such an offering but that "most animal sacrifices consisted of males for the probable reason that fewer males than females were necessary to reproduce the herds and flocks" (cf. Milgrom 1991:252). Milgrom (1991:174) also argues that the instruction for female animals is a later addition which is a more artificial construction, as males are more expendable than females.

According to Bellinger (2012:43) and Sklar (2013:114-115) chapter 5 begins with *four* specific occasions where an individual would need to bring a purification offering namely: Verse 1 *starts* with failing to testify for or against someone and withholding evidence will lead to punishment (cf. Levine 1989:72). One would probably withhold evidence for the sake of a family member or friend, even out of shame or fear of what will happen thereafter (cf. Milgrom 199:294). Therefore, sinners in this regard are to confess as well as bring an offering.

Verses 2-3 deal with failure to deal with impurities correctly, which lists two types of impurities which could occur. *Firstly*, impurity contracted from an impure carcass from an unclean animal, beast or swarming creature (Levine 1989:27).

Secondly, exposure to human impurity, which probably refers to women who have just given birth (Lv. 12:2), bodily discharge (Lv. 15:2, 19), or sexual relations with a menstruating woman (Lv. 18:19) (Levine 1989:27). Sklar (2013:115-116) emphasises the idea that it was not a sin to become ritually impure, however not dealing with one's impurities can lead to sin, as one may forget and participate in rituals which leads to defiling of the tabernacle which is considered a grave sin.

The *last* specified sin is taking an impulsive oath (Lv. 5:20-26). Bellinger (2012:43), Sklar (2013:116) and Levine (1989:27) all agree that when taking an oath that person is using Yahweh's name as a seal, asking for blessing or curses in accordance to following or breaking the oath. When breaking an oath, one is directly profaning the Lord's name, which leads to punishment. Thus, people were more likely to keep an oath even if there was no benefit for them. Levine (1989:27) argues that punishment may be given in terms of oath-taking if one impulsively commits but also if one fails to commit to the act. Either way, the offender is to firstly confess, then to make right as well as bring an offering.

For these four specific acts, there are three possible victims or objects which are acceptable for the offering. According to Bellinger (2012:44), Levine (1989:28-29) and Sklar (2013:116-117) verses 5-6 explain that one must bring a female from the flock. Verses 7-10 allow for two birds to be brought if one cannot afford a female from the flock. Two birds were probably brought because one needed to be wholly burnt, and the other would be sufficient for the sin offering. Verses 11-13 allow for a member to bring grain, as a substitute for birds. This is provision for the poor, as all Israelites would have needed an opportunity to cleanse themselves from ritual impurity. One would probably have been confused between the grain from the purification offering and that of the grain offering, however, the purification offering did not require oils. The priest would take a memorial portion and burn it with another gift offering/ food offering to the Lord, and the rest of the offering would be given to the priest.

One should note that in the instructions for the purification offering in Leviticus 4, all accepted animals and materials are mentioned whether it be the domestic animals appropriate for sacrifice or the grain which is acceptable for the offering. However, the different levels of purification offering's seem to mostly use different types of victims in terms of species and sex (and grain being acceptable). Leviticus 4 gives an extensive explanation on the חַטָּאת but a lack of instructions to remove the offering from the sanctuary, which suggests the priest may consume it. This gap in the text is filled with reading Leviticus 6:24-30.

Leviticus 6:24-30 according to Kamionkowski (2018:50) and Watts (2013:406) discusses the purification offering and is the shortest section compared to the other extended notes on the offerings, only adding a few extra notes onto Leviticus 4. Leviticus 6:24-30 now gives the priests permission to consume the purification offering of the other (prohibiting him from consuming his own purification offering). Once again, this text stipulates that this offering is most holy; it would also seem that this section is very focused on holiness and the active participation to stay holy or keep objects holy.

Verse 26 discusses the fact that priests may consume certain parts of particular purification offerings. Milgrom (1991:402) argues for the translation of יֹאכְלֶנָּה as "shall enjoy it", not "shall eat it" as commonly translated because he claims it implies that the priest is to consume such an offering on the day the offering is given. Milgrom (1991:402) rejects the understanding that this offering must be consumed on the day of its offering as a priest will not be able to eat a whole animal in one sitting. However, Sklar (2013:130-131) states that the purification offering had a "most holy" status and with such a status one had to be extra cautious with how the meat and blood were dealt with. So once again the offering was to be eaten by holy people and in a sacred place. So only the male descendants of Aaron could consume it, and whoever came into contact with it needed to be holy (a priest). This would mean that the priest could share his portions with his male descendants as Leviticus 6:29 states; therefore, Milgrom's argument in rejection to consumption in a day lays bare.

111

Watts (2013:407) however argues that the time of consumption is not the focus of this verse but rather the fact that this text is now permitting the priests to consume the purification offerings meat where it was once left out in Leviticus 4 instructions. Milgrom (1991:407) eventually agrees with this understanding that priests may share their portions as it is stipulated in verse 29.

As this section is focused on holiness, Kamionkowski (2018:51) argues that the concept of holiness contagion is at play here and is linked with Exodus 29:35-37, 30:29 and Ezekiel 44:19; 46:20. Her interpretation of the text is; once the altar has been consecrated anything and everything which comes into contact with it becomes holy; therefore, cannot be used outside of the sanctuary (Lv. 6:27). As an example, with the priest's sacred garments which may not exit the sanctuary. Levine (1989:41) however, argues that this should not be interpreted as holiness contagion, but rather as anyone who comes into contact with the flesh, altar or sanctuary must be holy. Which is connected to the interpretation of impurity, all those who are impure have the ability to defile other objects, therefore should be in a state of holiness before coming in contact with anything which needs to be offered. Watts (2013:399-402) asserts that Exodus 29:37; 30:26-29; Ezekiel 44:19; 46:20 and Haggai 2:11-13 all reflect a debate about holiness contagion which P does not necessarily come to a conclusion on. Some scholars regard it as being holy before coming into contact with the offering or objects; others regard it as becoming holy after being in contact with the offering and sacred objects. However, interpreting it as holiness contagion may explain other instructions or prohibitions in Leviticus which otherwise seem arbitrary such as the exclusion of women from the sanctuary after giving birth.

Kamionkowski (2018:51) and Sklar (2013:131) note that whatever comes into contact with meat becomes holy as stipulated in Leviticus 6:27. Thus, in order to keep to this holiness or avoid contamination, the clothing must be cleaned and stored in a holy place, some utensils used to cook or serve the meat must be broken except for the bronze vessels which needed to be extensively cleaned (Lv. 6:27-28). Watts (2013:407) adds that these pots or utensils used for the offering could possibly

112

not become thoroughly clean as the blood or holy meat would have seeped into the ceramic objects. Sklar (2013:131) suggesting that the breaking of pots would have been a measure put in place to make sure that these pots were never used in an unholy sphere. But Watts (2013:408) makes it very clear that the pots had nothing to do with impurity or holiness but rather the correct manner in which offerings are dealt with either eaten or discarded outside the sanctuary.

In summary, Leviticus 4-5 provides one with the initial instructions regarding the purification offering. The purification offering can be divided into six sections, which deal with the priest's purification offering, community's purification offering, leader's purification offering, ordinary people inadvertent sin purification offering, openly sin purification offering and the inclusion of victims which are acceptable for purification offering's if one were not able to give the more economic straining victims. Leviticus 4-5, explains the handling rites of the offering, whereas Leviticus 6 explains the handling of the offering after it has been sacrificed. The purpose of this offering is for expiation; another expiation offering is the reparation offering. In the purification offering, female animals may only be used when an ordinary individual has committed an error with it be knowingly or unknowingly. However, for leaders, priests and a communal error, only male animals are accepted.

The next and last offering to be discussed is the reparation offering which forms part of the same group as the purification offering but only accepts male animals as sacrificial victims.

5.5 Reparation Offering (אָשָׁם)

As with all the sacrifices, once again, this sacrifice's name comes into question. Bellinger (2012:48) and Watts (2013:7) both firmly agree that אָשָׁם translates to "guilt" offering. Watts (2013:4) further argues that its verb root form translates to "trespass or guilt" offering. Milgrom (1991:319) strictly uses "reparation offering" as the translation for אָשָׁם. Jenson (2004:26), Sklar (2013:118-119) and Dozeman (2017:386) all acknowledge that both translations are sufficed, using guilt and

113

reparation offering interchangeably. Milgrom (1991:326-327), Jenson (2004:30) and Sklar (2013:119-120) argue that reparation offering is more suitable according to the function of the offering, which involves financial compensation for the sin committed (cf. Watts 2013:5).

The reparation offering is also considered an expiatory sacrifice, but this offering focuses on sins which go against the covenant, and holiness of Yahweh. Bellinger (2012:48) divides the pericope on reparation offerings into two sections; Leviticus 5:14-19 profaning holy objects and Leviticus 5:20-26 profaning Yahweh's name. However, Sklar (2013:120), Watts (2013:300) and Milgrom (1991:319) all agree that the reparation offering should be divided into three sections; first Leviticus 5:14-16 which is the inadvertent defiling of a holy place or object. Second Leviticus 5:17-19 which is considered an unknown fault or sin, but having been suspected of committing some form of defilement against a holy place or item, and last Leviticus 5:20-26 which is a false oath, taken in Yahweh's name which defiles his holy name. Watts (2013:366) notes that in this offering there is no exception to the victim which needs to be offered, one's status in society or wealth does not determine what victim one could bring, all were to offer a ram.

The inadvertent defiling of a holy place or object verses Leviticus 5:14-16. Watts (2013:367) and Milgrom (1991:345) argue that this offering has to do with מַעַל which they translate as "sacrilege" and Sklar (2013:119-120) argues this sacrilege goes against specifically Yahweh's קָדְשֵׁי (holy things). Holy things could include the sanctuary, temple, offerings, objects in the sanctuary, Milgrom (1991:346-348) and Watts (2013:367) argue that מַעַל has also been used in connection with worshipping of other gods, the use of illegal altars and profaning of the temple or its objects.

Bellinger (2012:48) and Watts (2013:368) both notice that the animal's worth in terms of its usage in the offering is what distinguishes the reparation offering from the purification offering. The worshiper is to bring a ram, which is a *male sheep* without blemish as an offering, whereas the purification offering female sheep and

114

goat were accepted as well as a male goat. A reparation offering is the first offering where one comes into contact with the idea of being able to substitute one's animal with shekels. According to Watts (2013:369) this is why some scholars (such as Fishbane and Rendtorff) would argue that the reparation offering is a late addition.

Sklar (2013:121-122), Watts (2013:369) and Bellinger (2012:48) all note that for the priest to make atonement on behalf of the worshiper, the offender needs to first שׁלם which is to make right in terms of legal restitution. It would make sense that the priest receives the legal restitution because the holy things which have been defiled were probably in his possession. However, Levine (1989:30) makes it very clear that the goods which were violated are not referring to the priest's possessions but that its plausible that the priest received the restitution on behalf of Yahweh. And finally, an offering could be made, and the priest would be able to confirm forgiveness for the offender.

According to Watts (2013:370) there has been much debate between scholars if verses 17-19 are to be considered one section along with verses 14-16, as discussed above. Here it will be addressed as a separate section, based on the understanding that there is another introductory particle present.

Another debate, which scholars seem to have agreed with is about לֹא־יָדַע. Milgrom (1991:331-335), Levine (1989:32), Sklar (2013:123), Bellinger (2012:48) Wenham (1979:107-108), and Nihan (2007:249-256) all agree that the sinner is unaware if he has or has not committed a sin. This is strange because in the purification offering one initially does not know, but eventually becomes aware, this is not the case for this offering the offender seemingly never knows whether he has or has not committed a sin. Sklar (2013:122) argues with this understanding, as it makes sense why the offender never needed to bring restitution before bringing an offering because this sin was committed unknowingly. Watts (2013:371) and Sklar (2013:122) then both pose the question: Why would someone bring such an offering, why would one suspect themselves of such an offence? Milgrom (1991:361-363),

Sklar (2013:122) and Watts (2013:371) all state that the possible offender must have been suffering from some form of misfortune which they would have thought comes from an offence they must have committed and the divine punishment is now upon them. This concept of misfortune as punishment is not a foreign concept to the societies of Ancient Near East.

Even though the offender is unaware if he had committed an error, Watts (2013:370) and Sklar (2013:123) both argue that the worshiper rather be safe than sorry, and offer up a rather costly sacrifice to atone for their suspected sin, because knowingly or unknowingly the offender is liable for the err.

The conclusion to the suspected offence offering is strange, Watts (2013:371-372) firstly notes that this verse has received very little attention, but that it could resemble the temple liturgy which emphasised that this could be the concluding chapter of the five offerings presented before it. Verse 19 has a repetition of "guilt"; אָשָׁם the noun, אָשֵׁם the verbal infinitive form and אָשָׁם the verbal perfect form. Watts (2013:371) states that the Targums translated "first as a guilt offering, then as a guilt offering which is owed and must be brought, and finally as guilt itself which has been incurred."

In terms of the last instruction for the reparation offering, one should first note that in English and LXX translations this is where a new chapter begins (Chapter 6) because of the new divine speech marker. However, the MT only begins the new chapter at the next divine speech marker. It was possibly showing that all three instructions (Lv. 5:14-16, Lv. 5:17-19 and Lv. 5:20-26) are related to the reparation offering.[37] Sklar (2013:79) notes that the last instructions deal with two specific sins, an unfaithful act against Yahweh and an unfaithful act against other community members.

---

[37] Leviticus 5:14-16 the inadvertent defiling of a holy place or object, Leviticus 5:17-19 an unknown fault or sin, leading to defilement and Leviticus 5:20-26 which involves a false oath.

Leviticus 5:21-22 explain the crimes which need would lead the offender to give such an offering. One should first note that the main error incurred in this section is false oaths being taken. Sklar (2013:123-124) and Watts (2013:373) note for Israelites to prove their innocence (in courts) they would do so by taking an oath (which could lead people to lie about their innocence). Oaths involved using Yahweh's name and to lie about an oath or in an oath would be to defile Yahweh's name. Watts (2013:372) argues that false oaths are what connects crimes against the community with a crime against Yahweh (Lv. 5:22). The other four sinful acts which lead up to the main err, that also need an offering are: taking something which was given to someone to keep but not for personal use and then refusing to reimburse the rightful owner, robbery which is someone forcefully taking something from someone, defrauding, exploiting or withholding something which someone rightfully earned such as wages and lastly taking lost property and denying it, which is basically stealing.

The instructions for repaying the victim are indicated in Leviticus 6:4-5 (5:23-24), Sklar (2013:125) and Watts (2013:373) both note that the offender is to confess the sin or crime committed. However, Sklar (2013:125) poses the question why would one confess to a crime or sin which they have seemingly gotten away with? Well, for the same reason, the offender would have confessed to their err in previous offerings, that they were experiencing some form of consequences for their actions. Watts (2013:373) acknowledges that admitting to the crime is what transforms this err from being on an unforgivable status to a status of being considered for atonement, which also allows the process of restitution to begin.

Leviticus 5-6 explains in terms of the reparation offering what animal is needed for such an offering and why one would need to bring such an offering. However, in Leviticus 7:1-10, one finds more instructions regarding the reparation offering. Kamionkowski (2018:52) notes that Leviticus 7:1-7 should have been added to Leviticus 5-6 because it explains how one is to participate in the reparation offerings ritual process just as the other initial instructions on the offerings had presented.

117

Once again, in this section, readers are reminded that this is a most holy offering. Sklar (2013:132), Kamionkowski (2018:52) and Watts (2013:409) note that in many ways the reparation offering reflects the same actions as that of the purification offering and somewhat the grain offering, all of which are considered most holy. Similar measures between these most holy offerings are that the offering is to be killed in a sacred place, the meat was to be consumed by holy people and in a holy place. Watts (2013:409) and Sklar (2013:132) note that in the instructions for the reparation offering the blood act is different from that of the purification offering. In the purification offering the blood should be sprinkled in front of the veil, some blood placed on the horns of the altar and the rest of the blood placed in the base of the altar; where in terms of the reparation offering the blood was to be splashed around the altar.

There is a small insertion of the instructions of distribution for the priests in Leviticus 7:8-10. Where verse 8 states that the priest gets the hide of the burnt offering, verse 9 includes the grain offering portions fried or baked and verse 10 including the mixture of oils in the grain offering (Watts 2013:411-412, Kamionkowski 2018:52 and Sklar 2013:132).

The reparation offering is essentially the process of repaying. The offender firstly needs to publicly confess to his error, which leads to him having to return or restore that which he had taken and add a further 20 per cent penalty to be given to the community member which was victimised (Watts 2013:373-374 and Sklar 2013:123). After the offender has paid his offence, he is allowed to proceed to give a reparation offering (Lv. 5:25), which requires a ram from the flock, which is unblemished. Leviticus 5:25-26 according to Watts (2013:374-375) is a repeat of what every other offering has concluded with, possibly incorporating a more significant conclusion for all the offerings, that once one has brought an offering to the priest, he will make atonement on one's behalf and thus be forgiven. It should be clear that the אָשָׁם is an all-male offering.

5.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, each offering gives clear instructions on how the ritual is to be performed, what animal is to be used, what is to happen after the sacrifice has taken place and how the portions are to be distributed. As this dissertation focuses on the female animals, their role and their status, one might wonder why I discussed all four blood sacrifices as only two of them make use of female animals. However, by engaging with the other offering's (the burnt offering and the reparation offering) which do not make use of female animals, one is still able to identify the status of female animals, by comparing them to the male animals and their roles and status. Discussing all the blood sacrifices is also of importance as initially in Leviticus 1-5 the structure is based on two types of offering groups; the gift or food offerings and the expiation or atonement offerings. However, when looking at Leviticus 6-7, one notes that there is a change in structure, based on most holy and holy offerings. This structure accentuates the understanding that most holy offerings rarely involve female animals and holy offerings (lesser status) make use of female animals or at least the option to choose between either sex.

So, in short, female animals were accepted as the victims in only two offerings, namely the well-being offering and the purification offering. Taking into consideration the overall structure and in some cases, the internal structure of the sacrificial system, it is clear that female animals were used in lower status offerings. For example, in terms of the administrative order, the well-being offering is ranked the least holy, possibly influencing female animals status. In terms of the internal ranking system within the purification offering, female animals are associated with ordinary people rather than the higher-ranked leaders of society. These associations with female animals are the crux of this dissertation. Thus the following chapter will engage with the sex preferences portrayed in Leviticus 1-7, which inevitably highlights the gender issues within Leviticus and its sacrificial system.

Chapter 6

Gender in Leviticus and sacrifice

6.1 Introduction

Up to this point, I have separately discussed each theme, starting with the gender approach, the culture, society, agriculture of ancient Israel and finally Leviticus specifically its four blood sacrifices. By using the gender and feminist historical-critical approach, the roles of specifically women and female animals, but also men and male animals in the Israelites society were identified and emphasised.

Now I would like to employ a revisionist approach with a milder liberation approach. Both approaches are appropriate because each could highlight that the sacrificial laws were employed to control and regulate offerings which interpreted incorrectly gave power to males. I am using a revisionist approach, as I reject the legitimacy of the social order which was constructed by misinterpreted values of animals in connection with sacrifice. I engage with political, public and private forms of gender inequality which the sacrificial system implements and portrays, which may seem like a radical feminist view. However, a radical feminist view would attempt to destroy the whole system as it is male-dominated and implement a new one, which is not what I intend on doing. This understanding, suggests that I will be utilising a revisionist approach alongside a liberation approach as I argue there is a fault in the current viewing of the social order of sacrificial victims, as they can be viewed as equal, which was ultimately reflected onto the societal norms of ancient Israelites. As Ruane (2013:12-13) notes Leviticus is packed with gender references starting with the "ritual treatment of animals" with regards to their sex, leading to "sacrificial purity laws" which discuss probably the most essential features of either male or female bodies (menstruation and ejaculation) which would call for a gender or feminist approach.

Therefore, with this position between the revisionist approach and liberation approach, I engage with the theories of sacrifice, sacrifice in Leviticus, animals sexes and its correlation with humans, providing a suggested interpretation. By engaging with a feminist historical-critical approach, one may identify the social meaning of

ritual, but more specifically, the meanings of sacrifices and its participants. In this chapter, I will therefore give an analysis of sacrificial and ritual theories (those which seem relevant) and the emphasis of gender presented in sacrifices.

6.2 Ritual and Sacrifice as a Language

Several scholars attempt to provide a theory of ritual and sacrifice. I utilise theories of ritual as some of these theories are relevant for the discussion on sacrifice and sacrifices are usually regarded as a kind of ritual. I will first discuss a few theories of sacrifice as they incorporate the relevance of animals within the sacrifice. Then a discussion on some theories of ritual which tie into the understanding of sacrifice; better yet they seem to give an appropriate explanation on the significance of animals, their order and usage within sacrifices.

Watts (2007:176-177) starts with a discussion on Henri Hubert and Marcel Mauss theory of sacrifice. They presented a theory of sacrifice based on the sacrificial rituals of the Vedic and Biblical traditions, which led to the understanding that animals were just the materials used to provide expiation. Walter Burkert presented a theory based on the gathering and hunting strategies of communities in which sacrifice acted as a survival tool. The hunt was then viewed as a ritualised act, which communities would perform (cf. Mack 1999:22, 29). James G. Frazer argued for a sacrificial kinship theory, where the ritual sacrifices of kings are considered the base form of all ritual expression in those traditions and that human sacrifice is the reason for all sacrifice.

According to Mack (1999:32, 39), Watts (2007:176) and Janzen (2004:20) Jonathan Z. Smith has a very rational explanation for the concept of sacrifice as a response to the domestication of animals. He argues that the domestication of animals took place in order for the community to provide food for themselves and that humanity had and still has a need for symbolism and order. These they could find in the ritualisation of domestic animal slaughter. This theory of sacrifice can then be explained as people taking the most mundane things in life, which they partake in every day and giving is an elevated status by attaching a ritual model to it.

Watts (2007:177) acknowledges that Sigmund Freud followed similar lines of argument as Frazer, explaining a story of sons killing a father who eventually

becomes traumatised by their actions. This led them to create coping mechanisms to repress the trauma, by indulging in taboos and a ritual enactment of the killing but substituting an animal in their father's place.

Rene Girard utilised Freud's theory, to emphasise his theory of violence (Watts 2007:177 and Mack 1999:14). Girard (1989:14, 16, 18-19) argues that all sacrifice is a form of controlling violence, that attempts to prevent a cycle of vengeance acting as a judicial system for the society. The theory of violence, according to Watts (2007:177-178) is based on the idea that when a rival wished to destroy a community, the community would offer a sacrifice. This would be a sacrificial victim who could not retaliate so that the rival can extinguish their aggression. The most obvious victim would be considered an animal as a substitute, but humans were not exempt from being a victim in such a situation (cf. Mack 1999:18-19). Watts (2007:178) notes that Bruce Lincoln continued with Girard's theory of sacrifice as violence, stating that animal and human sacrifice were considered a symbol to justify the violence within a community to maintain specific aspects of that society.

Watts (2007:178) notes that sacrifice initially as a theory of violence was a viable theory. However, in his later works, Watts (2013:57) acknowledges that ritual instructions for animal sacrifice presented in Leviticus 1-7 are not analogies for human killings. Janzen (2004:3-4) also disagrees with Girard's theory stating that some anthropologists rejected Girard's theory on the premise that he attempted to create a universal theory, which was supposed to explain all societies and cultures meaning of ritual and sacrifice. Bell (1992:174-175) also rejects the understanding of Girard's violence theory, puts forth that ritual (and thus sacrifice) rather gives authority to particular societal views. Bataille (1989:43-44) argues that sacrifice is a way to reconnect humans with nature. McClymond (2008:13-17) discusses Hubert, Mauss, Girard and Burkert's violence theories, highlighting that they each have different approaches but that they all place too much emphasis on violence and killing. McClymond (2008:113) thinks that killing and possibly violence is only a small part of sacrifice and ritual, arguing that sacrificial rituals focus more on creating sacred space, moments and time.

Sacrifice as noted above is therefore seen as a tool for expressing life, a way to give food a symbolic meaning, used as a coping mechanism for activities not necessarily

122

accepted, expression of violence in a controlled environment or a way to connect with nature. The connection between sacrifice and that which it expresses can be explained through the understanding of ritual.

Geertz (1973:143, 164-167, 169) argues that rituals act to preserve a set of beliefs. However, rituals do not work or continue to exist if they do not align themselves with the political, cultural, and social beliefs; this holds true for sacrifice as well. Thus, whatever sacrifice was attempting to convey, it needed to be in alignment with the political, cultural, and social beliefs.

Lincoln (1989:53) states that ritual is needed to build a society on the basis that a ritual is a symbolic form of communication which holds authority and is a powerful tool to separate and unite, which society uses in its construction. To summarise Janzen (2004:21-22) states that most of the social messages that ritual portrays has to do with order. One aspect of all these theories is that ritual is a form of communication which elucidates the social reality but also constructs them. Nevertheless, attempting to define ritual as a communication, renders a few issues, such as how does one tell the difference between ritual communication and other social communication. Bell (1992:70) notes that if one cannot define ritual as a different from other forms of communication or acts, then it cannot truly be "distinguished" as something unique, sacred or even different.

Janzen (2004:22-24, 27) argues that rituals have specific characteristics which allows one to tell the difference between a regular act and a ritual act. The two most common characteristics are formality and repetition; these are concepts which are commonly associated with sacrifice. Formality is focused on the structure of how one is to participate in this ritual, which once again correlates with the social order. In Leviticus, the first seven chapters are dedicated to the structuring on the sacrifices. Rituals having strict formal structure allows for domination to occur specifically in terms of the social order and also leaves no room for debate. Watts (2007:12) notes that Leviticus 1-7 is full of similar formation's with slight differentiation due to circumstances. As Wuthnow (1987:138-139) argues, ritual dramatises the social order, showing people the way society should be as a collective force. Therefore, they should accept their social responsibility and fall in line with its structure, leaving them vulnerable to resist. Repetition is obviously focused on doing the same activity

123

over and over in the same manner where people are required to participate every time. Within Leviticus 1-7, one can clearly see the repetition between sacrifices as well as within the same type of sacrifice. Watts (2007:12) however, does acknowledge that Leviticus 1-7 attempts to avoid verbatim repetition by using different words or exchanging terms which imply or mean the same thing. Janzen (2004:24) also acknowledges that formality and repetition create a pattern in themselves; an "undying and unchanging nature of the society's structure, order, rules and morality. The things that it communicates thus appear to be normal and natural, simply because everyone has been saying and doing these ritual activities over and over."

Sacrifice, like other rituals, also communicates some sort of social meaning to the people who participate in the ritual (Janzen 2004:4). Once again showing that a universal theory of ritual or sacrifice will not work as each ritual or sacrifice's meaning will be different according to the social context, the worldview and the moral structure which they are used in or come from. Applying this understanding to the Hebrew Bible, one can note that there are discrepancies in the way some offerings are done which emphasises that these offerings were done in different contexts and attempting to express a different meaning.

Even though social contexts can change the meaning of sacrifice, Janzen (2004:8) argues that there does seem to be a general understanding that sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible communicates firstly a type of relationship which needs to be sustained and an ultimate authority of Yahweh. The Israelites need to follow the moral code, given in the ritual and more specifically sacrificial instructions as it was given by Yahweh.

Ritual and sacrifice at its basis is a form of language, in such one needs to understand the grammar and its vocabulary, so too one would need to unpack rituals and specifically sacrifice as to what it is communicating (Janzen 2004:4). When analysing ritual as a communicative tool, one will need to note each ritual expresses a different message. Ruane (2013:2) notes that as sacrifices have the ability to express life, symbols, influence the social order, create connections and induce or dissuade violence, its primary form of communication is power. Ruane's understanding of sacrifice as power will be unpacked with the discussion on gender

in sacrifice. The purpose of this dissertation is to understand the role of animals in the sacrificial system. Can one assume that the language employed in the sacrificial instructions incorporated animals, to motivate the natural and normal appearance of sacrifice so that the Israelites would accept this ritual / social order?

6.3 Relationship between Animals and Israelites

Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:2-3) notes that the Israelites' religious activities were filled with and surrounded by animal husbandry and agriculture which also acts as a rich vocabulary for the Israelites to think about several social and religious aspects of life. What often gives a certain practice a form of power, is the connection with other systems such as the religious, social, ecological and cultural systems (See discussion on how these concepts are intertwined domains in Chapter 3). Bell (1997:34, 64) similarly asserts that ritual activities are given meaning through the cultural ideas and values which are conveyed in the symbols and actions of the rituals practised, in this case, sacrifice is this practised ritual. Morgan (2010:32) states that more often than not life and death is one of the biggest motivating factors for rituals, beliefs and practices in cultures and societies (life and death of humans and animals). Thus, people will only follow and find religious rituals to be acceptable when they supposedly intertwine with other aspects of their religion, culture and social structure.

Thus, metaphors concerning animals affect the relationship between animals and Israelites. A few examples of essential metaphors will be discussed; however, these metaphors will not be the focus of this section; rather, the focus is on the social meaning these metaphors imply. Firstly as Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:3) notes there are metaphors that compare Israelites to animals like the He-goat (Jr. 50:8) and a Flock (Ezr. 24:3). Yahweh is also used in such metaphors, associated with being the shepherd over the Israelites for protection but also associated with being a shepherd who slaughters his flock as well (Jr. 12:3, Ps. 44:12, 23; 74:1).

Second, not only animals but crops also supplies its fair share of images attempting to show as Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:4) notes the relation between Israel and Yahweh. Seen in texts such as Jeremiah 11:16; 24:3-5; 2:3; Psalm 1:3; 42:2; 80:9; Ezekiel

125

19:10; 16:7 in which Israelites are compared to olive trees, vines, fields, ripe figs and first fruits of Yahweh.

Third, Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:4) notes another set of metaphors which show the relations between Israelites and Israelites, "kinship and social relations" that are also filled with "animal husbandry and agricultural terminology". These can be found in Genesis 49:3 and Deuteronomy 21:17 where the children are compared to the first fruits of their parents, just as Yahweh's first fruits are the Israelites and in Psalms 128:3 women are described as their husbands' fruitful vines.

According to Ruane (2013:1-2) the Levitical laws are mainly concerned with the sacrifice and its specific procedures. Sacrificial laws then inevitably affect many aspects of Israelites life, such as when and how they are to consume meat, how to maintain their ritual purity, the selection process in terms of animal husbandry "and the establishment of a heir."

Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:4) argues that the Israelites must have analysed the characters and habits of animals and nature. They must have recognised distinctive eating, mating, reproducing, growing and fighting characteristics and saw a bond between such and their own societies structure; their relations to other nations, connection or formation of relationships with a divine and between themselves. This obviously led them to believe there is some form of parallel world between the animals/nature and the Israelite society. Ruane (2013:12) notes that the biblical laws on sacrifice can be viewed as a mediator, which helps maintain the relationships between: "priests and laity," "high priests and other priests," father of the house and his descendants, men and women, people and society, and humans and animals.

Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:5) then states that if metaphors described human experiences, it is definitely possible to claim it shaped their societal practices, which then means metaphors are at the foundation for some parts of the ancient Israelites religious rituals. This would mean that one should be able to find similarities between the treatment of animals and fields in relation to humans. Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:5-6) lists the similarities of Israelites to animals in terms of ritual laws:

1. To rest on the seventh day is for animals and humans alike (Ex. 20:9; 23:12 and Dt. 5:12-14).

2. Slaves are meant to work for only six years and then be set free in their seventh year (Ex. 21:2) similarly one's fields may be worked for six years, and in the seventh year it must be uncultivated (Ex. 23:10-11; Dt. 15:1-3; Lv. 25:1-7).

3. The firstborn male is to be given to Yahweh and presented to him at the temple just as the firstborn animals of the flocks or herds and even first fruits are Yahweh's possessions and must be brought to the temple as an offering (Ex. 13:1-2; 22:27; 23:17; 34:19, 20, 26; Nm. 8:6,16; Dt. 15:19 and Ex. 23:6, 9; Dt. 26:10; 23:19). Also, another important feature here would be the fact that human descendants, the firstborn, is considered first fruits in Genesis 49:3; Deuteronomy 21:17 and Micah 6:7.

4. Blemishes which bar the priests from serving in the temple also act as the excluding factors for the animals with blemishes not being able to be used as an offering (Lv. 21:17; 22:19; Dt. 17:1; 23:2).

5. On the eighth day of life, a male Israelite must be circumcised just as a newborn animal must be at least eight days old before being used as a sacrifice (Ex. 22:27; Lv. 12:3; 22:27).

6. Just as murderers would receive the death penalty (Ex. 21:12; Nm. 35:16-20; Lv. 24:17) so too do the animals which kill humans (Ex. 21:28).

7. Israelites are not allowed to mix their seed, probably meaning no mixing between nations in terms of marriage (Dt. 7:3). One is not allowed to plants two sets of different crops (species) in the same field, garments must be pure of one type of weaving material, one cannot yoke an ox and ass on the same cart to plough at the same time, and no interbreeding is allowed between species of animals (Dt. 22:9; Lv. 19:19).

8. Leaven is not to be used in grain or certain animal offerings (Ex. 23:18; 34:25; Lv. 2:11) just as Israelites were not allowed to consume leaven in the Passover season (Ex. 12:15, 18-19).

9. Human corpses and animal carcasses both have the ability to give off impurities (Nm. 9:7 and Lv. 11:24).

10. When a person has been "impaled for a capital offence", the corpse must be burned before morning (Dt. 21:22) parallels the concept that a thanksgiving offering must be consumed on the day of sacrifice (Lv. 7:17; 22:29-30).

11. Israelites are commanded to leave the corner of their fields unharvested (Lv. 19:9; 23:22; Dt. 24:19) Israelites are also to leave the corners of their faces unshaven (Lv. 19:27; 21:5).

This list of laws which govern the Israelites seems to find equivalent parallels in the laws governing agriculture or animal husbandry. Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:6) considers this to be some form of strategy to legitimise social rules, incorporating animals and crops into the equation gives these laws a sense of natural order as if to say "this is the way things are supposed to be".

Eilberg-Schwartz's (1988:6) list of metaphors which link animals and humans above is based on a synchronic reading of the text. However, when looking at it from a diachronic perspective, one would need to separate the list according to the sources (P and non-P). Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:7) strikingly discovered when analysing the metaphors with a diachronic approach, the metaphors which emphasised the rules governing nature where mostly from non-P (J and E) whereas the rules governing the humans were sourced from mostly P, but also some non-P sources (D and H). Which ultimately emphasises the idea that the Israelites had drawn their rules and laws from the already existing laws which governed nature and possibly vice versa.

Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:8, 12) argues that some metaphors have been dramatised, such as the laws governing the diet of Israelites. One can also see the Israelites associate themselves with flocks and herds in terms of treatment and consumption, but distance themselves from other animals (not acceptable for consumption) as they do from other nations (not acceptable to be associated with). They also have laws on incest which correspond with animal husbandry,[38] intermarrying laws that correspond with interbreeding species of animals.

In terms of interbreeding animals, it would seem that laws governing the Israelites in the same sense would not always apply here as one would need to multiply one's herds and flocks (see chapter 3 for instructions on swapping out males for interbreeding purposes). Thus, it would seem the Israelites used the laws governing consumption, cooking and slaughtering of animals to parallel the cultic activity of the

---

[38] Animals laws seen in Deuteronomy 27:20 and Leviticus 18:6, human laws regarding incest seen in Deuteronomy 27:33; Leviticus 18:12 and 20:14.

Israelites in terms of incest.[39] Bell (1997:62) also notes Levi-Strauss' understanding of ritual as language, noting "if we want to understand art, religion or law, and perhaps even cooking or the rules of politeness"; then one should understand them as signs and as a part of a collective pattern which expresses some form of communication.

All in all, with the understanding that animals and humans are treated alike, Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:16) notes that this creates an expectation that so too Israelites would treat one another in the same light. However, these laws, rules and ways of treating someone, seem to be exploited for someone else's gain specifically when viewing the sacrificial system with an emphasis on gender roles and sex selection.

6.4 Gender in Sacrifice

Ruane (2013:2) argues that the sacrificial laws place much emphasis on gender (cf. Table 2.), in terms of the priests, offerers and those who can consume the offering but also extends to specifically the sex of the animal which could be offered. This then shows that the sacrificial laws are concerned with gender roles, and this affects both the people who participate in the sacrifice as well as the animal involved.

Table 2:		
Burnt Offering (1:1-17) Whole offering Burnt.	**Grain offering (2:1-16)**	**Peace Offering (3:1-17)** Portions split between Yahweh, Priest and Community members.
vv. 3-9 – Cattle Male & Perfect	vv. 1-3 – Uncooked Memorial portion burnt for Yahweh	vv. 1-5 – Cattle Male or Female & Perfect
vv. 10-13 – Sheep or Goats Male & Perfect	vv. 4-10 – Cooked Rest of the offering divided among Aaron and sons	vv. 6-11 – Sheep Male or Female & Perfect
vv. 14-17 – Birds Doves or Pigeons	vv. 11-16 – Miscellaneous	vv. 12-17 – Goats No description
Purification Offering (4:1-5:13)		**Reparation Offering (5:14-26)**

---

[39] See Eilberg-Schwartz's (1988:13-16) discussion on these laws.

4:3-12 – Priest Sin Bull (Male) & Perfect Portions offered to Yahweh, the rest burnt outside the camp.		5:15-16 – Sin against Lords Property Perfect ram (worth silver shekels) and add fifth extra to pay the priest.
4:13-21 – Congregation Sin Bull (Male) Portions offered to Yahweh, the rest burnt outside the camp.		5:17-19 – Sin, by breaking commandment Perfect ram (worth in silver shekels).
4:22- 26 – Leader Sins Goat, Male & Perfect Fat portions offered to Yahweh.		5:21-26 – Sin by cheating Must repay person and perfect ram (worth in silver shekels).
4:27-35 – ordinary people sin (Unknowingly) Goat, Female & Perfect v. 28 & Lamb, Perfect & Female v. 32 The fat portion offered to Yahweh.		
5:1-6 – Openly sin Female sheep or goat Portions offered to Yahweh, the rest burnt outside the camp.		
5:7-13 – What those who cannot afford the standard offering can bring. Two doves or pigeons or flour Portions offered to Yahweh, the rest burnt outside the camp.		

So why would gender be important for sacrifice? Ruane (2013:2) argues that sacrifice is overall understood as one having power. Ruane first acknowledges the apparent power of life and death but also emphasises the material power one has in order to sacrifice. To sacrifice means one has some form of ownership over something, whether it be grown, bred or bought but also has the ability to decide to offer up such an item. That leads Ruane (2013:2) to argue that sacrifice has the ability to display the social status and material status of both men and women. Ruane seems to understand sacrifice as a reflection of society, and a placement tool, as Janzen (2004:43-51) also argues. Another critical power role sacrifice plays,

130

which is somewhat overlooked, pointed out by Ruane (2013:3), is the fact that "sacrificial systems are corollaries of reproductive power."

Ruane (2013:3) uses Nancy Jay's juxtaposition of childbirth with sacrifice as an explanation. Ruane illustrates that sacrifice uses social and patrilineal constructs to reorganise human and animal biological reproduction by excluding women from the lineage and domesticating animals. This is then a clear example of how the system likely treats humans as they do animals, specifically how women are treated as an owned animal is treated. Firstly, the control of reproduction, women have no lineage as control is placed on their reproductive abilities, and animals are domesticated, which also controls their reproductive abilities and lineage. Secondly, maintained lifestyle, animals need to be looked after as they cannot fend for themselves just as women have no or low social status to live on their own and need to be looked after. Thirdly, animals and women alike are useful in certain aspects, but their use needs to be spelt out in the text specifically for when they should be involved. Lastly, the treatment of animals according to sex corresponds with the treatment of humans according to sex, specifically with regards to sacrifice.

Concerning the statements above, Ruane (2013:4) notes that males are mostly involved with sacrifices (animals and human alike) when a female is included, it is spelt out and portrayed as inferior. It seems that the sacrificial system also expressly excludes active reproduction, by excluding new mothers (animal and human alike) and by always using young animals which have not yet become sexually active.

Ruane (2013:4) states that the nature and function of each sacrificial ritual usually change depending on the sex of both its victims and its offerers. However, Janzen (2004:14) adds that the same rituals will have different meanings according to their social and historical context.

Shectman (2019:428) argues that texts which emphasise "bodies and bodily anomalies and differences" (as we find with P specifically in Leviticus) are the roots to the construction of gender in society. Gender is then portrayed as a placement tool in the social order; thus, Leviticus is a good subject to analysis regarding gender construction. Because cultural "root metaphors" have an effect on the ritual treatment of animals and humans, as Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:1) expresses, animals are too a good subject for analysis of societal concepts of gender. Ruane (2013:41) notes that

131

animals and humans alike consist of two sexes, the reproduction of animals and humans roughly similar and domesticated animals need to be maintained (see Chapter 3 above). These concepts closely reflect the concepts of human reproduction and lineage. Considering the treatment of animals reflected in ritual laws not only highlights the way animals are controlled but also how the relationship between humans and animals work.

The very fact that the text spells out specific sexes for certain sacrifices clearly gives an indication of what society thought about gender. Ruane (2013:41) argues that in the Old Testament legal texts, one can almost guarantee a sacrificial victim will be accompanied by its specific sex. In the priestly texts, it is usually spelt out an "unblemished male" (Ex. 12:5; Lv. 1:3,10; 4:23; 22:19[40]), an "unblemished female" (Lv. 4:28, 32) or the victim can be either sex (Lv. 3:1, 6). In other Old Testament texts, the sex is slightly less emphasised but inherent in the name chosen to describe the animal, for example, a ewe (כִּשְׂבָּה), a she-goat (שְׂעִירַת), a bull (פַּר) and a ram (אַיִל). Thus, the type of animal, its sex, its blemish status along with its age at times has a significant purpose for understanding the sacrifice and the larger societal order which justifies it.

Ruane (2013:42) notes that the idea of a gender ideology controlling the societal norm is not a recent debate, but rather one which stems from the time of Philo. Ruane and Milgrom (1991:147) quote a statement of Philo's with regards to the עֹלָה sacrificial victim which

> is a male because the male is more complete, more dominant than the female, closer akin to causal activity, for the female is incomplete and in subjection and belongs to the category of the passive rather than the active.

Ruane (2013:42) also refers to Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Clarence J. Vos who have conflicting conclusions on the gender roles in the sacrificial system. Stanton, who notes that even though females are added to the sin offering, "a sacrifice of a female animal is an indication of the lesser social position of its offeror." However,

---

[40] Even though Leviticus 22:19 is considered part of H.

Vos argues that the inclusion of males is not directed at excluding females, nor is it to be seen as derogatory towards the female sex in general.

When analysing Leviticus one can note that commentators frequently assume that males are superior according to the sacrifice they are associated with and females inferior because of the sacrifices they are associated with as is seen with Gerstenberger (1993:74), Wenham (1979:95, 100) and Bellinger (2012:42). But scholars such as Levine (1989:25) and Milgrom (1991:174) both give practical explanations which align with the domestication of animals, stating that fewer males are necessary for the herd or flock to multiple. Which shows that animal husbandry was an important aspect when considering victims for sacrifice. Be that as it may, Ruane (2013:43) cannot deny the fact that these laws governing the sacrificial victim coincide with the gender concepts discussed in chapter 3. Males are the primary public participants in ritual who have a higher ritual status, whereas females have a lower ritual status restricted to a more private level of participation. Thus, one can undeniably see the inclusion or exclusion of women in rituals as directly proportional to the inclusion or exclusion of female sacrificial victims and both emphasise the purpose and function of the ritual.

A discussion on sacrifices in terms of the festival calendars and Leviticus' sacrificial requirements is then necessary to see how these societal gender ideologies operate. Ruane (2013:45) argues that only male victims were used in public offerings just as the participates and officiants are male. Males are used in continual offerings, which is a burnt offering every day in Exodus 29:38-42 and Numbers 28:1-8. In festival offerings males appear to be the sacrificial victim as the species is mentioned in a masculine form (for example in Lv. 23:19 the victim is to be a male lamb, even though with the fellowship offering either sex is acceptable). Ruane (2013:45) adds that offerings such as "raising of the omer, Shevuot, the Passover offering, Sukkot, Yom Kippur, the New Moon, the sabbaths, Trumpets, and Shemini Atseret" are festival calendar offerings which seem to use males. However, some of the descriptions do not specify the sex of the animal as it uses gender-neutral terms, but one can assume they were males.[41] Shectman (2019:417) acknowledges that the

---

[41] Leviticus 23:12 (Omer offering), Leviticus 23:18, 19, Numbers 28:27, 30-32 (Shevuot), Passover offering differed according to sources but all stayed constant on males Exodus 12:5, Deuteronomy 16

Hebrew Bible has a default masculine vocabulary and that there are two schools of thought: the first school argues that the masculine default form can include women as an interpretation scholars such as Waltke and O'Connor (1990:108) agree to this. The second school of thought rejects this view and argues that it excludes women unless they are mentioned explicitly by using female terminology and Ruane (2013:4) would be an example of this school of thought. For this reasoning, I set out a table which surveys all animal terms used in Leviticus 1-7, including the morphological analysis thereof.

Table 3:				
Hebrew Term:	**English Translation:**	**Text in Leviticus:**	**Interpreted Sex:**	**Morphology:**
בְּהֵמָה	Animal	Lv. 1:2	Neutral	Noun, Feminine, Singular.
הַבָּקָר	Herd	Lv. 1:2	Neutral (male)	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
הַבָּקָר	Herd	Lv. 1:3, 1:5 (no addition) & 3:1	Male – Added זָכָר	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
הַבָּקָר	Herd	Lv. 3:1	Female – Added נְקֵבָה	Noun, Masculine, Singular.

---

and Ezekiel 45:21-25, Numbers 29:12-34 (Sukkot), Numbers 16:3-11 (Yom Kippur), Numbers 28:11, 15 (the New Moon), Numbers 28:9 (the sabbath), Numbers 29:2, 5 (Trumpets) and Numbers 29:35 (Shemini Atseret).

134

בֶּן הַבָּקָר	young son from the herd	Lv. 1:5, 4:3 & 4:14	Male	בֵּן – Noun, Masculine, Singular
פַּר	Bull	Lv. 4:3, 4:4, 4:7, 4:8, 4:11, 4:12, 4:14, 4:15, 4:16, 4:20 & 4:21	Male	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
שׁוֹר	Bull, ox, steer, cattle	Lv. 7:23	Male	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
צֹאן	Flock	Lv. 1:10 & 3:6	Male – Added זָכָר	Noun, Both, Singular.
צֹאן	Flock	Lv. 3:6 & 5:6	Female – Added נְקֵבָה	Noun, Both, Singular.
צֹאן	Flock	Lv. 1:2	Neutral	Noun, Both, Singular.
צֹאן	Flock	Lv. 5:15, 5:18 & 5:25	Male – Addition of אַיִל	Noun, Both, Singular.

כֶּשֶׂב	Sheep	Lv. 3:7 & 4:35	Male	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
כֶּשֶׂב	Sheep	Lv. 4:32	Female – Added נְקֵבָה	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
כִּשְׂבָּה	Sheep	Lv. 5:6	Female – Added נְקֵבָה	Noun, Feminine Singular.
שְׂעִירַת	She-goat	Lv. 5:6	Female – Added נְקֵבָה	Noun, Feminine Singular.
הַכְּשָׂבִים	Sheep	Lv. 1:10	Male – Added זָכָר	Noun, Masculine, Plural.
כֶּשֶׂב	Sheep	Lv. 7:23	Neutral	Noun, Masculine, Singular.
וָעֵז	Goat's	Lv. 7:23	Neutral	Noun, Feminine, Singular.

וָעֵז	Goats	Lv. 1:10 & 4:23	Male – Added זָכָר	Noun, Feminine, Plural.
עִזִּים	Goat	Lv. 4:28 & 5:6	Female – Added נְקֵבָה	Noun, Feminine, Plural.
עֵז	Goat	Lv. 3:12	Neutral	Noun, Feminine, Singular.
אַיִל	Ram	Lv. 5:15, 5:16, 5:18 & 5:25	Male	Noun, Masculine, Singular.

In Ruane's (2013:4) understanding every animal which is not physically specified in Leviticus 1-7 is inherently male. Unless the animals have been specified, such as Leviticus 3:1, 3:6, 4:28, 4:32, and 5:6, where the addition of נְקֵבָה is present, which expresses the victim should be female. Also, with the exception that some animal terms at root form indicate female animals such as כִּשְׂבָּה and שְׂעִירַת. Ruane's understanding of male animals can also be reflected in the terminology used for humans. That males are more assumed to be present in the texts because of the root form of terms which reflect human participation. However, Ruane's (2013:4) male-as-root-form theory falls short when one examines בְּהֵמָה and עֵז, which at its root is feminine and therefore would need one to specify if a male was needed. However, Ruane does acknowledge that more terms are associated with masculinity than that of femininity.

Ruane (2013:46) comes to the conclusion that the terminology shares gender patterns between animals and humans but continues to states that there are some

other gender patterns between human and animals, especially when comparing male humans to male animals and female humans to female animals. Ruane continues to explain how male and female animals are viewed in private and public sacrifices. These gender patterns reflect that females are associated with the private and personal spheres of society. In contrast, the males are representatives in public, patrilineal spheres with a higher social status, but now one is posed with the question of how this social construct came into play and why? There could obviously be no fixed answer to such a question, but with the information at hand from previous chapters, I have narrowed it down to at least three possibilities: 1. Due to metaphorical equivalence. 2. Economic value. 3. Symbolic value. These three possibilities could act interchangeably, just like the Israelites domains usually did.[42]

6.4.1 Metaphor Equivalence

If one were to use Eilberg-Schwartz's (1988:1) "root metaphor" as a blueprint, the way in which male and female animals were treated would refer to the way in which male and female Israelites were treated. This is consistent with the explanation above of private and public exposure to ritual ceremonies according to gender and even social status.

The understanding of sacrifice as a substitute comes into question here. Bell (1997:35) notes a very crucial point of sacrifice was that it was carried out in the way which the culture had outlined it to. The acts of the sacrifice are what portray the system of ideas behind it. Specifically, for a system that correlates with Bell's understanding that humans and animals are portrayed as equivalent and that an animal acts as a substitute for the human to repair their relationship with a deity. Eilberg-Schwartz's (1988:17) gives credit to Bell's understanding, stating that it cannot be a coincidence that animals used as metaphors for Israelites can also be considered as suitable substitutes for Israelites in sacrifice.[43] Wenham (1979:60-61)

---

[42] See chapter 3 for the discussion on Israelites domains.

[43] Substitution metaphors can be seen in Genesis 22 with regards to Abraham and Isaac as well as Genesis 8 where Noah sacrifices and gets a significant response from Yahweh.

notes in terms of Leviticus that the sacrificial victim can be seen as a substitute. But would that mean the gender of the animal needs to reflect the gender of the offerer or at least the officiant of the offering? Levine (1989:21) agreed with Wenham (1979:60-61) but stated it was only recognisable in the offerings described in Leviticus 4. However, there is much debate over the idea that sacrifice is a substitute. For example, Milgrom (1991:254-256) understands that the blood of the offerings, is an agent of purification for the sanctuary and that the offering itself is not a substitute for the sins of the offerer. Milgrom bases his argument on the idea that the offerer's sins ultimately defiled the sanctuary; thus, only the sanctuary needed purification. Ruane (2013:52) states that animals being seen as a substitute or not is irrelevant in the fact that with or without it being viewed as a substitution the חַטָּאת victim inevitably enacts a form of social identity. Victimology viewed in Leviticus 4 clearly emphasises that females are considered inferior, culturally and socially. If one had to look at Milgrom's argument of the blood being a purification agent for the sanctuary not a substitute for the offerer, then Ruane (2013:55) states it would seem then that females blood makes space less sacred then that of a male's. Purely because the higher social status one had the more need, there was for a male to be the victim, which emphasises that males blood was more used.[44]

All in all, the metaphoric equivalence somewhat emphasises males more. Probably because it uses mostly animals for comparison, and as discussed above, terminology regarding animals portrays males more often than females.

6.4.2 Economic Level

As I have given an extensive discussion on the animal's economic value in Chapter 3, this is just a short overview of how male animals as a collective (so to say the

---

[44] This point seems to venture into the topic of magic but is not the point I am attempting to make. I am connecting the idea that Milgrom had in terms of victims' blood being the most important aspect of the offering to sanctify the sanctuary and the fact that female animals' blood is less used than that of males. Thus, with the use of more male animals' blood to cleanse the sanctuary it seems that it emphasises that female animals' blood cannot do the same.

majority of male animals which are not kept for breeding purposes) are seen as less valuable or at least should be seen as less valuable.

For the אָשָׁם, a male ram is required. Milgrom (1991:326-327), Jenson (2004:30) and Sklar (2013:121) claim "reparation" is a more suitable name for the אָשָׁם offering because of its function as this offering involves financial compensation for the sin committed (cf. Watts 2013:5). Borowski (2002a:290) and Ruane (2013:51) assume that males must have been considered a prime form of currency which is probably why one could use other types of currency as a form of repayment in the reparation offering.

As noted in chapter 3, herds and flocks were kept for at least three main reasons, namely their meat, milk and hair.[45] Therefore Ruane (2013:57) argues that "the gender, age ratios and numbers in a herd vary depending on which of the three products is most desired." If the Israelites wanted milk, one would need to cull young males and limit young females from drinking milk as well as encourage females to reproduce more offspring in order to keep the milk coming. If Israelites wanted meat (whilst taking into consideration the need for milk), it would make sense to eat males but to maximise meat one needed to wait for them to become a suitable size before killing them. If Israelites wanted wool or hair (taking into consideration the need for milk and meat), males produced more hair, which meant they would be maintained to a certain age for the purpose of their hair and eventually their meat.

Ruane (2013:58) therefore states it is possible that offspring most probably males would have been slaughtered for meat, sold or traded for other goods or kept to reproduce with, but for the latter, you only needed the minimum.

In subsistence farming (as the Israelites were substance farmers) female animals seem to have more use and greater economic value at least whilst being alive, healthy and fertile. It, therefore, does not make sense to slaughter a female animal

---

[45] cf. Vancil (1992a:1040); Cansdale (1970:46,50-52,58); Kohler-Rollefson (1996a:172), (1996b:381); Firmage (1992:1119); Cundall *et al.* (1982:135) and Ruane (2013:57).

before her reproductive date has expired, because of the secondary produce she provides. Ruane (2013:58) notes that a female חַטָּאת sacrifice which was to be given by a commoner was probably sterile, old in age or a kid/lamb. This specific female victim would then most definitely be viewed as less valuable according to the argument mentioned above because a male is larger in size and symbolically more valuable as social gender schemes would suggest.

In Leviticus 1, Watts (2013:156) identifies that there is a range of animals which seem to have been placed in economic value order, starting with a bull, sheep/goat and lastly a pigeon. The text here does not stipulate as to why there is this distinction, but in later verses such as Leviticus 5:7, it is clear that there is differentiation for such offerings because it needs to be easily accessible for all to give an offering (cf. Levine 1989:9). With such an interpretation, one would not question the possible discrimination Leviticus supports. As this interpretation aims to include all into a joint ability to offer sacrifice no matter what one's income level is. Milgrom (1991:252) similarly argues with regards to Leviticus 4, that a commoner was to bring a female animal because it was more likely that he had a female animal in his possession. Low or average income households probably had a few females at hand to reproduce with and gain secondary products from, but they were less likely to have males in their flock or herds, as this would have been too costly, so they probably outsourced males to repopulate their herds and flocks. But Ruane (2013:58) opines that one may be able to trade in a female for a male which renders Milgrom's (1991:252) argument invalid. With chapter 3's discussion of animals value, Watts' (2013:156) order of animals presented in Leviticus 1 seems faulty as well, considering females are capable of generating more profit or produce.

Subsistence farming had few males, one or two to reproduce the flock or herd but the rest were probably slaughtered at a young age. This is probably because it was costly to keep an animal which does not generate enough produce to justify keeping it and does not produce offspring. Males with little use would be killed to preserve water and food for the female animals and Israelites alike. Ruane (2013:59) notes

that female animals being the main source of secondary products probably received more benefits; better shelters, more food and a longer life. The benefits which female animals receive is somewhat in contrast to the social organisation of ancient Israel" because it seems that female animals were treated better than males.

Ruane (2013:60) notes that slaughtering at weaning would have been the most cost-effective (low or no maintenance and more milk leftover), yearlings were also very economically promoted, large in size and probably had enough hair to use. Practicalities such as these could very well explain why the biblical requirement for a sacrificial animal is a yearling male. One might ask why not slaughter a weaning female, but owners probably kept her or sold her as one would need or keep more females. It would seem that males "were more useful in death" (Ruane 2013:60).

With the above discussion at hand, one cannot argue on the basis of economic value that males are more superior, as all evidence points to males being not as valuable as females. The structure and quantity of the herds and flocks also contradict the social system of the Israelites. Thus, the authors of the sacrificial system needed to find another way of portraying males more valuable than females.

6.4.3 Symbolic Level

Just as Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:1) argued, metaphors convey the treatment of animals as similar to humans. So too, Ruane (2013:47) states that gender shows the difference in one's sanctity and cultic status. When people of higher positions are to make offerings of high status such as the עֹלָה then a male animal is required. Maleness in the sacrificial system portrayed in P and H according to Ruane (2013:55-56) seems to be placed on a pedestal with higher authority and a holier or more sacred status as well as being an ideal image for the communal and public eye. Whereas femaleness is excluded from this ideal image or ritual material because of their reproductive abilities and child-caring responsibilities.

Ruane (2013:60) argues there are biblical passages which reflect the "uselessness" of males in a herd or flock such as Genesis 32:13-16 where the gift selected for

Esau consisted of: two hundred female goats and twenty male goats, two hundred ewes and twenty rams, thirty female camels with their young, forty cows and ten bulls, and twenty female donkeys and ten male donkeys. In nonlegal texts males are the leading animal described or used in slaughter or sacrifice such as Deuteronomy 32:14; Isaiah 1:11; Isaiah 34:6-7; Jeremiah 51:40; Micah 6:6-7; Psalms 66:13-15 and Ezra 6:9; 7:17.[46] However, these texts can also be allocated to different historical and social contexts which render different social meanings for a particular group who are in need of a particular image or reference. Alternatively, it could be a social group attempting to reject a specific social order.

Ruane (2013:60) notes that even though males prove to be less useful "their strength, aggressiveness, virility and beauty contribute to their symbolic value" as seen in Deuteronomy 33:17 and Proverbs 30:29-31. Borowski (2002a:299, 2002b:408) also notes that Yahweh was associated with the image of the bull seen in Genesis 49:24 and Isaiah 49:26. In the Exodus narrative the golden calf, the "bull horn was also a symbol of strength, power and fertility". Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:4) states that there are several animals such as the bulls, rams, he-goats and lions, which are terms usually used in metaphors to describe leaders. The symbolic value of males seems to have influenced its material value, where they would be kept as a sign of wealth. Milgrom (1991:252) notes that usually only leaders keep a surplus of male animals as a form of currency as seen in Proverbs 27:26. Moreover, because of male symbolism being highly recognised, they managed to be highly reflected as the superior sacrificial victim (Ruane 2013:61). I do believe male symbolic value is inspired by their role in the herd, or the lack thereof as there is no focus on what

---

[46] Deuteronomy 32:14, which emphasises that female animals are used for curds and milk and male animals are slaughtered. Isaiah 1:11, in its specific context calls the offerings meaningless but this is not true for offerings which are done in accordance with Yahweh's legislation. Isaiah 34:6-7, males once again mentioned as the slaughtered victim. Jeremiah 51:40, males are used in a simile which emphasises that males were more common sources of slaughter. Micah 6:6-7, male animals as offerings are questioned, if such an offering would please the Lord. Psalms 66:13-15, conveys the idea that in thanksgiving and completion of vows male animals will be offered. Ezra 6:9 only male animals are listed as needed victims for offerings and Ezra 7:17, notes that male animals should be bought to be sacrificed.

143

happens to the male animals which have no use. Therefore, the excess males needed their value to "increase" so that these males could be used rather than offering females which would actually cost them more.

Having discussed the three possibilities above, the metaphorical equivalence, symbolic value and economic value. It would seem that the metaphorical equivalence and symbolic value both emphasise the usage of male animals and their importance. However, on an economic level, the exclusion of the use of female animals in sacrifice seems to motivate a higher value than that of males. If the sacrificial system called for female animals with its higher valued rituals, the whole community would be affected, this would be a costly transaction. Thus, one can see a power play between the interpretations which motivate higher male status and those which do not. With that in mind, it would seem that the sacrificial system was cautious of the possible economic gain when sacrificing animals without directly spelling it out. Without explaining the economic significance of choosing a victim, the sacrificial system naturally implemented and became interpreted with symbolic value and metaphoric equivalence, in favour of males which overrode the commercial value. Discussing metaphoric equivalence, economic value and symbolic value leads one to understand that sacrifice was packed with power. Power to decide, change, choose, and influence the whole society.

6.5 Ritual and Sacrifice Speak Power

Once again, ritual and sacrifice are discussed interchangeably in this section as there are points made about ritual which hold relevance for sacrifice. Ritual as a form of power has four ways in which it operates in or with society, according to Janzen (2004:43-53):

1. Ritual simply reflects the social order: whenever a ritual is performed one is reminded of one's social status as the social hierarchy is emphasised within the ritual performance, a structure which shows who is more important in society. Concepts such as lineage and sex (gender) are mostly focused on, in a social order; thus, each ritual reinforces or emphasises this social order. So

144

whoever is portrayed with a high position in society and deemed important is reflected with a high position in the ritual and important. Using ritual in this way helped when one would question the social order, as they could simply argue the authority of the ritual permits such an order. For example, sacrifices presented in Leviticus 1-7, portray the social order in terms of animals and humans (specifically the burnt offering, purification offering and reparation offering). Rappaport (1999:123) adds that ritual was not created to control community members behaviour directly, but that ritual creates regulations which reflect the social rules and actions which can be seen in the sacrificial rituals. Thus, ritual can be viewed in the form of a symbolical representation of social rules and by actively engaging in such a ritual one automatically accepts the social rules accompanying them. However, Rappaport (1999:138) notes, one should not merely recognise ritual as a symbolic representation of society but as a social construct in itself.

2. A ritual which rejects the social order: when a ritual changes its structure, it has the possibility to create a whole new group as it no longer reflects the social order. A possible example of a sacrifice which rejected the social order is the addition of a red heifer in Numbers 19, which is a purification offering (חַטָּאת) specifically for the Israelite community. In Leviticus 4 a male bull was required for such an offering, female animals are present (goat or sheep) in ordinary individual offerings, but nowhere in the purification offering described in Leviticus 4 is a female cow required.

3. Ritual as a placement tool: as a placement tool, ritual influences the social order, allows one to move from one status to another. Rituals such as circumcision and marriage could be seen as placement tools, which upgrade one's status. Purification or reparation offering could also act as a placement tool, as it upgrades someone or something's status from being impure or sinful to pure and forgiven.

4. "Ritual that reflects an ideal society": the meaning of these rituals are not necessarily incorporated into the society yet but portray what the society should be following. The idealised structure is practised in rituals with the hope of implementation into society. These rituals, however, should not be viewed as a rebellion against the current social order but rather as a stepping

145

stone to the ultimate social order which should be implemented. In terms of the sacrificial system presented in Leviticus 1-7, it seems highly unlikely that the rituals were ideal portrayals of society. This is because the community, as seen in chapter 3, somewhat already reflects such views and social constructs. However, posed with a different understanding of the value of animals, a different societal order could be reflected.

As rituals and specifically sacrifices are considered a form of communication, it is clear to see in terms of sacrificial animals, the message which the sacrificial system in Leviticus 1-7 expresses. By analysing the relationship between animals and humans as well as an analysis of animals in terms of their metaphorical equivalence, economic value and symbolic justification. It is clear to see that the sacrificial system presented in Leviticus 1-7, operates to reflect social orders, as a placement tool as well as reflects an ideal society.

6.6 Conclusion

As a form of power, it would seem that the sacrificial systems are symbolic systems which organise social relations, create regulated systems for the consumption of meat and provide a ritual meaning for culling animals which are deemed useless to the reproduction of the herd or flock. If one were to ignore the metaphoric equivalence and symbolic value of male animals, males as a collective (of which most are excess males) would not have been viewed with such high status as biblical texts usually portray them as. This would have taken power away from a patriarchal structured society; thus, symbolic and metaphoric values prevailed to emphasis male dominance.

However, the exclusion of female animals does not need to be viewed only as negative but rather as a starting point to liberate the value of them and eventually women too. They are more excluded from the sacrificial system, because they are more needed in numerical value as well as alive because of the physical value as proven producers. However, in light of Masenya's (2005a:191) Bosadi interpretation it would prove to be negative, as she notes that African-south African women are also only recognized in the work force, in large numbers, but often in the private spheres and religious communities not recognized at all. These women's commercial

values are only noticed, wanted and praised when it benefits another, but this is not a reflection of her private and religious value nor does it benefit her in such spheres. Ruane (2013:62) states in the sacrificial systems, the victim is required to die, which in a reproduction setting and in terms of the economic value a male victim makes more sense. This is because of a female's reproductive value and gains in terms of her secondary produce; thus, female animals would not regularly be used as sacrificial victims.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

From the beginning of the dissertation, I acknowledged Ruane's understanding that sex selection of sacrificial victims created and motivated underlying societal gender constructs. In order to justify such a statement, one needed to analyse and engage with a gender/feminist approach, the culture, society and animal husbandry of the Ancient Near East and the actual offerings presented in Leviticus 1-7, where sex selection is spelt out. Therefore, in this chapter, it is essential to attempt to synthesise all these concepts by discussing each chapter's contributions individually as well as collectively. Possibly concluding with an understanding that Leviticus' sacrificial system may or may not have contributed to a continual patriarchal structure, through the emphasis of animal sex selection.

Firstly, the gender/feminist approach caused some confusion as the approach uses a variety of critical methods to motivate and answer questions regarding gender issues. Therefore, choosing a single feminist approach came with much hesitancy and indecision as each approach brought forth essential points which would be useful for the overall study of animals in the sacrificial system. However, each approach also had its drawbacks, either extremely radical or very lenient with regards to the authority of the text. With that, a summary of the influence that the feminist approach had on this dissertation is appropriate.

As Osiek (1997:960), Jeong (2002:117), Brayford (2009:314), Schottroff (1996:20) and Dreyer (1998:626) have described the Rejectionists in chapter 2, one can identify that if one were to accept the ordering of Leviticus 1-7 according to the administrative order, it would motivate the patriarchal influence on the sacrificial system. If one were to view the ordering of Leviticus 1-7, in terms of gifts and mandatory offerings (Lv.1-5), the patriarchal tendencies would have been less pervasive, than that of the "holy" and "most holy" ordering found in Leviticus 6-7. As the order of offerings in Leviticus 1-5 do not necessarily emphasise a male-

148

dominated society which Leviticus 6-7 does, by placing importance on the hierarchy of sacrifices which ultimately exclude female animals. Thus, with a rejectionist view in mind, I reject the social order which the sacrificial system portrays. However, the rejectionists' view seems like a dead-end after rejecting the authority of the Bible; thus, to continue the search for the value of animals, a revisionists view was necessary. Revisionists, according to Knellwolf (2001:197), Schottroff (1996:20), Jeong (2002:118) and Osiek (1997:963) in chapter 2, believe that the sacrificial system can be subjected to transformed interpretation. Meaning the revisionist acknowledges the patriarchal tendencies but looks past them to find a different interpretation. Possibly acknowledging that women and female animals were excluded but that this exclusion need not be viewed in a negative light. Specifically for animals, the exclusion gives them somewhat of a higher status, that they are more valuable and need not be presented as an offering. Revisionists have, however, been scrutinised for not dealing with patriarchy and giving women or in this case, female animals overly optimistic views within the patriarchal constraints. Thus, the need for a liberalist view is necessary. Liberalist's as noted by Brayford (2009:316), Osiek (1997:965), and Jeong (2002:119) do not attempt to revise patriarchy but rather push to find salvation and liberation within the texts. The liberalists, therefore, acknowledge the patriarchal symbolism attached to sacrifice and its system but, possibly choose to explain the exclusion of female animals in terms of economic gain. This then liberates female animals from the symbolic value, which in turn was once used to exploit the women.

Overall the feminist and gender approach help emphasise the understanding that which is considered "normal" is not "normal" or "natural" but was created to reflect such, to exploit and control. Thus, an analysis of culture, society and agriculture took place to decipher what "normal" was.

In terms of animal husbandry, it would seem that female animals had more economic value when kept alive, but with Ancient Near East being a patriarchal society, the symbolic value of males outweighed that of females. As in the culture, societal

values and animal husbandry revolved around patriarchal constructions that males are portrayed and taught to be more superior than females. This is a concept which interpreters convey specifically today still when engaging with the orders or structures of the offerings in Leviticus (social status, ranks of offerings, ranks of officiants and animals involved). Implementing the understanding of Watts (2007:67-68, 2013: 169-171, 383) and Rainey (1979:487-488) who argue for offerings' importance according to the consumption, priestly prebends and quantity of offerings somewhat justifies the gender bias for males but also motivates the understanding that sacrificial ritual is a reflection of the social order. However, as I have noted above, Fewell (1999:268) argues that feminists are interested in revealing the real value of women and in the case, the real value of female animals. To summarise chapter 3:

- Males controlled animal domestication (which includes their reproductive abilities and lineage).
- Male animals are deemed more expendable.
- Females were limited to reproductive abilities, kept alive for their secondary produce and lived a better life than that of a male animal.
- Female animals as a collective compared to males as a collective had a low status in terms of symbolic and metaphoric value but higher status in terms of economic value.
- Female animals were rarely sold; however, males were commonly sold, slaughtered and even outsourced.

One of the research problems posed in the introduction was "Does the sacrificial victim then solely reflect the social values such as the patriarchal system which humans followed in the Ancient Near East?" It would seem that the answer to this question is yes, based on the evidence provided in the table below, which is a comparison between the patriarchal characteristics of Ancient Near East and the Sacrificial system presented in Leviticus 1-7.

150

Table 4:	
Patriarchal Characteristics:	Sacrificial Relevance:
Fathers or males hold power, owned women's bodies and controlled the lineage.	Only males can be high priests and priests. More male animals were used for offerings.
Women have low status (in the household, societal, political, and economic spheres)	Females only used in "low" status offerings.
Male children are praised and preferred.	Male animals are more preferred in offerings and given higher status offerings.
Women's education was limited to household duties, as they were not permitted into the public sphere.	Women were not explicitly mentioned within the sacrificial system; thus, one can assume that only men were accepted in the public eye. Female animals were mentioned in only two types of offerings but rarely ever used in practice.
Males had the power to sell, abuse or kill his property (wives, children and animals).	Male animals were considered the most common sacrifice.
Males considered elite based on the patriarchal system.	Males animals considered elite based on their participation in high ranked offerings. Men emphasised as elite based on the idea that only males could have a priestly status.

It is clear to see that there is a patriarchal influence on the sacrificial system, specifically when taking into consideration the contradictions between the real value of women and female animals against their supposed value and treatment in the sacrificial system. Ruane (2013:3-4, 12, 41-46) and Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:5-6) as

151

noted in chapter 6, mentions the many reflections between the treatment of male animals and men, female animals and women, and animals in general and women. Most interpretations would be viewed as unfavourable, because female animals are mostly excluded, used as lower status (for low ranked people and low ranked offerings), controlled by a male system and discriminated against due to reproductive purposes. However, with the investigation of animals and their usage in chapter 3, it would seem that the exclusion of female animals could be interpreted differently.

Most scholars, specifically feminist scholars, would regard the exclusion of female animals as negative and derogatory. However, when viewing the economic value and secondary produce of female animals, it would seem that they are more valuable alive and therefore excluded from being used in the sacrificial system. This view could then also be reflected on women in society. However, when reflecting such a concept onto women in society, it would seem that they are only useful in certain aspects and therefore restricted to those areas and only called upon when a man needs them, highlighting yet another issue which needs to be resolved. That women are only sometimes useful, and only when a man is in need or only when called upon, this, however, should be a discussion for another day.

There are other issues when comparing the usage of female animals to women, specifically when regarding their treatment as equal. The quantity of animals in a herd or flock does not seem to reflect or represent the societal structure as there were more females than males. The way in which the animals were kept also did not match the quality of lifestyle women and men lived, as female animals lived better lives than that of a male animal.

In terms of culture, society and agriculture I have come to the conclusion that the sacrificial system needed victims and with a surplus of males it was the perfect opportunity to accommodate males, leading them to be the prized possession for the perfect sacrifice. In the discussion on male animals, it does seem that I was taking a

more sublimationist approach,[47] but I was rather attempting to highlight the equal status of each sex, disproving that males should have dominate status.

So how did the sacrificial system in Leviticus 1-7 contribute to the societal value of humans and animals alike? Janzen (2004:14,17-18) states that one needs to analyse ritual order, especially the internal order of the ritual. Thus, what happens in the ritual itself, as well as the place of a ritual in other activities. But also the external order of ritual, what significance the ritual's placement has in terms of other rituals, the historical contexts, the social contexts, the social structure and the geographical location all to find accurate social meanings of ritual.[48] Thus an extensive analysis took place on the blood offerings presented in Leviticus. Noting mostly males where used, there is a definite social ranking system present in the offerings, and each offering as a whole has a rank which also differentiates between the using a female or male animal. However, when viewing the economic value of animals, it would seem that the sacrificial system is following a different value system. Tambiah (1968:202) states that all ritual "attempts to re-structure and integrate the minds and emotions of the actors" and is a powerful form of language. With Tambiah's understanding in mind, the author of Leviticus understood that the economic value of males would not do their patriarchal society justice, therefore implemented a metaphoric equivalence and symbolic value, which emphasised male's higher status and value. Eilberg-Schwartz (1988:12) notes that he may be over-reading into such laws regarding the root metaphors. However, because of the correspondence of the parallels seen above and in Gender in Leviticus and Sacrifice, it is plausible that these sacrificial laws also parallel social constructs in the Israelite tradition. With interactive domains, if Israelites reflected that female animals were more useful and valuable. The patriarchal system would be questioned as the females' value would contradict the root metaphors and cultural structures. Thus, the sacrificial system

---

[47] See chapter 2 for discussion on Sublimationist approach.

[48] See discussion on social structure and geographical location in chapter 3, Culture, Society and Agriculture. See discussion on social context, sacrifices placement and order in Chapter 5 Blood Sacrifices in Leviticus 1-7.

153

helped maintain this patriarchal view, reducing female animals value to uphold a male-dominated society.

Bibliography

Adams, S.L., 2014, *Social and Economic Life in Second Temple Judea,* Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Baker, D.W., 2003, "Agriculture", in T.D. Alexander and D.W. Baker eds., *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, pp. 21-26.

Baker-Fletcher, K., 1996, "Difference", in L.M. Russel and J. Shannon eds., Dictionary of Feminist Theologies, Lousiville: Westminster John Knox Press, pp. 68-69.

Bataille, G., 1989, *Theory of Religion*, trans. R. Hurley, New York: Zone Books.

Bell, C., 1992, *Ritual Theory, Ritual Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bell, C., 1997, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bellinger, W.J., 2012, *Leviticus, Numbers,* Grand Rapids: Baker Books. *(Understanding the Bible Commentary Series)*

Bhasin, K., 1993, *What is Patriarchy?,* New Delhi: Raj Press.

Blenkinsopp, J., 1996, "An assessment of the alleged pre-exilic date of the Priestly material in the Pentateuch", *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 108(4), pp. 495-518.

Boer, R., 2015, *The Sacred Economy of Ancient Israel*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press.

Bons-Storm, R., 2005, "A Challenge to Change Developments in Feminist Theology and Feminist Christology", *HTS: Theological Studies*, 61(1/2), pp. 45-63.

Borowski, O., 2002, "Animals in the Literature of Syria-Palestine", in B.J. Collins ed., *A History of Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 289-308.

Borowski, O., 2002, "Animals in the Religions of Syria-Palestine", in B.J. Collins ed., *A History of Animal World in the Ancient Near East*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 405-426.

Borowski, O., 2003, "Daily Life in Biblical Times", *Archaeology and Biblical Studies* 5, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Borowski, O., 2006, "Animals of the Bible", in K.D. Sakenfeld ed., *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Volume 1*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, pp. 159-164.

Bowen, N.R., 2007, "Feminist Interpretation", in K.D. Sakenfeld ed., *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Volume 2,* Nashville: Abingdon Press, pp. 448–449.

Brayford, S., 2009, "Feminist Criticism: Sarah Laughs Last", in J.M. LeMon and K.H. Richards eds., *Method Matters*, SBL 56, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, pp. 311-332.

Cansdale, G., 1970, *All the Animals of the Bible Lands,* Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House.

Castle, G., 2007, *The Blackwell Guide to Literary Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Clifford, R.J., 1996, "bull", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 157-158.

Clines, D. J. A., ed., 1993, "אַיִל", *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Volume 1, Sheffield*: Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 210-211.

Clines, D. J. A., ed., 2011, "שׁוֹר", *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew, Volume 8*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 312-313.

Collins, J.J., 2018, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible and Deutero-Canonical Books*, 3rd edn., Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Copeland, M.S., 1996, "Theologies, Contemporary", in L.M. Russel and J. Shannon eds., *Dictionary of Feminist Theologies*, Lousiville: Westminster John Knox Press, pp. 283-287.

Cover, R.C., 1992, "Sin, Sinners", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, New York: Doubleday, vol. 6, pp. 31-40.

Cundal, A., Bruce, F.F., Mellor, R. & Rowe, A., 1982, *Nelson Bible Encyclopedia for the Family*, Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Daly, M., 1985, *Beyond God the Father: Towards a Philosophy of Women's Liberation*, Boston: Beacon.

De Pury, A., 1992, "Yahwist ("J") Source", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Volume 6*, New York: Doubleday, pp. 1012-1020.

Deist, F.E., 2000, *The Material Culture of the Bible*, London: Sheffield Academic Press.

Dozeman, T.B., 2017, *The Pentateuch: Introducing the Torah*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Dreyer, Y., 1998, "Feministiese Hermeneutiek as Kritiese Teorie", *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, *54*(3/4), pp. 623-651.

Duling, D., 1993, "Torah Orientation", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp. 171-178.

Eilberg-Schwartz, H., 1988, "Israel in the Mirror of Nature: Animal Metaphors in the Ritual and Narratives of Ancient Israel", *Journal of Ritual Studies*, (2)1, pp. 1-30.

Eilberg-Schwartz, H.,1990, *The Savage in Judaism: An Anthropology of Israelite Religion and Ancient Judaism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Exum, J.C., 1995, "Feminist Criticism: Whose interests are being served", in G.A. Yee ed., *Judges and Method: New Approaches in Biblical Studies,* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, pp. 65–90.

Fewell, D.N., 1999, "Reading the Bible Ideologically: Feminist Criticism", in S.L. McKenzie & S.R. Haynes eds., *To Each Its Own Meaning: An Introduction to Biblical*

Criticisms and Their Application, rev. & expanded edn., Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, pp. 268–282.

Firmage, E., 1992, "Zoology", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, New York: Doubleday, vol. 6, pp. 1109-1167.

Friedman, R.E., 1992, "Torah (Pentateuch)", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, New York: Doubleday, vol. 6, pp. 605-622.

Geertz, C., 1973, *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York: Basic Books.

Gerstenberger, E.S., 1993, *Leviticus: a Commentary*, Louisville: Westminister. (The Old Testament Library)

Girard, R., 1989, *Violence and the Sacred*, London: John Hopkins University Press.

Gorman, F.H., 2008, "Leviticus", in K.D. Sakenfeld ed., *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Volume 3*, Nashville: Abingdon Press, pp. 645-651.

Grabbe, L.L., 2001, "Leviticus", in J. Barton, and J. Muddiman eds., *The Oxford Bible Commentary*, Oxford University Press, pp. 91-109.

Haas, G., 1995, "Patriarchy as an Evil that God Tolerated: Analysis and Implications for the Authority of Scripture", *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 38(3), pp. 321-336.

Harrison, R.K., 1980, *Leviticus, an Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 3, Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.

Hartley, J. E., 1992, *Leviticus*, Dallas: Word Books Publisher. (Word Biblical Commentary vol. 4)

Isherwood, L. & McEwan, D., 2001, *Introducing Feminist Theology*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Janzen, D., 2012, *The Social Meanings of Sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible: A study of four writings*, BZAW 344, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Jay, N., 1992, *Throughout your Generations Forever: Sacrifice, Religion, and Paternity*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jenks, A.W., 1992, "Elohist", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Volume 2*, New York: Doubleday, pp. 478-482.

Jenson, P.P., 2004, "The Levitical Sacrificial System", in R.T. Beckwith & M.J. Selman eds., *Sacrifice in the Bible*, Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, pp. 25-40.

Jeong, E.O., 2002, *Empowerment of Korean Women from a Feminist Perspective: a Postmodern*, PhD Dissertation, Dep. Of Practical Theology, University of Pretoria.

Kaiser, W.C., 1994, "The Book of Leviticus: Introduction, Commentary and Reflections", *The New Interpreter's Bible*, Volume. 1, pp.983-1191.

Kamionkowski, S.T., 2018, *Leviticus*, Minnesota: Liturgical Press. (Wisdom Commentary, vol. 3)

Kennedy, X.J. and Gioia, D., 1995, *Literature: An Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama*, New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.

King, P.J., & Stager, L.E., 2001, *Life in Biblical Israel*, London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Kirk-Duggan, C.A., 2014, "Womanist Theology as a Corrective to African American Theology", in K.G. Cannon & A.B. Pinn eds., *The Oxford Handbook of African American Theology*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 267-279.

Klages, M., 2012, *Key Terms in Literary Theory*, London: Continuum.

Knellwolf, C., 2001, "The History of Feminist Criticism", in C. Knellwolf & C. Norris eds., *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 9, pp.193-206.

Kohler-Rollefson, I.U., 1996a, "Cattle", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 171-172.

Kohler-Rollefson, I.U., 1996b, "Goat", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 381.

Kohler-Rollefson, I.U., 1996c, "Sheep", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 1008-1009.

Kiuchi, N., 2003, "Leviticus, Book of", in D.T. Alexander and D.W. Baker eds., *Dictionary of the Old Testament: Pentateuch*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, pp. 522-532.

Lawrence, B., "Gender Analysis: Gender and Method in Biblical Studies", in J.M. LeMon & K.H. Richards eds., *Method Matters*, SBL 56, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, pp.333-348.

Levine, B.A., 1989, *Leviticus*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society. (The JPS Torah Commentary)

Lincoln, B., 1989, *Discourse and the Construction of Society: Comparative studies of myth, ritual and classification*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mack, B., 1999, "Introduction: Religion and Ritual", in W. Burkert, R. Girard & J. Z. Smith eds., *Violent Origins: Ritual Killings and Cultural Formation*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 1-72.

Malina, B.J., 1993, "Love", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp. 110-114.

Masenya, M., 2005a, "Their Hermeneutics Was Strange! Ours Is A Necessity! Rereading Vashti As African-South African Women", in C. Vander Stichele & T. Penner eds., *Her Master's Tools? Feminist and Postcolonial Engagements of Historical-Critical Discourse*, SBL 9, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, pp.179-194.

Masenya, M., 2005b, "An African Methodology for South African Biblical Sciences: Revisiting the Bosadi (womanhood) Approach", *Old Testament Essays*, 18(3), pp. 741-751.

Mattingly, G.L., 1996, "Farming", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 331-332.

May, M.A., 1996, "Feminist Theologies, North American", in L.M. Russel & J. Shannon eds., *Dictionary of Feminist Theologies*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, pp. 106-108.

McClymond, K., 2008, *Beyond Sacred Violence: A Comparative Study of Sacrifice*, Baltimore: Johns Hoskins University Press.

McVann, M., 1993, "Family-Centeredness", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp. 70-74.

Melanchthon, M.J., 2014, "Toward Mapping Feminist Biblical Interpretations in Asia", in E. Schüssler Fiorenza ed., *Feminist Biblical Studies in the Twentieth Century: Scholarship and Movement*, SBL 9.1, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, pp.105-119.

Meshel, N.S., 2014, *The 'Grammar' of Sacrifice: A Generativist Study of the Israelite Sacrificial System in the Priestly Writings with A 'Grammar' of Σ*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meyer, E.E., 2010, "Dating the Priestly text in the pre-exilic period: Some remarks about anachronistic slips and other obstacles", *Verbum et Ecclesia* 31(1), Art. #423, 6 pages. DOI: 10.4102/ ve.v31i1.423.

Meyer, E.E., 2013, "From Cult to Community: The Two Halves of Leviticus", *Verbum et Ecclesia* 34(2), Art. #774, 7 pages. http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/ve.v34i2.774.

Meyers, C., 1988, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Meyers, C.L., 2014, "Was Ancient Israel a Patriarchal Society?", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *133*(1), pp. 8-27.

Miles, J.R., 1992, "Lamb", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, New York: Doubleday, vol. 4, pp.132-134.

Milgrom, J., 1991, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York: Doubleday. (The Anchor Bible, vol. 3)

Milgrom, J., 1992, "Priestly ("P") Source", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Volume 5*, New York: Doubleday, pp. 454-461.

Milgrom, J., 2000, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, New York: Doubleday. (The Anchor Bible, vol. 3A)

Morgan, J., 2010, "Sacrifice in Leviticus: Eco-Friendly Ritual or Unholy Waste?", in D.G. Horrell, C. Hunt, C. Southgate & F. Stavrakopoulou eds., Ecological Hermeneutics: Biblical Historical and Theological Perspectives, London: T & T Clark, pp. 32-45.

Neyrey, J.H., 1993, "Clothing", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp. 20-25.

Nihan, C., 2007, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch: a study in the composition of the book of Leviticus*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (Forschungen zum Alten Testament. 2. Reihe, 25).

North, G., 1994, *Leviticus: An Economic Commentary*, Texas: Institute for Christian Economics.

Orlin, L.L., 2007, *Life and Thought in the Ancient Near East*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ortiz, S.M., 2014, "United Monarchy: Archaeology and Literary Sources", in B.T. Arnold & R.S. Hess eds., *Ancient Israel's History: An Introduction to Issues and Sources*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, pp. 227-261.

Osiek, C., 1993, "Relatedness", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp. 155-157.

Osiek, C., 1997, "The Feminist and the Bible: Hermeneutical Alternatives", *Hervormde Teologiese Studies*, 53(4), pp. 956–968.

Perry, C.A., 2016, Family, Gender Roles and Marriage in the Ancient Near East and the Greco-Roman World, https://www.academia.edu/35441066/Family_Gender_Roles_and_Marriage_in_the_Ancient_Near_East_and_the_Greco_Roman_World

Pilch, J.J., 1993, "Parenting", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp.128-131.

Pilch, J.J. & Malina, B.J., 1993, "Introduction", in J.J. Pilch & B.J. Malina eds., A *Handbook of Biblical Social Values,* Peabody: Hendrickson, pp.xii-xxxix.

Rainey, A., 1970, "The Order of Sacrifices in the Old Testament", *Biblica* 51, pp. 485-498.

Rakoczy, S., 2004, *In her name: Women doing theology*, Dorpspruit: Cluster Publications.

Ramazanoglu, C., 1989, *Feminism and the Contradictions of Oppression*, London: Routledge.

Rappaport, R.A. 1999, "Ritual and Religion in the Making of Humanity", *Cambridge Studies in Social and Cultural Anthropology, Volume 110*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rooker, M.F., 2000, *Leviticus*, Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers. (The New American Commentary vol. 3A)

Rowbotham, S., Alexander, S., & Taylor, B., 2006, "The Trouble with 'Patriarchy", in S. Morgan ed., *The Feminist History Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 51-58.

Ruane, N., 2013, *Sacrifice and Gender in Biblical Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, L.C., 2000, "The Courage to See and to Sin: Mary Daly's Elemental Transformation of Paul Tillich's Ontology", in S.L. Hoagland, & M. Faye eds., *Feminist Interpretations of Mary Daly*, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 55-75.

Schneiders, S.M., 2004, Beyond Patching: Faith and Feminism in the Catholic Church, New York: Paulist Press.

Schottroff, L., 1996, "Authority of Scripture", in L.M. Russel & J. Shannon eds., *Dictionary of Feminist Theologies*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, pp. 20-21.

Schüssler Fiorenza, E., 1977, "Feminist Theology as a Critical Theology of Liberation", in W. Burghardt ed., *Woman: New Dimensions*, New York: Paulist Press, pp. 29-50.

Schüssler Fiorenza, E., 1983, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, New York: Crossroad.

Schüssler Fiorenza, E., 1996, "For Women in Men's World: A Critical Feminist Theology of Liberation", in E. Schüssler Fiorenza ed., *The Power of Naming: A Concilium Reader in Feminist Liberation Theology*, New York: Orbis Books, pp. 3-13.

Shectman, S., 2019, "The Priestly Language of Gender", *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel*, 8(4), pp. 416-430.

Simmons, P. & Ekarius, C., 2009, *Storey's Guide to Raising Sheep*, 4th edn., North Adams: Storey Books.

Ska, J.L., 2006, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Sklar, J., 2013, *Leviticus: An Introduction and Commentary,* Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press. (Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, vol. 3)

Steinberg, N., 2010, "Feminist Criticism", in T.B. Dozeman ed., *Methods for Exodus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 163-192.

Tambiah, S.J., 1968, "The Magical Power of Words", *Man*, *3*(2), pp. 175-208.

Thomas, H.S., 2009, *Storey's Guide to Raising Beef Cattle: Health, Handling, Breeding*, 3rd edn., North Adams: Storey Publishing.

Tischler, N.M., 2006, *All Things in the Bible: An Encyclopaedia of the Biblical World*, vol. 2, London: Greenwood Press.

Unterman, J., 1996, "Fathers", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 332-333.

Vancil, J.W., 1992a, "Goat", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Volume 2*, New York: Doubleday, pp. 1040-1041.

Vancil, J.W., 1992b, "Sheep", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Volume 5*, New York: Doubleday, pp. 1187-1190.

Van Der Veen, P., 2014, "Sixth-Century Issues: The Fall of Jerusalem, the Exile, and the Return", in B.T. Arnold & R.S. Hess eds., *Ancient Israel's History: An Introduction to Issues and Sources*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, pp. 383-405.

Walby, S., 1990, *Theorizing Patriarchy*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Waltke, B.K., & O'Connor, M., 1990, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Watts, J.W., 2007, *Ritual and Rhetoric in Leviticus: From Sacrifice to Scripture*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watts, J.W., 2013, *Leviticus 1-10*, Leuven: Peeters.

Weinfeld, M., 1992, "Deuteronomy, Book of", in D.N. Freedman ed., *The Anchor Bible Dictionary, Volume 2*, New York: Doubleday, pp. 168-183.

Wenham, G.J., 1979, *The Book of Leviticus*, London: Hodder & Stoughton. (The New International Commentary on the Old Testament)

Wilson, R.R., 1996, "Family", in P.J. Achtemeier ed., *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, rev. edn., San Francisco: Harper Collins, pp. 330.

Wuthnow, R., 1987, *Meaning and Moral Order: Exploration in Cultural Analysis*, Oakland: University of California Press.