The Priestly Torah and Holiness School—the basic traditions of the priestly writings in Leviticus and the other pentateuchal books—offer differing perspectives on holiness. The Holiness School reinterprets the prescriptions of the Priestly Torah by developing a system of holiness that emphasizes God's holiness in relation to the people's experience and conduct.

Holiness in Leviticus and Beyond

Differing Perspectives

David P. Wright
Associate Professor of Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near East
Brandeis University

THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS IS PART OF A LARGER BODY of priestly writings that comprise much of the Pentateuch, including parts of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and a short passage at the end of Deuteronomy. These writings developed over a rather long period of time, beginning in the first temple period and continuing into the exile (586–539 BCE) and post-exilic era. Scholars have identified two main sub-traditions or sources among the priestly writings: the Priestly materials proper or "Priestly Torah" and the Holiness materials or "Holiness School."[1] The latter was initially identified by scholars with Leviticus 17–26 and as such was called the "Holiness Code." It was thought that this material antedated the Priestly Torah, which allegedly had incorporated the code in its legislation. The recent work of Israel Knohl has made it clear, however, that while the Holiness School material is concentrated in Leviticus 17–26, it is also found elsewhere in Leviticus and throughout the rest of the Pentateuch, and that it supplements, hence postdates, the Priestly Torah material.[2]

When viewed against other sources and traditions in the Pentateuch, the Holiness School and Priestly Torah appear to be quite similar. Nevertheless, a close examination shows that the Holiness School has distinctive concerns. Even when it takes up and adopts the Priestly Torah, the Holiness School often recontextualizes

and transforms the earlier material for its own purposes. This is particularly true of the issue of holiness, which may be defined basically as a state of being—in places, objects, persons, and time—that is commensurate with the divine presence. What is not holy, particularly what is impure, poses a threat to holiness. The designations given the two traditions in critical scholarship highlight their differing perspectives. The Priestly Torah is more interested in priestly or cultic matters and only peripherally in how holiness relates to the cult. The Holiness School, in contrast, has holiness as its central focus and relates it to God, humans, various places, objects, and time. The following discussion will explore these differences more fully.[3]

Holiness of persons

Both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School treat the issue of holiness with respect to the identity and conduct of certain classifications of persons, including priests, Levites, the firstborn, all Israel, and most fundamentally, God. Yet differences in how holiness is construed by each tradition emerge for each classification.

God. The Priestly Torah offers only a few, indirect words about God's holiness. After Aaron's sons are killed for their illicit incense offering, Moses explains the disaster by citing YHWH's decree, "I will maintain my holiness by those who are near to me, and I will maintain my honor before all the people" (Lev 10:3). That God affirms God's holiness is also shared by the Holiness School (Lev 22:32; cf. Exod 29:43). Indeed, such affirmation is central to the story about Moses and Aaron's failure to sanctify God when they proclaim themselves as the ones to "bring water out of this rock for you" (Num 20:10–12; cf. 27:14). YHWH affirms holiness by punishing the pair (Num 20:13).

The Holiness School enlarges on the sacredness of deity by noting certain behaviors that desecrate or profane—that is, make unholy—God's name, such as Molech worship (Lev 20:3), the priests' performing certain illicit funerary practices (21:6), and not keeping impurity away from sacrifices (22:2). Apparently, any transgression can profane God's name (v. 32). The importance of the divine name for the Holiness School is further seen in the story of blasphemy in 24:10–23. That the name, rather than God, is the object of profanation perhaps reflects the belief that God's very self cannot be besmirched, only God's reputation.

Moreover, a recurring motif in the Holiness material is the call for the people to be holy just as God is holy (Lev 11:44–45; 19:2; 20:7; 26). The deity is the paradigm of sanctity; God is the model for which Israel is to strive and by which all holiness is defined. While the Holiness School assumes with the Priestly Torah that holiness is generated by ritual means (see below), it observes that God is the ultimate source of sanctification (Exod 31:13; Lev 21:8; 22:32).

Israel. We have seen that the Priestly Torah says little about the holiness of God. It likewise says little about the holiness of lay Israelites (on priests, see below), and only in limited, cultic terms. It observes that contact with something most holy

communicates holiness (Exod 29:37; 30:29; Lev 6:27 [Heb. 6:20]). It is not clear whether people or only objects become holy by such contact. If people are not included, the Priestly Torah's only extant statement on the people's sanctity is found in the Nazirite law of Num 6:1–21. According to this, a man or woman may make a vow of self-consecration. The person, specifically his or her head, becomes holy. Certain restrictions result from this status: grape products (including wine and other intoxicants) are to be avoided, the hair is to not be cut, and certain impurities such as corpse contamination are to be shunned. These restrictions in the Priestly Torah are similar to the Holiness School's restrictions for priests against corpse contamination and drinking alcoholic beverages while on duty (Lev 10:9–10; cf. Ezek 44:21).

The Holiness School's conception of the people's holiness goes far beyond that of the Priestly Torah. Whereas the Holiness School assumes the Priestly Torah's laws of personal sanctification, as found in the Nazirite laws in Numbers 6, it makes the Israelites' holiness a requirement, not an optional vow or a matter of accident. Holiness is achieved primarily through behavioral, even ethical, means rather than through ritual. The people's holiness is made analagous to divine holiness: "You shall be holy for I the Lord your God am holy" (see also Lev 11:44–45; 19:2; 20:7, 26). According to this formulaic analogy, holiness is not a preexisting state but something to be attained. Israel's separation from the other nations does not bestow holiness; it only sets the stage for consequent holiness (Lev 20:24–26). By contrast, Deuteronomy considers the people holy from the beginning, prior to any act of obedience, on account of their election by YHWH (Deut 7:6; 14:2, 21).

According to the Holiness School, the people attain and maintain holiness by observing the commandments. The mandate that the people be holy as God is holy heads a list of various commands in Lev 19:2 and is associated with a call to general obedience in Lev 20:7–8. The causative association of obedience and holiness is most clearly seen in Num 15:37–41, which commands all Israelites to wear fringes with a blue thread in imitation of priestly clothing and hence of priestly holiness. The text informs the people that by wearing these, "you shall remember to perform all my commands, and you will thereby be holy to your God" (v. 40). While declaring that obedience leads to holiness, the Holiness School recognizes that holiness ultimately comes from God (Exod 31:13; Lev 20:8; 22:32). Thus, God and God's people come into dialectical interplay: when the people live a life in accordance with divine holiness, they are, in turn, sanctified by God.

The Holiness School singles out two commandments as integral to the people's holiness. The people are to keep the Sabbath as a sign that YHWH sanctifies them (Exod 31:13; cf. Ezek 20:12). The Holiness School thus interlocks two of its primary concerns in this ordinance: the holiness of the people and that of the Sabbath. Moreover, in an addendum to the Priestly Torah's dietary laws in Leviticus 11, the Holiness School states the purpose behind such dietary restrictions: so that the people can be holy as God is holy (vv. 44–45). Leviticus 20:24–26, similarly, develops the symbolic significance of the food laws for the people's holiness. Just as God has

separated the people from the nations, so the people are to make a separation between pure and impure animals. The diet thus encodes the social and political situation of Israel among the nations. The formulaic call to be holy like God accompanies these food laws. Holiness for both God and the people entails distinguishing the acceptable from the unacceptable and prizing the former while shunning the latter.

Priests. Priests have a different level, or even type, of holiness from the rest of the people. Both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School view their holiness as bestowed externally rather than deriving from individual merit. But, whereas the Priestly Torah speaks of the priests' holiness in ritual or cultic terms, the Holiness School adds a behavioral dimension. In the Priestly Torah, the priestly consecration rite as a whole sanctifies the priests (Exod 28:41; 29:1, 33); more specifically, all priests (including the high priest) are sanctified by applying ram blood to their bodily extremities (symbolically, the part for the whole) and sprinkling them with blood taken from the altar and oil (29:20–21; 30:30; Lev 8:23–24, 30). The high priest is further sanctified by pouring oil on his head (Exod 29:7; Lev 8:12).

Building upon the prescriptions about priestly consecration, the Holiness School agrees with the Priestly Torah that the anointing sanctifies the priests (Exod 40:13) but also notes that the high priest's clothing contributes to his sanctification (28:3). The initial consecration rite of the regular priests suffices for all future generations of priests (40:15). The rite of the high priest, in contrast, is to be performed with the ascension of each new high priest (Lev 16:32; 21:10, 12; Num 35:25; cf. Num 20:25–28; in the Priestly Torah cf. Exod 29:29; Lev 6:22 [Heb. 6:15]).

It is in Leviticus 21 that the Holiness School adds certain behavioral dimensions to the priest's holiness. It notes that priests with bodily defects, though they cannot serve at the altar, may still eat the most holy offerings (vv. 16–23). These priests are, therefore, still considered holy. More importantly, the chapter lays out behaviors expected of priests to maintain their holiness. Regular priests are enjoined to limit opportunities for contamination by corpses and to refrain from performing certain body-altering funerary practices and from marrying harlots or divorcees (vv. 1–8). The end of this passage includes a command, apparently to the people, to treat the priests as holy, which includes reference to God's holiness and the remark that God makes the people holy. The people's holiness is reflected by the honor they show its holy priesthood.

After listing the restrictions of the regular priests, Leviticus 21 goes on to treat the funerary and marriage restrictions of the high priest (vv. 10–15). His requirements are stricter than those of regular priests, indicating a higher degree of holiness. The passage offers two rationales: he is to avoid transgressing these rules "because the crown of anointing oil of his God has been poured on his head" (v. 12) and "because I am YHWH who sanctifies him" (v. 15). This last clause, as well as Exod 29:44, shows that the Holiness School ultimately ascribes the priests' holiness to God (see also Lev 21:8).

The priests, according to the Holiness School, have a more stringent dietary constraint. While the flesh of pure animals that have not been properly slaughtered causes uncleanness, the meat may still be eaten by the people at large. Legislation allows this implicitly by never prohibiting the people from eating it and by giving purification prescriptions, rather than issuing condemnation, when such meat is eaten (Lev 11:39–40). The Holiness School condemns the eating of improperly slaughtered meat only when one is not cleansed (Lev 17:15–16). But, in correspondence with the higher holiness of the priests, the Holiness School prohibits this meat altogether from their diet (Lev 22:8; cf. Ezek 44:31).

Firstborn and Levites. Two other subgroups of people whose holiness, or potential holiness, requires clarification are the firstborn and Levites. There is no question that the firstborn—humans and animals—are holy. According to the Holiness School, God sanctified them as the people left Egypt (Num 3:13; 8:17). Since firstborn animals are holy, they cannot be redeemed (Num 18:17), nor can they be made an object of a vow (Lev 27:26).[4] It might be thought that the Levites, who appear only in the Holiness School (The Priestly Torah lacks discussion of the Levites altogether!), are holy since they are substitutes for the Israelite firstborn (Num 3:11–13, 44–51)—a substitution that desanctifies the firstborn humans. But although the Chronicler considered the Levites holy (2 Chr 23:6; cf. 35:3), the Holiness School never calls them such, even in their installation rite (Num 8:5–22). That the Levites are not holy is also indicated in their being restricted from contacting the furnishings of the tabernacle (Num 4:4–20; 18:2–4; both passages from the Holiness School).

The Holiness School exemplified many of its concerns about holiness in narrative rather than in direct legal formulation, as noted above in 24:10–23 and Num 20:2–13. A story that reflects concerns about the holiness of the people, priests, and Levites is the rebellion of Korah and his followers in Numbers 16, a composite story from the Holiness School and JE (the Yahwist-Elohist or Jehovist compositional layer). Korah contends, in the spirit of Deuteronomy, that the entire community is holy, because (as the syntax may be interpreted) God is in their midst (v. 3). By this claim, Korah, a Levite, wants to serve as a priest (v. 10). As a sort of ritual ordeal, Korah is instructed to make an incense offering so that God can prove who are truly chosen as priests (vv. 5–11, 16–24, 26a, 27a). As in the story of priestly trespass in Lev 10:1–4, a fire issues from God (i.e., from the tabernacle) and consumes Korah's band (v. 35). This story appears to counter Levitic claims to priestly authority and privileges, and emphasizes the view of the Holiness School that the people are not by nature holy.

Holiness of places

Not only does holiness inform the identity and conduct of persons within the ancient community of faith, differentiated as it is, it also gives structure to space, the community's habitation and God's. In particular, the sanctuary, the camp, and the

land are important issues for both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School.

The sanctuary in the camp. For both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School, the sanctuary is the primary place of holiness. In this regard, the Priestly Torah's focus is mainly on the sanctuary and its relative degrees of sanctity. According to its description in Exodus, the sanctuary consists of an open-air court, surrounded by a fence. In the back half of this court stands the sanctuary tent. The tent is divided into two rooms, the adytum (the back room) and the shrine (the front room).

The Priestly Torah's tabernacle exhibits a gradation of holiness from the adytum to the court. This gradation is evident in four ways: terminology, distribution of materials, distribution of sanctuary furniture, and extent of access. The adytum is termed "the most holy place" (Exod 26:33), while the shrine is merely called the "holy place" (Exod 26:33; 28:29, 35; 29:30). The most precious materials (e.g., gold) are found at the center of the structure, the least precious (e.g., silver, bronze) toward the outside. As for the sanctuary furniture, the ark of the covenant—the deity's place of repose—was placed in the adytum (Exod 26:34; 30:6; Lev 16:2, 12–13), while other objects were placed in the shrine or in the open court (Exod 26:35; Lev 1:5; 4:5–7, 16–18, 25). Finally, only the high priest could enter the adytum (Lev 16:3–4, 11–16); regular priests could enter only the shrine (Exod 28:43; 30:19–20; Lev 16:17). Israelites (as long as they were pure) could only enter the court to offer sacrifice (Lev 1–7). The gradation of access parallels the graded holiness of humans, from high priest to lay person.

This gradation of sanctuary holiness is part of the Priestly Torah's larger scheme of the geographical distribution of holiness and impurity. The sanctuary, according to circumstantial evidence, stands in the midst of the people's habitation. Since it is holy, all impurity must be kept out of it (e.g., Lev 12:4). Most impurities may remain inside the human habitation, except for the most severe. The Priestly Torah specifically requires the removal of people with "surface affliction," which here includes various skin lesions (*ṣāra'at*, erroneously translated "leprosy"; Lev 13:45–46); corpses (Lev 10:4); building materials also with surface affliction (various fungal growths, which must be disposed of in an impure place; 14:40, 41, 45); the live bird used in purification from surface affliction (Lev 14:6–7, 51–53); the scapegoat, which carries sins (Lev 16:20–22); and carcasses of the purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭā't*, which must be disposed of in a pure place because of their simultaneous holiness; Exod 29:14; Lev 4:11–12, 21; 6:30 [Heb. 6:23]; 8:17; 9:11; 16:27). Such impurities, so removed, can also contaminate other persons and objects. In short, the sanctuary is holy and contains no impurity. The people's habitation is profane and contains either noncommunicable impurities or controlled communicable impurities. The area outside the habitation is, however, profane and tolerates all sorts of impurities, though it is not by nature or wholly an impure place.

The Holiness School further systematizes and rationalizes the Priestly Torah's geography of holiness, purity, and impurity. By recapitulating the Priestly Torah's architectural features of the sanctuary, the Holiness School thus agrees with the

Priestly Torah's gradation of holiness (Exod 35–40). The Holiness School also addresses impurity in the people's habitation: "Command the Israelites that they send out of the camp anyone with a surface [i.e., skin] affliction, anyone with a severe sexual flow, and anyone corpse contaminated" (Num 5:2–3). These are the major personal impurities that are communicable to other persons and objects. This prescription goes beyond Priestly Torah's rules by specifying that persons besides those with a skin affliction are to be excluded. The Holiness School, thus, may be attempting to make the Priestly Torah's principle of exclusion more theoretically consistent.

The Holiness School adds, by way of explanation, that these communicable impurities are excluded "so that they [the Israelites] not pollute their camp where I dwell [*škn*] among them" (Num 5:3b). Of the two traditions, only the Holiness School expresses the aforementioned idea that God dwells (*škn*) among the people (Exod 25:8; 29:45–46; Num 16:3; 35:34; cf. Lev 15:31; 26:11; see also Ezek 43:7, 9; the different formulation in Lev 16:16 is from the Priestly Torah). The presence of the deity has a sanctifying effect. This understanding confirms the Holiness School's view that it is God who ultimately provides sanctification. And yet the Holiness School guards against taking this belief too far: it denies Korah's claim that all the community is holy simply because God is in their midst (Num 16:3).

In contrast to the Priestly Torah, which merely assumes that the sanctuary is in the middle of the habitation, the Holiness School prescribes that the sanctuary be located in the center of a symmetrically laid out camp (Num 2:1–34; 3:23, 29, 35, 38).[5] Serving as a prelude to the law about exclusion in Numbers 5, this prescribed layout protects the sanctuary and its sancta, a concern of Numbers 1, 3–4 (cf. also chapter 18). The Levites and priests who camp immediately around the perimeter of the sanctuary are to protect God's habitation from encroachers with lethal force if necessary (Num 1:51–53; 3:10, 38; 18:4–5, 7, 22–23). Numbers 4 also tells how God will protect the holy furniture from Levitic and priestly infringement (Num 4:15, 18–20; 18:3; cf. Lev 10:1–4; Num 3:4; 16:35).

The land. The Holiness School's systematization of the Priestly Torah's cultic geography and its concern about the sanctifying effect of God's presence coincides with a focus on the land in which the people are to make their home. The Holiness School stipulates that sins pollute the land. Among these sins are unacceptable sexual behaviors (Lev 18). The people are to avoid these acts so that the land not be defiled and "vomit" them out, as it did the previous inhabitants who committed such abominations (Lev vv. 24–28). Homicide also pollutes the land when those who have intentionally killed are not executed (Num 35:33–34). In these passages, the Holiness School does not call the land holy. Nevertheless, the tradition appears to assume the land has a quality above that of the surrounding non-holy nations. The hesitation to call the land of the Israelites holy recalls the Holiness School's hesitation to attribute holiness to the Levites despite their special cultic status.

This concern about the land also complements the Priestly Torah's view of

sanctuary pollution, accepted by the Holiness School. In the Priestly Torah, sins and strong impurities pollute various places in the sanctuary. Inadvertent sins by lay individuals pollute the outer altar (Lev 4:22–35; 5:1–10; 12:6–8; 15:13–15, 28–31). Inadvertent sins by the high priest and the community pollute the shrine (4:1–21). Intentional sins pollute the adytum, the heart of the sanctuary complex (16:11–16).[6] As these passages indicate, the blood of the purgation sacrifice (*ḥaṭṭā't*) serves to remove these impurities. The Holiness School assumes this scheme and adds further detail, stating that the sanctuary may be polluted by sins such as offering children to Molech or by delaying purification from corpse-contamination (20:3; Num 19:13, 20). Unless the impurities affecting the sanctuary are properly removed—the primary purpose of the Day of Atonement rite in Leviticus 16—God's presence will forsake the sanctuary. This principle is couched in the oracular narrative of the literary cousin of the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School, Ezekiel, which graphically describes the departure of YHWH's glory from the temple on account of the people's sins (cf. Ezek 8–11).

The Holiness School amplifies the Priestly Torah, as we have seen, by including the land as a locus of pollution caused by various sins. The theological consequences of obedience are laid out in the blessings and curses of Leviticus 26. Many of these pertain to the bounty or security of the land. The list is also concerned with God's presence and the sanctuary: if the people obey, "I [God] will set my sanctuary among you . . . . I will walk among you and be your God, and you will be my people" (vv. 11–12). If they disobey, "I will make your sanctuaries desolate, and no longer smell your pleasing [sacrificial] odors" (v. 31). The implication is that YHWH's presence will not remain in the land. The Holiness School's concern about the quality of the land explains in part its concern for other laws and matters pertaining to the land (e.g., 19:9–10, 19, 23, 33–34; 25:1–55).

Although the Holiness School has broadened the effect of sin to pollution of the land as well as the sanctuary, the pollution is ultimately not on the same conceptual level. The pollution of the sanctuary has a clear cultic remedy in sacrifice. In contrast, there is no cultic remedy for the pollution of the land. True, the execution of willful murderers cancels or prevents pollution, but this is not a cultic remedy. The inconsistency is due not so much to the Holiness School's extending the Priestly Torah's system of sanctuary pollution as to overlaying the theology of the Priestly Torah with another, perhaps traditional or even popular, theology that had a less systematic view of impurity and holiness.[7]

Holiness of objects

In addition to the sacred use of space, certain inanimate objects can also be invested with holiness, in particular the sanctuary furniture and offerings.

Sanctuary furniture. The foregoing discussion alluded to the Priestly Torah's gradation in the holiness of the sanctuary furniture, which includes the ark, incense

altar, bread table, lamp, laver, and the outer altar. Though all of these are called "most holy," the ark is preeminent in its holiness (Exod 29:37; 30:26–29). The implements which accompany these sancta (e.g., bowls, tongs, and stands) and items used on or derived from them (incense [Exod 30:35–37; Lev 2:1–2, 15; 10:1; 16:12], consecration oil [Exod 30:22–25, 31–33], and perhaps the water from the laver for the suspected adulteress ordeal [Num 5:17]) are either explicitly or implicitly deemed most holy.

The Holiness School shares views of the Priestly Torah about the sanctuary furniture and items associated with it, as seen in its recapitulation of the priestly sanctuary building prescriptions in Exodus 35–40 (cf. Exod 30:10; 37:29; 40:10; see also Num 4:4, 19; 35:25). However, the Holiness School goes beyond the Priestly Torah by adding prescriptions about guarding the furniture's holiness. Numbers 3–4 prescribes how the sanctuary is to be packed and gives the Levitic assignments for, and warnings about, transporting it. The Holiness School also adds to the furniture the altar cover made from the censers of Korah and his band after their punishment (Num 16:38–40 [Heb 17:1–4]). These had become holy through making the offering to the Lord. Their acquisition of holiness reflects the idea of the Priestly Torah that whatever comes into contact with something most holy becomes holy itself (Exod 29:37; 30:29; Lev 6:27 [Heb 6:20]).

Offerings. The Priestly Torah also recognizes a gradation of holiness in offerings, distinguishing between those most holy and those with lesser holiness. The most holy offerings include the burnt offering (*ʿōlâ*; cf. Lev 6:25 [Heb 6:18]; 14:13), the purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭāʾt*; Lev 6:25, 29–30 [Heb 6:18, 22–23]; 10:17), the reparation offering (*ʾāšām*; Lev 7:1, 6; 14:13), and the cereal offering (*minḥâ*; Lev 2:3, 10; 6:16–17 [Heb 6:9–10]; 10:12). The high holiness of these sacrifices is marked by the requirements that only priests eat the edible portions and that these portions be eaten in "a holy place," that is, in the sanctuary court (Lev 6:16, 26 [Heb 6:9, 19]; 7:6; 10:12–13, 17). The priests' consecration offering should probably also be considered most holy since similar rules apply (Exod 29:33; Lev 8:31–32). Lesser holy offerings include the well-being offering (*zebaḥ šĕlāmîm*; Lev 7:16–18) and the thank offering (*tôdâ*; 7:11–15), a specialized version of the former. Though certain portions of these offerings go to the priests and their families, including women (Lev 10:14–15), the rest of the animal (apart from what is devoted to God on the altar) may be eaten by lay persons who bring the offering (Lev 7:19–21). They may presumably eat it even outside the sanctuary as long as it is done in a pure place (cf. Lev 10:14).

As it does for the holy furniture, the Holiness School lends further detail and systematization to the management and distribution of the offerings. Numbers 18 notes that priests receive prebends from the Israelites' offerings for their work in the sanctuary. The males of the priestly line may eat of the most holy offerings, including the meal, purgation, and reparation offerings (vv. 9–10; cf. Lev 21:22; 24:9; the Holiness School supplements offering prescriptions in Num 15:1–15, 22–31). All members of the priestly households, including women, may eat of the lesser holy

offerings and contributions. Numbers 18 includes in this last group offerings elevated in dedication (which include the well-being offering portions; cf. Lev 7:28–36 of the Holiness School); the best portions of new oil, wine, wheat; first ripe produce; what is proscribed (*ḥērem*); and firstborn animals (Num 18:11–20).

Leviticus 22 is a companion passage to Num 18:9–20. It first stipulates purity regulations for the priests in eating the offerings (Lev 22:1–9; cf. Num 18:11, 13) and then specifies who within a priest's household may eat the lesser holy offerings (Lev 22:10–16). Basically, an individual must be a member of the priest's family, living at home, and unattached to another household. Hence, permanent slaves, as the priest's property, may also partake, but not temporary workers. Unmarried daughters, or those divorced and living at home, may partake, but not a daughter who marries a nonpriest. As part of its systematization, Leviticus 22 specifies what blemishes disqualify an animal for sacrifice, a concern undeveloped in the Priestly Torah (cf. the Priestly Torah's Lev 1:3; 3:1; 4:3; 5:15, etc.). The chapter ends with a rule about eating the thank offering, which complements the Holiness School's other prescriptions about the well-being offering in Lev 7:22–36 and 19:5–8.

The offerings that concern the Priestly Torah, as noted above, are the backbone of the sacrificial system. The Holiness School's systematic statements about the consumption of offerings in Numbers 18 include several other types of contributions besides these basic sacrifices (vv. 11–20). In addressing these contributions, the Priestly Torah subsumes them under the term "holy things" (*qōdeš* or *qŏdāšîm*, Lev 5:15–16; 12:4). The offerings in Leviticus 27 appear to be from the Priestly Torah, though perhaps reformulated by the Holiness School. The tithe law in Lev 27:30–33 states without qualification that all tithes are holy, implying that they are brought to the sanctuary and belong to the priests (and probably their households). The Holiness School develops the tithe law in connection with its concern about the Levites (Num 18:21–32). These lesser servitors are now the ones who receive the tithe. Out of this portion they give a tenth to the priests. This tithe-of-the-tithe remains holy, but the nine-tenths kept by the Levites becomes profane, as indicated in the rule that their entire households may consume it "in any place" (v. 31), even in an impure place. Leviticus 27 also speaks of *ḥērem*, "something utterly dedicated or proscribed" (vv. 28–29). This is called "most holy" and presumably would be used solely by the (male) priests (unless this term here is an exaggeration to emphasize the irredeemable character of *ḥērem*. In contrast, the Holiness School treats *ḥērem* as less holy by allocating it to the priests and their households (Num 18:14). Finally, Leviticus 27 describes the inherent holiness of firstborn animals (vv. 26–27). Although the Holiness School does not differ much from the Priestly Torah in its view about these animals, it does allocate the animals' meat to the priestly households (Num 18:15–18) and gives the rule of the firstborn a significant role in the rationale behind establishing the Levites as sanctuary servants.

In its cultic calendars (Lev 23:5; Num 28:16), the Priestly Torah only briefly refers to the Passover animal offering consumed by the Israelites. The Holiness

School provides, however, the detailed prescriptions of this festival, telling in narrative fashion about the first and second Passovers that the Israelites celebrated. At the first Passover, slaughter of the animal was not strictly considered a sacrifice, since the sanctuary had not yet been constructed (Exod 12:1–20, 43–49). With the second Passover, the Holiness School links the Passover prescriptions firmly to the cult (Num 9:1–14). According to this story, some potential celebrants find that they cannot participate because they are corpse-contaminated. The rules are amended to allow those who are impure or on a long journey to celebrate the Passover the following month. Since one must be pure to eat the Passover animal, slaughter of the animal is now considered a sacrifice.[8]

The Holiness School mentions a number of other cultic donations made from the produce of the land: the first ripe produce (*bikkûrîm*; Num 18:13), first processed produce (*rē'šît*; Num 15:20–21; 18:12; cf. Lev 23:10–11, 17–20), and the produce of trees in their fourth year (Lev 19:23–25). Though produce offerings are not unique to the Holiness School (the Priestly Torah mentions *rē'šît* in Lev 2:12, and 27:30 speaks of produce tithes), the Holiness School's emphasis on the land may have led to a greater focus on these offerings.[9]

Holiness in time

Finally, holiness has as much to do with time as it does with space from the perspectives of both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School.

The Priestly Torah observes that certain days of the main festivals are "occasions of holiness" (*miqrā'ê qōdeš*, literally "declarations of holiness"). These include the first and seventh days of Unleavened Bread, the Feast of Weeks, the first day of the seventh month, the Day of Atonement, and the first day of the Feast of Booths (Lev 23:4, 7, 8, [21], 24, 26, 35, 37; Num 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 7, 12). This designation is connected with the requirement to refrain from performing work on these days, as the context of the passages shows. Cessation from labor sanctifies these times.

The Holiness School differs from the Priestly Torah by including the Sabbath among these "occasions of holiness."[10] This is evident in its expansion of the introduction of Leviticus 23, a cultic calendar whose original core is the Priestly Torah. Verses 2b–3 (starting after the command to speak) are additions of the Holiness School, indicated in part by their repetition with v. 4. The original Priestly Torah introduction consisted of vv. 1–2a, 4 and introduced a list of these "occasions of holiness," which did not include the Sabbath.

This expansion is part of the Holiness School's general tendency to elevate the holiness of the Sabbath. The Priestly Torah only mentions the Sabbath twice: once in its other cultic calendar, where it is only concerned with the sacrifices to be offered on this day (cf. Num 28:9–10) and once at the end of its creation story in Gen 1:1–2:4a. The Holiness School, by contrast, directly mentions the Sabbath several times and gives specific requirements of observance and penalties for transgression (besides

Lev 23:3, see Exod 16:22–30; 31:12–17; 35:2–3; Lev 19:30; 26:2; Num 15:32–36; cf. the Sabbath year in Lev 25:2–6). The Holiness School's elevation of the holiness of the Sabbath is further evident in its association with the sanctuary. Rules for observing the Sabbath appear at the end of the sanctuary plans and again at the beginning of the plans' execution (Exod 31:12–17; 35:2–3). The Holiness School also calls for reverencing God's Sabbaths and sanctuary in the same breath in two separate chapters: "You shall observe my Sabbaths and you shall reverence my sanctuary—I am YHWH" (Lev 19:30; 26:2). This association of Sabbath and sanctuary, as Knohl observes, effectively places the Sabbath "on the same level as the sanctuary."[11] When we recall that the Sabbath is a sign that God sanctifies the people and that their sins affect the purity of the sanctuary, we see how the Holiness School has intertwined its various perspectives on holiness.

The Holiness School also goes beyond the Priestly Torah in explicitly forbidding work, and *all* work for that matter, on the Sabbath. It describes the rest of the Sabbath as a *šabbāt šabbātôn* , an "occasion of complete rest" (Exod 16:23; 31:15; 35:2; Lev 23:3). In reference to festival days, the Holiness School uses this compound term otherwise only with the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:31; 23:24, 32).[12] The Holiness School designates *kōl mĕlā'kâ* "all labor" to be avoided on these two days (Lev 23:3, 28; cf. Exod 31:14–15).

The Holiness School's restriction of all work on the Sabbath builds on a distinction that the Priestly Torah appears to make in work allowed on different holy days. To understand this, we must first note that the Holiness School has combined two cultic events, originally separate in the Priestly Torah, into its version of the Day of Atonement: (1) an undated atonement festival (Lev 16:1–28), and (2) a fast on the tenth day of the seventh month, which was one of the "occasions of holiness" (Lev 23:26–27; Num 29:7–10). The Holiness School combined the two events by appending the fasting regulations at the end of Leviticus 16 (vv. 29–34) and adding elements in the cultic calendars to identify the tenth day of the seventh month as the Day of Atonement. This transformed the atonement rite in Lev 16:1–28 into an annual ceremony and converted it from a sanctuary-centered rite performed by the priesthood to one that included the people.

The Priestly Torah makes a distinction in the work allowed on its seventh-month fast day and its other festivities. Though it does not mention a work prohibition for the Sabbath (only Gen 2:2 alludes to this), it does say that "all labor" (*kōl mĕlā'kâ*) is to be avoided on the tenth day of the seventh month (Num 29:7, if the text is correct). Yet it describes the work to be avoided on other holy occasions differently with the phrase "laborious work" (*mĕle'ket 'ăbôdâ*) (Lev 23:7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36; Num 28:18, 25, 26; 29:1, 12, 35). This difference seems to imply that on the tenth day of the seventh month all work is to be avoided but, on the other holy occasions (the Sabbath aside), only laborious work is prohibited, which means that light work such as food preparation may be undertaken, a liberty that the Holiness School makes explicit for the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 12:16. The more rigorous

prohibition that marks the tenth day of the seventh month makes perfect sense since, even in the Priestly Torah, the people fast on this day (Num 29:7); there is no food preparation. The Holiness School picked up on this distinction in the Priestly Torah and, as it combined the atonement rite and seventh-month fast in the Day of Atonement, broadened the rigorous work restrictions for the Sabbath.

Conclusion

Holiness is a fundamental theological principle in both the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School. The Holiness School's concern for holiness grows out of its dependence upon the Priestly Torah. But the Holiness School also transforms and expands this basic doctrine of the Priestly Torah. One of the Holiness School's main interests is constructing a system in which obedience to God's commandments is logical and compelling for its audience. It emphasizes God's high holiness and covenant relationship with all Israel. Since God is holy, the argument goes, God's chosen people must be holy, that is, obedient. The Holiness School ensures that popular holiness is not just an abstract religious idea. It builds on the cultic customs of the Priestly Torah to tie the people's status to their spatial and temporal experience. It fleshes out the Priestly Torah's cultic geography, emphasizing the centrality of God's presence in the community. It insists that this paradigmatic force of divine holiness dwells close at hand, at the heart of the community. The Holiness School also raises the sanctity of the Sabbath so that it can serve as an effective sign of the people's sanctification by God. In short, while the Holiness School does not revolutionize the Priestly Torah tradition, it explains, adapts, updates, and reformulates it. In the context of the history of religious ideas, the Holiness School is an early example of the interpretive application of authoritative tradition.

NOTES

1.These designations are found in I. Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

2. In this essay, I generally concur with Knohl's attribution of material to the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School (see pp. 104–06 in his book for a summary). See also J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991) 1–62; B. Schwartz, "'Profane' Slaughter and the Integrity of the Priestly Code," *HUCA* 67 (1996) 15–42, esp. 16 n. 2. I differ from the foregoing scholars by dating the Holiness School to the exile, with some updating from the early post-exilic period, rather than placing it in the pre-exilic period. For some of the issues, see J. Blenkinsopp, "An Assessment of the Alleged Pre-Exilic Date of the Priestly Material in the Pentateuch," *ZAW* 108 (1996) 495–518.

3. This article fine-tunes the author's article, "Holiness (OT)," *ABD* 3 (1992) 237–49, which did not distinguish between the Priestly Torah and the Holiness School. See also the author's "Unclean and Clean (OT)," *ABD* 6 (1992) 729–41. In the present essay, translation of biblical passages and terms is the author's.

4. This chapter may have a Priestly core, but it appears to have been partially formulated

by the Holiness School; see below.

5. The centrality of the sanctuary is so important that the Holiness School maintains it even on the wilderness march (Num 10:11–28).

6. For this theology of the purgation offering, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 253–64.

7. The idea that the land is polluted by sin is found in various biblical texts and is therefore apparently a traditional notion; see Wright, "Unclean," 733–35.

8. The Holiness School's requirement that all slaughtering take place at the sanctuary (Lev 17) further indicates that the Passover animals are sacrifices.

9. Another class of holy objects is the priestly clothing; see Wright, "Holiness," 240.

10. For the difference in views, see Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence,* 14–19.

11. Ibid., 16.

12. The Holiness School uses *šabbātôn* ("complete rest") alone to designate the rest days in its supplement on the Feast of Booths in Lev 23:39. By analogy to the Sabbath (and somewhat metaphorically), it uses f *šabbāt šabbātôn* or the Sabbath year (Lev 25:4–5).