



Butler University
Digital Commons @ Butler University

Graduate Thesis Collection

Graduate Scholarship

1-1-1946

The Old Testament Idea of Holiness

John William Lambert
Butler University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lambert, John William, "The Old Testament Idea of Holiness" (1946). *Graduate Thesis Collection*. 371.
<https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/grtheses/371>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Thesis Collection by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.

(This certification-sheet is to be bound with the thesis. The major professor should have it filled out at the oral examination.)

Name of candidate:

.....John William Lambert.....

Oral examination:

DateMay 17, 1946.....

Committee:

.....Louisa W. Hallen....., Chairman

.....L. Marion Smith.....

.....A. Holmes.....

.....

.....

Thesis title:

.....The Old Testament.....

.....Idea of Holiness.....

.....

Thesis approved in final form:

DateMay 17, 1946.....

Major ProfessorLouisa W. Hallen.....

(Please return this certification-sheet, along with two copies of the thesis and the candidate's record, to the Graduate Office, Room 105, Jordan Hall. The third copy of the thesis should be returned to the candidate immediately after the oral examination.)

12

THE OLD TESTAMENT IDEA OF HOLINESS

by

JOHN WILLIAM LAMBERT, AB., BD.

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
Semitics Department

Division of Graduate Instruction
Butler University
Indianapolis
1946

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to acknowledge his appreciation of the encouragement and helpful suggestions given by his major professor, Dr. T. W. Nakarai.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	Page ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapter	
I. THE HEBREW CONCEPT OF HOLINESS	5
II. THE HOLINESS OF GOD	23
III. THE HOLINESS OF MAN	36
IV. THE HOLINESS OF PLACES	52
V. THE HOLINESS OF TIMES	68
VI. THE HOLINESS OF RITUALISTIC REQUIREMENTS	74
VII. THE VARIATIONS BETWEEN THE MT AND THE LXX	89
CONCLUSION	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Am.--Amos
Cf.--compare
Chr.--Chronicles
Dan.--Daniel
Dt.--Deuteronomy
Eccl.--Ecclesiastes
Ex.--Exodus
Ezek.--Ezekiel
Gen.--Genesis
Hab.--Habakkuk
Hag.--Haggai
HDB--Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible
HERE--Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics
Ibid.--the same
ICC--International Critical Commentary
Isa.--Isaiah
ISBE--International Standard Bible Encyclopedia
JBL--Journal of Biblical Literature
Jdgs.--Judges
Jer.--Jeremiah
JE--Jewish Encyclopedia
Jon.--Jonah
Josh.--Joshua

K.--Kings
Lam.--Lamentations
Lev.--Leviticus
LXX--the Septuagint
Mic.--Micah
MT--Massoretic Text
Neh.--Nehemiah
Num.--Numbers
Obad.--Obadiah
Pf.--perfect
Psa.--Psalms
Ptcp--participle
RV--American Revised Version Standard Edition
Sam.--Samuel
Trans.--translator, or translation
UJE--The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia
V.--verse
Vv.--verses
Zech.--Zechariah
Zeph.--Zephaniah

INTRODUCTION

While making a study of "The New Testament Idea of Holiness,"¹ the writer came to the conviction that the Old Testament background of the idea needs to be considered before one can reach the clearest comprehension of what is meant by holiness, or make the most impartial judgment of what new content it received in the revelation of Christ. He determined, therefore, to continue his study of the subject of holiness by giving additional attention to the Old Testament foundation upon which the New Testament concept was built.

Early in the study the writer found his attention arrested by the following statement:

It may be a little difficult to realize the original simplicity of this idea of holiness, expressing, as Wellhausen says, "rather what a thing is not, than what it is"; but from this meager foundation has been developed a series of the most pregnant significations in the whole range of Old Testament revelation.²

The purpose of this thesis, therefore, is to ascertain the Old Testament idea of holiness. To chart

¹John W. Lambert, The New Testament Idea of Holiness (Unpublished B.D. dissertation, New Testament Department, School of Religion, Butler University, 1945), p. 1.

²p. A. Nordell, "Old Testament Word-Studies: 3. Moral Good," The Old Testament Student, ed. William R. Harper, VIII (Sept. 1888--June 1889), p. 101f.

the course which holiness followed from the time when it signified "what a thing is not" until it came to represent in Judaism "the virtue par excellence"¹ is the writer's design. It is his intention to show what holiness was, and what it became in its application to God, man, places, times, and ritualistic requirements. He will deal in the first chapter with the earliest Hebrew concept of holiness, its assumption of ethical content, and its relation to modern usage. Then in subsequent chapters he will indicate what connotations dominated the word when it was employed in reference to God, man, places, times, and ritualistic requirements. In the final chapter he will present the results of the comparison of the Hebrew and Greek texts.

The final chapter of the thesis proper is necessitated by the writer's method of approach. He has consulted dictionaries, concordances, and encyclopedias; he has referred to magazines and books upon the religion of the Hebrews; but his principal research has been the comparison of the MT and LXX² at the places where $\Psi\tau\pi$ and $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ appear respectively. The assumption upon which he has worked throughout is that the Hebrew concept of holiness may be ascertained from the study of the word $\Psi\tau\pi$.

¹Louis L. Mann, "Holiness," UJE, ed. Isaac Landman (New York: The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1941), V, 417.

²For these and other abbreviations, see the list given on p. iv.

In the thesis chapter and verse references to the MT, LXX, and RV will be found. Because the research was done in the Old Testament Department, the reference to Scriptures will always be, in the first instance, to the MT. Where the chapter and verse arrangement of the MT and LXX agree against the RV, the reference given in the thesis will assume the following form : Ezek. 21:7 (RV 21:2). On the other hand, where the chapter and verse arrangement of the MT and RV agree as against the LXX, the reference will be indicated thus: Psa. 93:5 (LXX 92:5). In those instances where all three references are different, all three will be given, the order being MT, LXX, and RV respectively.

The writer has not deemed it necessary to give more than the chapter and verse references to the LXX. He has assumed that anyone interested in reviewing the Greek references in the thesis will have had sufficient background to know certain facts--for example, that in the LXX I and II Samuel are I and II Kings, and that Ezra and Nehemiah are combined in it under the title of II Esdras. Wherever the translation of the LXX is given, it is the writer's own. The reader may wonder why, in at least one instance, the Greek terms appear without the aspirants and accents. The following distinction will be observed: if the quotation is from the received text of the LXX, the aspirants and accents will appear; if the quotation is from the marginal reading, the aspirants

and accents will be omitted.

While the references to chapter and verse are, in the first instance, always to the MT, the quotations of the verses themselves will be taken from the RV. Thus it will sometimes occur that the quotation, though from the American Standard Revised Edition of the Bible, does not have the same chapter and verse reference as in the American Standard Version.

Honorific titles will not appear in the thesis. Those whose scholarly research will be used in the development of the thesis' argument will be cited by surname alone, unless it becomes necessary to distinguish between two men of the same surname. In this case, both their initials and their surname will be given.

CHAPTER I

THE HEBREW CONCEPT OF HOLINESS

The Hebrew concept of holiness is expressed by the word קדש . The purpose of this chapter is to consider three things: (1) the original concept for which the word stood, (2) the ethical concept which it later came to express, and (3) the essential concept by which the various usages, ancient and modern, are united.

The Original Concept

Etymologically the original meaning of the word קדש cannot be determined with exactness. It is highly probable, however, that both the verb and the adjective forms "had originally, like all such words, a physical sense, now completely lost, not only in Hebrew but in all the other Shemitic languages."¹

Two major conjectures have been made regarding this original, physical sense. The older view is that the stem is related to קדד , a cognate with קד , the root-meaning of which is said to be "enitiut, to break forth with splendor."² Upon this supposition Oehler

¹A. B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), p. 144.

²G. F. Oehler, The Theology of the Old Testament, trans. by G. E. Day (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883), p. 105.

comments: "Thus the idea of the breaking forth of brilliant light would lie in the word; compare specially Isa. x. 17, where the epithet 'light of Israel' corresponds to the Holy One of Israel."¹ However, Day, the translator of Oehler's book, remarks in brackets: "This view must be given up. With far greater probability the word שׁוּד must be referred to the fundamental meaning, 'separated,' from which the more specific meaning 'pure' could be directly derived."²

While Day's statement may sound dogmatic, it must be observed that Christian scholars of the last century have usually accepted the latter derivation of the word. The method employed by Whitehouse in the following definition is a fair sample of the way in which they explain the root-meaning of the word:

Our only safe course is to generalize from the use of k-d-s both as verb and as substantive in the earliest documentary sources, and of other words, such as h-r-m, found in all the Semitic languages possessing a similar meaning. We are thereby led to the conclusion that the term k-d-s expresses the separation or reservation of a thing or a person for Divine use or a Divine cult, and the state of an object or person so reserved and brought into close relation with Deity as inaccessible or hardly accessible, and invested with quasi-Divine character and power.³

On the other hand, the view of modern Jewish scholars approaches a synthesis between the ideas of brilliance and separation. As Kohler expresses it, "At

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

³O. C. Whitehouse, "Holiness (Semitic)," HERE, VI, 751.

first the word Kadosh seems to have denoted unapproachableness in the sense in which fire is unapproachable, that is, threatening and consuming."¹ In another statement of this idea he adds elsewhere a provocative parenthesis. After saying, "To Moses and afterward to Israel YHWH on Sinai manifested Himself in fire as an unapproachable deity, and therefore as a holy being," he continues parenthetically, "(Ex. iii. 2-5, xix. 18-22, xxiv. 9-17: 'like devouring fire'; comp. Ex. xxxiv. 29-35, the radiant face of Moses being the effect of his intercourse with YHWH)." ²

Granted that it is impossible to state beyond a shadow of a doubt the root-meaning of שָׁרָא, yet some of the ideas which were associated with it may be indicated. One of these ideas was inviolability. Whether or not one is willing to go so far as to say that holiness began with certain taboos, he cannot deny that the realm of the holy was not for general human intrusion. In the Old Testament the violation of the restrictive measures which surrounded the use of holy things invited danger of the Divine wrath and of sudden death. Uzzah, who put forth his hand to steady the ark, and the men of Bethshemesh, who looked into it, are prominent examples. Deity and humanity represented such totally different orders of existence that only a few select persons among

¹K. Kohler, Jewish Theology (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918), p. 102.

²K. Kohler, "Holiness," JE, VI, 439.

men could have contact with God, and then only on the basis of the strictest rules and precautions.

That שקד invoked restrictions is evident from its antonym, סח . This word denotes "that which is free or set loose for ordinary use, in other words, not subject to the restrictions involved in holiness."¹ The difference between the two words is drawn in Lev. 10:10 where, among other things, Jehovah tells Aaron: "And that ye may make a distinction between the holy and the common." Another illustration of how holy is opposed to profane occurs in Ezek. 45:4, where a certain portion of the land, the portion for the priests, is described by the words קדש מן הארץ . To give an adequate discussion of the Hebrew concept of the profane would require a separate thesis. One more reference, which is especially illuminative, may be mentioned. In I Sam. 21:4-7 it is recorded that in the lack of ordinary, unconsecrated bread the priest distributed to David's starving followers the holy bread that stood on the table before the Divine presence. This extraordinary occurrence leads Whitehouse to conclude: "The fact that the distinction between kodesh and hol is here expressed, and that the priest endeavors to exact conditions of purity, points to the conclusion that we have a departure from ancient and normal custom."²

¹Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 753.

²Ibid.

The ancient custom, he seems to feel, would have been to allow no exceptions whatever to the restrictions by which the holy was marked off from the common. A holy thing was something which was restricted in its use.

Kohler asserts: "In the ancient conception holiness was a transmissible quality."¹ To substantiate this statement he lists Num. 17:2-3; Ex. 29:37; 30:29; Lev. 6:11 (RV 6:18); I Sam. 21:6; Hag. 2:12; Ezek. 44:19; 46:20; and Isa. 65:5. In Num. 17:2-3 (RV 16:27-38) he takes the "they" to refer to the priests rather than to the censers, which is the sense given by the English translation in the RV. Ex. 29:37 states that whoever touches the altar will become holy; 30:29, that holiness will be transmitted by contact with the furniture of the tent of meeting; and Lev. 6:11, that whoever touches the offerings will become holy. Since the last four references in his list require a more elaborate statement than a single sentence, they will be discussed in the four successive paragraphs.

In Hag. 2:12 the prophet asks this interesting question: "If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any food, shall it become holy?" The priests answer, "No." Then the prophet asks, in the next verse, if uncleanness is transmissible, and the

¹K. Kohler, "Holiness," JE, VI, 440.

priests answer in the affirmative. Kennett interprets the incident thus:

The priests are here asked for an opinion on a hitherto undecided point. Their answer brings out clearly a principle which Haggai develops, viz. whereas indirect contact with holiness does not make holy, direct contact with uncleanness does make unclean; and therefore since the nation has so little contact with holiness, and so much with uncleanness, the whole nation is unclean and the sacrifices which are offered are similarly infected.¹

Peake suggests as an alternative explanation:

Or the point may be that uncleanness has an intenser energy for infection than holiness; it can operate to two removes, holiness only to one. Uncleanness may be primary in persons or things, a dead body is unclean in itself; holiness can only be secondary, since the sole source of holiness is God.²

The actual fact is that Haggai draws his moral from the priests' second answer, and the reader is left ignorant of whether or not the prophet approves their first answer.

The provision of Ezek. 44:19, that the priests leave their garments in the holy chambers, is a precautionary measure, founded upon the idea that holiness may be passed along even by the priestly garments. The Zadokite priesthood are given instruction that, when they pass from the inner to the outer court, they shall put off their priestly vestments and lay them in special chambers, because contact with the priests' clothing might sanctify the people.

¹R. H. Kennett, "Haggai," A Commentary on the Bible, ed. A. S. Peake (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd., 1919), p. 574.

²Ibid.

Ezek. 46:20 states that the sin-offering, trespass-offering, and meal offering are not to be brought into the outer court, for that, too, would sanctify the people. Under his discussion of this verse, Cooke refers back to his note on 44:19, where he says: "The supernatural danger of consecrated things is accounted for on the principle of taboo."¹

Isa. 65:5, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou," is translated by Torrey thus: "'I am taboo for thee,' the suffix really signifying an indirect object."² Whitehouse writes of the verse:

This expression occurs in a passage crowded with obscure references to the cults of Palestine into which the resident Hebrew population in the middle of the 5th cent. had lapsed. One who had passed through a ceremony of consecration warns another to keep at a distance, because contact with his own consecrated person might infect that other with holiness, and thereby surround him with a circle of tabus or restrictions which would disqualify him from discharging the ordinary duties of life.³

But whatever the words may have meant in the mouth of the one who uttered them, as the text of Isaiah stands they are words which Jehovah is quoting with disapproval.

In addition to the verses which Kohler lists to prove that holiness was a transmissible quality may be given II Chr. 8:11: "The places are holy whereunto

¹G. A. Cooke, The Book of Ezekiel, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937), II, 484.

²C. C. Torrey, The Second Isaiah (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), p. 468.

³Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 752.

the ark of Jehovah hath come." Whitehouse thinks Num. 5:17 should also be included. This reference concerns the trial by ordeal of a woman suspected of adultery. Whitehouse explains the mention of holy water in this verse as "the survival of such magical conceptions."¹ The writer, however, does not think that the explanation is applicable here, because v. 21 specifically states that Jehovah is the cause of the curse.

In the light of the references discussed above, the assertion can scarcely be denied that there are references in the Old Testament where holiness is treated as a quality, almost physical, which can be transferred, like an infectious disease, upon contact. The majority of these references occur, nevertheless, in sections the date of which has been thought, by some scholars, to be late. It may be questioned, therefore, whether or not the idea that holiness could be transferred, in a magical sort of way, by physical contact is really integral to the original concept. It is conceivable that such a view of holiness is a degenerated, rather than the original, one.

The Ethical Concept

The first problem to be considered under the ethical concept of holiness is the very difficult relation-

¹Ibid.

ship which holiness sustains, on the one hand, to uncleanness, and, on the other hand, to cleanness. Holiness and uncleanness comprise a contradistinction. Notwithstanding their difference, there is a close analogy between them. In Lev. 11:33-35 uncleanness is subjected to the same kind of restrictions as is holiness. This reference deals with cases in which something unclean comes into contact with earthenware vessels. Thus, if a weasel, mouse, chameleon, or one of four kinds of lizards fall into either oven or stew-pan, the vessel's contents become unclean, and the vessel itself must be broken. The resemblance between this section and Lev. 6:21 (RV 6:28) is unmistakable. In this latter passage the same prescription, that the vessel be broken, is given regarding earthenware pans which are used in the preparation of the flesh of the sin-offering. If a brass vessel is used instead, it must be thoroughly scoured. Peake sees the following idea of holiness as underlying these provisions:

The idea is that the "holiness" in the liquid will sink into the very texture of the porous earthenware, so that no washing will remove it; accordingly it must be broken, that it may not be used again. On the other hand, the broth could not sink into the closer texture of the brazen vessel, so that cleansing of the surface sufficed to remove the holiness.¹

Thus both holiness and uncleanness have an identical

¹An editorial comment in W. F. Lofthouse, "Leviticus," Peake's Bible Commentary, p. 200.

effect upon vessels. The earthenware vessel has to be broken, and the bronze vessel carefully scoured, whether it has contained sacrificial flesh, or has come into accidental contact with the carcass of an unclean animal.

The relationship between holiness and uncleanness is very difficult to grasp so as to avoid confusion in one's own mind, much more so as to try to make it clear to another. Oesterley and Robinson offer the following distinction:

The apparent incongruity that under the term taboo are included both things which are holy and things which are unholy or unclean, is confusing; but what seems to be a contradiction may perhaps be explained by an analogy: the word "awe" expresses the two emotions of reverence and fear; reverence attracts, fear repels; and yet in both there is, if one may so express it, the element of "keep-at-a-distance." One may draw near to a holy thing and yet refrain from touching it just because of its holiness, i.e. out of reverential awe; and one may keep from an unclean thing for fear of being harmed. The holy thing is awesome; the unclean thing is awful.¹

The easiest way in which the writer can conceive the distinction is to let the algebraic scale represent the idea of taboo, and to locate holiness on the positive side and uncleanness on the negative side. Both holiness and uncleanness are surrounded by restrictions. Holiness is positive because it stands related to Deity. Uncleanness is negative, being related either to disease or to some other kind of evil.

¹W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, Hebrew Religion (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930), p. 56.

Not only does holiness maintain a relationship to uncleanness. It also has an affinity to cleanness. The writer, though he has suggested that holiness and uncleanness are opposites on the algebraic scale representing taboo, must caution that they are not antonymous. "Profane" is the antonym of "holy." A similar warning must be given about the relationship of holiness and cleanness. Holiness and cleanness are not synonymous. Davidson differentiates the two ideas thus: "Cleanness is only a condition of holiness, not that itself."¹

An illustration of cleanness as a condition of holiness appears at the end of Lev. 11. This chapter forbids the Hebrews to defile themselves with unclean beasts, fishes, birds, and vermin. At the end of the chapter the motive behind these prohibitions is stated thus: "For I am Jehovah that brought you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God: ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy." The idea seems to be that, just as Jehovah is a God separate unto them, so the Hebrews, as His chosen people, should be separate from the things declared unclean. Other illustrations of this same principle, that cleanness is a condition of holiness, are afforded by Lev. 22. In vv. 1-9 of this chapter the priest, who is unclean from leprosy, from contact with a dead body, or from association with anything having

¹Davidson, op. cit., p. 253f.

contagious uncleanness, is prohibited from eating of the holy things until he bathes himself in water.

The relationship between holiness and cleanness, which is primarily ceremonial in Hebrew legislation, becomes filled with ethical content in Hebrew prophecy. For example, Isaiah says of the highway of holiness that "the unclean shall not pass over it."¹ Isaiah is the prophet usually credited with having begun the ethical emphasis upon holiness. His enthusiasm for ethical holiness may be traced back to his call to the prophetic office, when he in the temple saw the Lord, high and lifted up. Kohler appraises the incident thus:

In his first vision Isaiah sees the Lord surrounded by "fiery beings," seraphim, their faces covered with wings so that they can not gaze upon the Lord; and he hears the seraphim cry, "Holy, Holy, Holy that is, 'unapproachable' is the Lord of Hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory." Henceforth the burden of his message to Israel is God's holiness (Isa. i. 4; v. 19, 24; x. 20; xii. 6; xvii. 7; xxix. 19, 23; xxx. 11 et. seq. xxxvii. 23), and the Isaian expression "the Holy One of Israel," reappears in the exilic chapters (Isa. xli. 14 et. seq.; xliii. 3 et. seq.; xlv. 11; xlvii. 4; xlviii. 17; xlix. 7; lv. 5; lx. 9, 14).²

To disentangle the specific contribution which this vision makes to the ethical emphasis of holiness is not easy. Several considerations must be borne in mind. First, the idea of inviolability is still present.

¹35:8.

²Kohler, "Holiness," JE, VI, 439.

The faces of the seraphim, which cry that God is holy, are covered with wings. The fact that Jehovah is here described as holy has been assumed, by most writers, to be a contribution to ethical religion. About this assumption Waterman remarks: "Over against this, it may be sufficient to quote the statement of J. M. P. Smith: 'The term "holy" affirmed by the seraphs does not here connote a moral idea, but a metaphysical one.'"¹ Robinson appears to have the same idea in mind when he warns:

We must not make "holy" here a mere synonym of moral righteousness, or we lose the force of Isaiah's conception of God. The earlier idea of "holiness"--which, etymologically, may mean "separation" is that of inaccessibility, perilous and unknown power, involving mysterious taboos, and superstitious fears. . . . But when the moral ideas of divine righteousness and love were firmly grasped, as they were by Amos and Hosea, the recognition of the transcendent majesty of God by Isaiah gave them a wider range and fuller meaning.²

Still another explanation of the import of holiness in Isaiah is offered by Wallis. He reasons that the peculiar contribution Isaiah made to religious thought is the remarkable synthesis which he worked out between kadosh and mishpat: "Setting out from the merely physical conception of 'holiness,' in the sense of being separate or distinct, but without characteristic moral quality, Isaiah perceives that the logic of Hebrew history

¹Leroy Waterman, "The Ethical Clarity of the Prophets," JBL, LXIV (Sept., 1945), p. 302.

²H. W. Robinson, The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 69f.

makes Yahweh kadosh (distinct or separate) in relation to mishpat."1

These quotations all grant that the idea of unapproachableness has not been completely dispelled from Isaiah's concept of holiness; yet their authors try to explain the confessed ethical ideal of holiness as belonging primarily to the word "holy." While the writer has no inclination to deny Isaiah's indebtedness to the intellectual and social currents which were his heritage, the writer feels that Peters' affirmation that cleanness was the door through which ethical content passed into holiness is much nearer the truth. Peters' statement is:

To a certain extent this idea of the holiness of the land to Yahaweh was a general Israelitic conception. . . . He naturally, therefore, emphasized very strongly the conception of the holiness of land and people to Yahaweh; but he also introduces for the first time a spiritual element into that conception. Although within the holy land and even within the precincts of the Temple itself, although belonging to the holy people and conformed to the outward laws of holiness, he feels himself altogether unclean in the presence of Yahaweh because of his inward sinfulness.²

Against the background of an enlarging conception of the nature of God as supreme and transcendent, the Hebrews of loftier spirit perceived that cleanness should be moral, rather than ceremonial; and, since

¹Louis Wallis, God and the Social Process (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 238.

²J. P. Peters, The Religion of the Hebrews (Boston: Ginn and Company, Publishers, 1914), p. 232f.

cleanness was the condition of holiness, holiness itself became infused with ethical content. The development affected the language not only of prophecy, but also of legislation. It reached its most complete expression in the Old Testament in the seventeenth to the twenty-sixth chapters of Leviticus, which have been called "The Holiness Code." Barton writes of this section:

Like Ezekiel, this writer was devoted at once to the prophetic and priestly ideals. Nowhere else in the Old Testament is the thought that Yahweh is holy, and that, therefore his people must be holy, insisted upon with so much emphasis. He compiled a code of laws, many of which represented practices much older than his time, the main purpose of which was to preserve the holiness of Israel. Holiness, as here conceived, was, as among the early Semites, partly a physical condition, but nevertheless there breathes through his work a lofty and passionate devotion to the prophetic ideals, which links his work to Deuteronomy and to that of Ezekiel.¹

To the Jewish writers "The Holiness Code" is the summum bonum of their religion. Mann describes how holiness is the warp and woof of the tapestry of Hebrew daily life:

The meaning of holiness is made abundantly clear in chap. 19. It runs the whole gamut of human life, "revering father and mother," turning away from idols, in prohibition against "wholly reaping the corners of the field or gleaning the vineyard" but in "leaving them for the poor." Holiness is incompatible with theft, falsehood and perjury; it can not be found side by side with the oppression of one's neighbor or withholding the wages of the hired servant. Holiness vanishes with cursing the deaf or putting a stumbling block before the blind.

¹G. A. Barton, The Religion of Israel (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918), p. 133f.

Holiness demands justice in the courts, equality of rich and poor before the law; it requires just balances and just weights; it repudiates tale-bearing, hatred of human beings and vengeance; it culminates in "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."¹

The Essential Concept

From the ethical concept of holiness just presented, which makes of holiness almost what might be called the categorical imperative of Judaism, to the original concept, which regarded holiness as a physical quality contact with which was restricted to special persons, is a long intellectual stride. Yet there should be an essential idea by which the chasm is bridged. There must be, if language has any continuity of idea, a common concept by which the most ancient and the most modern usages of the word "holy" may be harmonized.

In summary of his discussion of the original concept of holiness Whitehouse says:

In all these holiness appears as a positive quality derived from close contact with a Deity or supernatural power which becomes deterrent and restrictive, circumscribing human activities which are free as to ordinary or non-holy objects. Holiness in primitive religion, like much else, is concrete and quasi-physical, and, moreover, is bound up with magical elements of tabu.²

¹Mann, op. cit., p. 417.

²Whitehouse, op. cit., VI, 758.

Under the discussion given in this thesis to the original concept, it was shown that, though there is a Scriptural basis for regarding holiness as a quality which could be transmitted like an infection, this magical element may represent a perversion of the original idea. Primitive holiness is defined, therefore, as that physical quality, the use of which is surrounded by restrictive measures, the violation of which measures is fraught with physical danger of punishment by the Divine.

The following quotation from Kohler gives both the ordinary explanation of the spiritualized idea of holiness and the usual identification of the genesis of the ethical content:

Out of such crude conceptions (as were present in the primitive idea) evolved the idea of God's majesty as unapproachable in the sense of the sublime, banishing everything profane from its presence, and visiting with punishment every violation of its sanctity. The old conception of the fiery appearance of the deity served especially as a figurative expression of the moral power of God, which manifests itself as a "consuming fire," exterminating evil, and making man long for the good and the true, for righteousness and love.¹

The writer has indicated, however, under his discussion of the ethical content of holiness, that, in his judgment, the spiritualized idea derives from the perception that cleanness is moral, rather than ceremonial. This perception, he maintains, is not simply humanistic in

¹Kohler, Jewish Theology, p. 103.

origin. It was derived from man's increasing apprehension of the nature of God and God's continuing revelation of Himself. Consequently, ethical holiness is defined as the sum of the connotations infused into the original idea as a result of the perception that cleanness must be moral, as well as ceremonial.

To illustrate the modern conception of holiness the definition of Rudolf Otto, given below, will suffice. This recognized mystic writes:

That which is recognized as the Holy is not of this world, and, as clarity of vision grows, its nature is seen to contrast to all mundane things. Even man, so far as he can perceive the essential nature of the Holy and its demands and can obey or turn away from them and become a "sinner," moves and lives in a sphere of existence entirely different from the merely "natural" and at the same time different also from the sphere of moral freedom.¹

Careful analysis of these three definitions of holiness will verify Whitehouse's claim that what "unites the most primitive ideas of holiness to the later and modern conceptions, which are ethical, is the fundamental principle of close union and association with the Divine."² Holiness is a quality, first physical and then ethical, which originates with the Deity and is favorably extended to persons, times, places, and objects needed in His service, and which is circumscribed with restrictions to prevent its infringement by those who have no right to possess it.

¹Rudolf Otto, "In the Sphere of the Holy," Hibbert Journal, XXXI (October 1932--July 1933), p. 415.

²Whitehouse, op. cit., VI, 759.

CHAPTER II

THE HOLINESS OF GOD

The holiness of God is one of the primary assertions of the Old Testament. He is the epitome and the source of holiness. While the word may, in its non-Biblical usage, signify a concept which is first associated with material objects and later comes to encompass the Deity, in the Old Testament, nevertheless, holiness is a concept which is attached first to God and becomes descriptive of man and things because they stand in a certain relationship to Him. After conceding that

In primitive Sem usage "holiness" seems to have expressed nothing more than that ceremonial separation of an object from common use which the modern study of savage religions has rendered familiar under the name of taboo,

J. C. Lambert makes this distinction between the primitive Semitic and the Biblical usages:

But within the Bib. sphere, with which alone we are immediately concerned, holiness attaches itself first of all, not to visible objects, but to the invisible Jeh, and to places, seasons, things, and human beings only in so far as they are associated with Him.¹

The holiness of Jehovah should, therefore, receive first consideration in a dissertation upon the

¹J. C. Lambert, "Holiness," ISBE (Chicago: The Howard-Severance Co., 1937), III, 1403.

Old Testament idea. As presented in the Old Testament, the holiness of God may be discussed under three aspects: (1) the holiness of His Person, (2) the holiness of His attributes, and (3) the holiness of His agents. This chapter will pursue the discussion in this order.

The Holiness of His Person

Since in the Bible holiness moves from the Divine to the human plane, God is the sanctifier. He separates times and men for His service. He is said in Gen 2:3 and Ex. 20:11 to sanctify the Sabbath; in Num. 3:13, the first-born; in Num. 8:17, the Levites; and in Jer. 1:5, the prophet. He designates Himself in Lev. 21:15, 23; 22:9, 16; and Ezek. 20:16 as the sanctifier of the priestly house of Aaron. In Ex. 31:13; Lev. 20:8; 21:8; 22:32; Ezek. 20:12 and 27:28, He is the sanctifier of the Hebrews.

Being the sanctifier, Jehovah both calls Himself holy and is called holy by those to whom His power is manifested. In Lev. 20:26, He takes the adjective to Himself, saying: "And ye shall be holy unto me: for I, Jehovah, am holy, and have set you apart from the peoples, that ye should be mine." Davidson insists that the following is the correct interpretation of this verse:

First, it is out of the question to say that, as Israel is holy, being dedicated to Jehovah, so Jehovah is holy, as belonging to Israel; and that the language, be ye holy: for I am holy, means

nothing more than "be mine: for I am yours." That sentence means, at all events, be My people, for I am your God.¹

In Isa. 43:15; Hos. 11:9 and 12, God describes Himself as the "Holy One" in such a way as to suggest that this term is a proper noun in these three references. Again, in Isa. 37:23; 41:14, 16, 20; and 43:3 the expression, "the Holy One of Israel," is upon His lips. In Isa. 29:23 He calls Himself likewise "the Holy One of Jacob." Moreover, He refers to His name as being holy in Lev. 20:3; 22:32; Ezek. 20:39; 36:20, 21, 22; 39:7, 25; 43:7 and 8.

But more frequently than by Himself, Jehovah is described as holy by those to whom His power is evident. Joshua, in Josh. 24:19; Hannah, in I Sam. 2:2; the men of Beth-shemesh, in I Sam. 6:20; the Psalmist, in Psa. 22:3; 99:3, 5, and 9; and the seraphim, in Isa. 6:3--all these, to whom His power is manifested, describe Jehovah as a Holy Being. In the sense of a proper name the phrase, "the Holy One," is applied to Him by the writers of Prov. 9:10; Isa. 5:16; 40:25; 49:7; Hab. 1:12 and 3:3. Though the epithet "the Holy One of Israel" appears in II K. 19:22; Psa. 71:22; 78:41; 89:19; Jer. 50:29; and 51:5, it is predominantly an Isaian expression, occurring in 1:4; 5:19, 24; 10:20; 12:6; 17:7; 30:11, 12, 15; 31:1; 43:14; 45:11; 47:4; 48:17; 55:5; 60:9 and 14. About this last-mentioned epithet Schultz writes:

¹Davidson, op. cit., p. 255.

The divine name which is found in all parts of the book of Isaiah, and occasionally also elsewhere, viz. "the Holy One of Israel," is worthy of special mention. As the whole context shows, this title is evidently intended to denote, not the moral character of God, but only His majesty as adorned in Israel. The main idea unquestionably is, that this God belongs to the people of Israel as the object of their worship. But the word chosen is also meant to express the incomparable majesty of the God whom Israel serves, a majesty constraining to fear and devotion.¹

Further, man pronounces God's name holy. "Thy holy name" is used in I Chr. 16:35; 29:16; and Psa. 106:47. "His holy name" is the phrase appearing in I Chr. 16:10; Psa. 33:21; 103:1; 105:3 and 145:21.² Though the construction is different, the idea that His name is holy appears also in Psa. 111:9, "Holy and reverend is his name," and in Isa. 57:15, "For thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy."

The idea fundamental to the holiness of God seems to be that of Godhead. Davidson claims that this was the ancient concept

It is so much peculiar to the gods, e. g., in Phoenician, that the gods are spoken of as "holy gods"; the term holy being a mere epitheton ornans, having no force.

and concludes that

Hence the term "holy" is applied to Jehovah when manifesting any attributes which are the token of Godhead, or which men consider to be contained in Godhead.³

¹Hermann Schultz, Old Testament Theology, trans. by J. A. Paterson (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892), II, 131.

²The RV also refers Psa. 30:5 and 97:12 to God's name, but both of these trans. alike from the LXX: "And give thanks in the memory of his holiness."

³Davidson, op. cit., p. 145.

Probably it is in the general sense of Godhead that Jehovah swears by His holiness. This idea is expressed in Am. 4:2 and Psa. 89:35. Am. 4:2 is parallel to Am. 6:8, except that in the latter God swears by Himself rather than by His holiness. Therefore, these two phrases, Davidson concludes, have "virtually the same sense."¹ Harper explains "by his holiness" in 4:2 to mean "by his majesty, 'his sacred awe-inspiring personality,' with the implication that he will vindicate his holiness by inflicting punishment for sin."² In Psa. 105:42 His word is called holy, and in Psa. 108:7 He is said to speak "in his holiness."³ In Psa. 150:1 men are enjoined to praise God "for his sanctity."⁴ Psa. 98:1 and Isa. 52:10 characterize the arm of His activity as holy. Thus, in the general sense of Godhead, holiness is the basis of His oath, the description of His word, the foundation of His speech, the motive for His praise, and the secret of His power.

¹Davidson, op. cit., p. 155.

²W. R. Harper, Amos and Hosea, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905), p. 86.

³Cf. C. A. Briggs, Psalms, ICC (New York, 1907) II, 59 on the omission of Psa. 60:6, which refers to "the sacred place of the divine presence. . . . and not 'in' or 'by His holiness!'"

⁴Cf. Ibid., II, 544: "There is no reference in the Ps. to heavenly beings or things, but to all that have breath on the earth. This inconsistency makes the reference to place in v.1 improbable."

The Holiness of His Attributes

While holiness is capable of the abstract signification of Godhead, it is more often particularized.

The word "holy" while expressing "Godhead" did not express this idea altogether abstractly, but always seized, on each occasion when used, upon some attribute, or connoted some attribute which betokened deity, such as majesty, or purity, or glory, or the like.¹

Five of God's attributes are thus characterized as holy in the Old Testament. They are glory, transcendence, judgment, spirit, and omniscience.

God's holiness is related to His glory in two respects: His holiness is the ground for His own people's glorification of Him, and the glorification of His people is the ground for the heathen nations' recognition of His holiness. A graphic illustration of the first principle appears in Lev. 10:3. After fire had come forth from Jehovah and devoured Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, for offering strange fire which God had not commanded, Moses comforted Aaron with the explanation: "This is it that Jehovah spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified." Thus it is evident that here "I will sanctify myself" and "I will glorify myself" are almost synonymous.

¹Davidson, op. cit., p. 147.

That God's holiness demands that His people give Him glory is seen again in Num. 20:12, where He says to Moses and Aaron: "Because ye believed not in me, to sanctify me in the eyes of the children of Israel, therefore ye shall not bring this assembly into the land which I have given them." The incident referred to in this verse is the smiting of the rock in order to get water. By taking the glory to themselves Moses and Aaron prevented the full might and power of Jehovah from becoming manifested to the people, and thus robbed Him of some of the glory which was rightfully His. The incident is referred to again in Num. 27:14 and Dt. 32:51, which speak of their failure to sanctify Him upon the foregoing occasion.

Perhaps in this same category of verses should be included Isa. 8:13: "Jehovah of hosts, him shall ye sanctify." This is the antithesis of v. 12 and, as such, raises a difficult textual problem.¹ As the text stands, the point seems to be that Isaiah's disciples, rather than fearing the political conspiracy of the day, are to render proper glory to Jehovah by making Him, instead, their dread and their fear.

Not only does God's holiness require that His people give glory to Him, but also it, in the glory which it will require Him to give to His people in their

¹Cf. G. B. Gray, Isaiah I, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 153: "Either vv. 11-15 were not originally the direct continuation of what precedes, or they call for a more satisfactory interpretation than they have yet received."

restoration, will be the occasion for His sanctification in the eyes of other nations. The idea that He will be sanctified in the other nations upon the restoration of the Hebrews from captivity appears in Isa. 29:23; Ezek. 20:41; 28:25; 36:23; and 29:27.

The second attribute of God to be considered in terms of holiness is transcendence. While the idea of glory is still present, in Ex. 15:11 that of transcendence is more prominent:

Who is like unto thee, O Jehovah, among the gods?
Who is like thee, glorious in holiness?

Again, in I Sam. 2:2, Hannah in prayer emphasizes Jehovah's transcendence:

There is none holy as Jehovah;
For there is none besides thee.

Kohler thinks that it is in the same sense, i. e., majesty or exaltation, that God is said, in the passages discussed above, to swear by His holiness, or, in other passages, to do the wonderful deeds achieved by the arm of His holiness.¹ It is quite plain that the unapproachable loftiness of God is what the Psalmist has in mind in 77:14 (LXX 76:14; RV 77:13m):²

Thy way, O God, is in holiness:
Who is a great god like unto God?

¹Kohler, "Holiness," JE, VI, 440.

²Kohler, the the reference given in the preceding footnote, also refers Psa. 68:25 (LXX 67:25; RV 68:24) to this same classification, but the writer agrees with Briggs, op. cit., II, 103 in retaining "into the sanctuary."

The same idea, that of transcendence, seems to be the explanation of those passages in which Jehovah may be said to be identified with a sanctuary. In Isa. 8:14 the sense is that "He will become a holy object, which no man touches or injures unpunished."¹ The sense of Ezek. 11:16 is that, though "deprived of Jahveh's Presence and of the sacrificial worship in the temple, yet they had not forfeited His protection."²

God's holiness is also associated with judgment. Isa. 5:16 describes God in this category: "Jehovah of hosts is exalted in justice, and God the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness." Davidson calls attention to the verb stem of the word "sanctified" in this verse:

The Niphal, rendered to be sanctified, means either to show one's self Kadosh or to get recognition as Kadosh. Here then Jehovah shows Himself as Kadosh or is recognized as Kadosh by a display of His righteous judgment upon the sinners of Israel.³

Nor is Jehovah's righteous judgment limited to the sinners among the Hebrews. In Ezek. 28:22, where the Nifal stem is used again, He sets Himself against Sidon and says that He will be sanctified in her midst when He has executed judgment upon her. In a similar way, He asserts in Ezek. 38:16 and 23 (the Nifal used in v. 16 and the Hithpael in v. 23), He will be sanctified in Gog.

¹Gray, Isaiah I, ICC, p. 153

²Cooke, op. cit., I, 125.

³Davidson, op. cit., p. 155f.

The fourth attribute of God which is characterized as holy in the Old Testament is His spirit. There are only three references in the Old Testament where God's spirit is so described.¹ They are Psa. 51:13 (LXX 50:13; RV 51:11); Isa. 63:10 and 11. Briggs gives adequate discussion of all three when he writes concerning the first as follows:

The divine Spirit was holy, as it was the presence of the holy God, requiring His people to be holy, not in the sense of ethical perfection, but in the sense of consecration, a keeping apart from all that was impure or defiling, in accordance with the conception of holiness in H and Ez. The phr. is used elsewhere only Is. 63¹⁰. 11, where the divine Spirit is identified with the theophanic angel of the Presence who led Israel up out of Egypt into the Holy Land. The people had then grieved Him. The poet conceives that the same Holy Spirit now dwells in Israel of the Restoration.²

The use of holiness in connection with omniscience is very interesting. Omniscience seems to be the idea inherent in the phrase, "the spirit of the holy gods." This phrase appears in Dan. 4:5, 6, 15; and 5:11. Montgomery argues that this is not "a polytheistic expression" but "the Aram. equivalent of JHWH's epithet in Josh. 24¹⁹ $\square' \psi \eta \eta \kappa \square' \eta \zeta$ (sic.)."³ Be that as it may, in Daniel the prophet is not troubled by any secret, and is able to interpret because of the residence

¹In Psa. 143:10 (LXX 142:10), "Thy Spirit is good," Codices Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, and Alexandrinus have $\alpha \gamma \iota \sigma \nu$ rather than $\alpha \gamma \alpha \theta \sigma \nu$

²Briggs, op. cit., II, 8.

³J. A. Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927), p. 225.

in him of "the spirit of the holy gods." It should be noted, however, that in 4:5, 6, and 15 the expression is upon the lips of Nebuchadnezzar, and in 5:11 the words are spoken by Belshazzar's queen. Consequently, it may be a mistake to assert that the Hebrews considered holiness to be associated with omniscience. In any case, the idea is expressed in all of its Old Testament appearances by Babylonians, rather than by Hebrews.

The Holiness of God's Agents

The reason for the ascription of holiness to the angels is not certain. Different suggestions have been made, depending, it seems, upon the religious faith of the commentator. The Jewish writers are almost unanimous in explaining that the angels are of the same nature as God, i. e., fiery beings.¹ The Christian writers, however, see in such description of the angels a space relationship. Moreover, they observe that, just as the application of holiness to God's Person is particularized, the angels are called holy when maintaining certain functions.

In Job 5:1 and 15:15 there is the suggestion that it was the custom of man to seek the intercession of angels. This custom arose because angels were considered closer to God than was man. Angels were called holy, therefore, "not on account of moral perfection (cf 4¹⁸),

¹Kohler, "Holiness," JE, VI, 439 and Jewish Theology, p. 102f.

but of their proximity to God."¹ It should also be remarked that the writer of Job did not approve of the practice of seeking the intercession of angels. As the commentator interprets it, the writer's argument runs thus: "Let not Job appeal to the angels, thereby manifesting the irritation of the foolish; but let him turn in the right temper to God Himself."²

Psa. 89:6-8 (LXX 88:6-8; RV 89:5-7) depict the angels as an assembly of worshippers in heaven, which form the counterpart of the worshipping congregation upon earth:

And the heavens shall praise thy wonders, O Jehovah;
Thy faithfulness also in the assembly of the holy ones.
For who in the skies can be compared unto Jehovah?
Who among the sons of the mighty is like unto Jehovah,
A God very terrible in the council of the holy ones,
And to be feared above all them that are round about him?

There are four references in Daniel to "holy ones"-- Dan. 4:10, 14, 20; and 8:13. Their function seems to have been that of Watchers. Montgomery explains:

The word ܠܝܬܐ is Aramaic in form, although it has its Heb. counterpart, and is doubtless an importation from the current syncretistic religion. Hence probably the addition of the exegetical 'and holy,' to secure identification with the angelic category. The same combination appears in Enoch: 20¹ 'the holy angels who watch,' i. e., the archangels; and 12² 'his (Enoch's) activities had to do with the Vigilants and his days with the Holy Ones,' the parallelism as below, v. 14. While the Vigilants become predominantly fallen angels, the original implication of the term as beings nearest to God is preserved in these references.³

¹S. R. Driver and G. B. Gray, The Book of Job, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), I, 48.

²Ibid., p. 49.

³Montgomery, op. cit., p 231f.

Montgomery also calls attention to the fact that, though he himself considers "the holy ones" fallen angels, they were regarded by Philo and the Syrian literature as guardian angels, and by a modern school of interpreters as the Second Person of the Trinity.

Again, the expression "holy ones" appears in Zech. 14:5. Here they are the companions of Jehovah at His advent for the deliverance of Jerusalem.

In summarization of the Old Testament view of the holiness of God, the following may be said: In the Old Testament holiness is a concept which moves downwards to man, rather than upwards to God. God is first holy. His holiness expresses in general His Godhead, but His Godhead is holy because it has a particular content. Jehovah is called holy when such attributes as His glory, His transcendence, His judgment, His spirit, and His omniscience are in view. This same characteristic of holiness, to come in usage to signify a particular characteristic rather than a general quality, is demonstrable in its application to angels. The angels are holy, either because they share the nature of God, or because of nearer proximity to Him than man. More important, however, is the fact that they are denominated holy when they are functioning in certain ways, such as interceding for man, worshipping God, watching over man, or companying with God.

CHAPTER III

THE HOLINESS OF MAN

Several aspects of the holiness of man should be considered by way of introduction. First, the application of holiness to man is a secondary one. It was indicated in the preceding chapter that holiness in the Old Testament reaches from God down towards men and things, rather than from taboo up to men and God. But regardless of whichever view one may take of the direction of the thought's movement, the holiness of man occupies the half-way position. It is a secondary and derived idea. Moreover, the holiness of man is realized through a human instrumentality. Though holiness emanates from God, it is required, nevertheless, particularly in the Pentateuch, for some human mediator to assist Jehovah in the sanctification of men. For example, in Ex. 29:44; Lev. 21:15, 23; 22:9 and 16, Jehovah describes Himself as the sanctifier of the priests; but in Ex. 28:41; 29:1; and Lev. 8:11, Moses is His agent to do the sanctifying. Although it does not come within the scope of this chapter, a third consideration about holiness, as applied to men, may be noted. Davidson reminds that it is the application of the idea

of holiness to men and to things that gives rise to the troublesome, and often vague, distinction between the clean and the holy and between the unclean and the holy.¹

There are eight different classifications of individuals in the Old Testament who are described as holy. These include the first-born, the priests, the Nazirites, the nation, certain prophets, individuals intrusted with special functions, members of select groups other than those regularly constituted by legislation, and the heathen priests and priestesses. This chapter will discuss the holiness of man in these eight classifications. However, it may be remarked that these eight classifications could be divided between two larger categories, which could be distinguished as the "regular" applications and the "special" applications of holiness to man. Under the regular applications would come the first four groups listed above: the first-born, the priests, the Nazirites, and the nation. Then the last four--the prophets, the individuals assigned to special duties, the members of the groups extraneous to the Mosaic legislation, and the heathen priests and priestesses--would comprise the special applications.

The First-born

In Ex. 13:2 Jehovah gives to Moses this command:

¹Davidson, op. cit., p. 152.

"Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast: it is mine." The verb "sanctify" here expresses the idea that God has chosen the first-born, and that they are to be separated from the others and dedicated to Him. This fact is referred to again in Num. 3:13 and 8:17. Both of these references occur in the discussion of the office and functions of the Levites, and it is stated in each of them that the Levites are substitutes for the first-born, whom Jehovah sanctified unto Himself at the time of the Hebrews' deliverance from Egypt.

The Priests

The holiness of the priests is an idea second in importance only to that of the holiness of the nation. In Ex. 19:22 Jehovah tells Moses to let the priests who come near Him (on the mountain?) sanctify themselves. Sanctification here involves conformity to the restrictions which deter the destructive judgment of Jehovah. Then in Ex. 29:44 Jehovah asserts: "Aaron also and his sons will I sanctify, to minister to me in the priest's office." But even though Jehovah makes the choice, Moses has the responsibility for conducting the prescribed ceremony of consecration. Ex. 29:1-35 contains the details for the elaborate ceremony by which this is to be done. The fact that both the sprinkling of blood

from the altar and the sprinkling of anointing oil are steps in the process is indicated by Ex. 29:21; 30:30; Lev. 8:12 and 30. The phrase in Psa. 106:16, "Aaron the saint of Jehovah," is probably to be explained on the basis of God's choice and Moses consecration of Aaron. Similarly, the "'consecrated' priests" of Ezek. 48:11 are designated thus on the basis of Ex. 29:1.¹

Having been declared holy by God and visibly acknowledged as such by Moses, the priests' holiness is to be respected by the Hebrews. Lev. 21:8 enjoins them: "Thou shalt sanctify him therefore; for he offereth the bread of thy God: he shall be holy unto thee." But the recognition of the priests as possessors of special holiness is not attained without difficulty. Num. 16:3 records how Korah and his company objected to the claim to the exclusive priesthood of Aaron: "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and Jehovah is among them: wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the assembly of Jehovah?" It may be suggested that Korah was the first Hebrew exponent of democracy. He objected to the distinction between the clergy and the laity. But his idea was premature. Moses answers in Num. 16:4: "In the morning Jehovah will show who are his, and who is holy, and will cause him to come near unto him: even him whom he shall

¹Cooke, op. cit., II, 534.

choose will he cause to come near unto him." Gray, in a familiar refrain based upon the documentary hypothesis, reconstructs the issue as follows:

The real point of this important story was for long obscured owing to the additions made by a later writer, who turned Korah and "all his company" into Levites. Korah's company in this story are not all Levites; probably none of them were Levites; and the two parties to the struggle throughout are Moses and Aaron (as representing the Levites) on the one side, and "the whole of the congregation," i.e., the whole of the rest of the people (. . . .) on the other.¹

Though the superior holiness of the priesthood was not accepted without questions, by the time of Solomon it is accepted, along with the priesthood's special prerogatives derived therefrom. After referring to the exit of the priests from the holy place at the time of the temple's dedication, II Chr. 5:11 explains parenthetically: "For all the priests that were present had sanctified themselves, and did not keep their courses." The priests and Levites' right of entrance into the temple, because they are holy, is asserted in II Chr. 23:6. Against Uzzah, the king who burned incense in the temple upon the altar of incense, Azariah and eighty other priests assert, as is told in II Chr. 26:18, that such is their exclusive privilege. They enjoy this privilege by virtue of their consecration. In contrast to this story is that, related in II Chr. 29:5, regarding King

¹G. B. Gray, Numbers, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903), p. 192.

Hezekiah, who acknowledges the priests' special functions and orders: "Hear me, ye Levites; now sanctify yourselves, and sanctify the house of Jehovah, the God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the place." II Chr. 30:24 and 31:18 indicate that this order was dispatched with thoroughness. II Chr. 35:3 and 6 draw attention to Josiah's regard for the holiness of the priesthood. Ezr. 8:28 shows how Ezra makes the holiness of the twelve priests--whom he appoints to bear the treasures, which the people had given for the new temple, from the river Ahava to Jerusalem--the incentive for them to guard the treasures carefully.

The Nazirites

It is the Book of Numbers which applies the epithet "holy" to the Nazirites. The Nazirite is described as holy only three times in the MT, and all three of these references are in Num. 6.¹ The adjective form appears in vv. 5 and 8 of this chapter. In v. 11 the Piel pf. verb is used in the record of the ritual by which the priest shall remove defilement from a Nazirite who has come into contact with a dead body.

The Nation

In Ex. 19:14 it is recorded that Moses, before

¹But in some MSS of the LXX a form of *ἅγιος* appears also in Num. 6:12; Jdgs. 13:5; and Am. 2:12.

going up on the mountain to receive the Law, sanctified the people. This, which was designed to remove them from the danger involved in their seeing the descent of Jehovah in the smoke which would hover about the mountain, was done in obedience to the command given in Ex. 19:10. Jehovah asserts, therefore, in Ex. 31:13, that He is their sanctifier. In Lev. 20:26 He describes the nation with the words "holy unto me." The prophet writes in Jer. 2:3 that the Hebrews were "holiness unto Jehovah." They are addressed in Ex. 19:6; Dt. 7:6; 14:2; 26:19; and 28:9 as "a holy people." "The holy seed" is the description of the nation given in Isa. 6:18 and Ezz. 9:2. In Isa. 63:18 the prophet petitions God on behalf of the nation, which he describes in his prayer as "thy holy people." In Dan. 7:18, 21, 22, 25; and 8:24 "saints" is the term by which the nation is denominated. These latter references incite special attention because they are

a peculiar designation for the Saints; for in 4¹⁰ $\omega' \kappa' \rho$ is used of an angel. This phrase is entirely different from $\kappa' \sigma' \iota' \rho' \iota' \epsilon' \lambda' \iota' \gamma' \iota' \kappa' \iota' \nu$. In the Psalms (30⁴, 31²³, &c.) the Saints are the $\kappa' \sigma' \iota' \rho' \iota' \nu$. But our author has chosen the phrase in our text to express the divine or supernatural character of God's people as contrasted with the other peoples of the earth.¹

The nation's status of holiness placed it under certain prohibitions. In Ex. 22:31 it is prescribed

¹R. H. Charles, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1929), p. 191.

that the people's holiness requires them to abstain from meats torn by the beasts of the field. Dt. 14:21 forbids them, because they are "a holy people," to eat of anything which dies of itself. In Ezek. 44:21 both of these restrictive measures are combined. Peters makes an interesting suggestion concerning this kind of regulation:

The Israelites are to be holy men unto God; therefore they shall not eat any flesh that is torn of beasts in the field. Here holiness is connected not with a distinctly moral idea, but with what seems to modern thought a mere provision of physical cleanness. To the ancient there was, however, something more in such a provision. Just as in Leviticus, chapter xvii, it is prescribed that the blood of wild animals slain in the hunt shall be covered up with earth, so that it may not become an offering to the demons of the field, so to eat the flesh of animals killed by wild beasts was to partake involuntarily in the worship of other gods by feasting on creatures sacrificed to them.¹

The prohibition against using creeping things in their diet is enforced in Lev. 11:44 with the words: "For I am Jehovah your God: sanctify yourselves, therefore, and be ye holy; for I am holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of creeping thing that moveth upon the earth." The condemnation of turning to wizardry in Lev. 20:6 is followed by these words of v. 7: "Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy; for I am Jehovah your God." The Deuteronomic

¹Peters, op. cit., p. 296.

legislation against making baldness between the eyes, which custom was in memory of the dead, is explained thus in 14:2: "For thou art a holy people unto Jehovah thy God, and Jehovah hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth." The necessity of respect for the devoted thing is illustrated by Josh. 7:13: "Up, sanctify the people, and say, Sanctify yourselves against tomorrow: for thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel, There is a devoted thing in the midst of thee, O Israel; thou canst not stand before thine enemies, until ye take away the devoted thing from among you."

In contrast to the prohibitive measures which holiness binds upon the members of the nation, the concept also places before them certain imperatives. It is required that they perpetually put fringes upon their garments. The reason for this is given thus in Num. 15:40: "That ye may remember and do all my commandments, and be holy unto your God." After having commanded them to exterminate all the other gods in the land into which He is to bring them, Jehovah explains in Dt. 7:6 the reason: "For thou art a holy people unto Jehovah thy God." The ideal held before them in Dt. 26:19, "that thou mayest be a holy people," enforces a charge to keep His statutes and ordinances.

Certain Prophets

Only two prophets in the Old Testament are designated as holy. They are Elisha and Jeremiah. In II K. 4:9 the Shunemmite woman says of Elisha: "Behold now, I perceive that this is a holy man of God, that passeth by us continually." Her idea of holiness probably involves the idea of the possession of supernatural power, for her hospitality to him is motivated by the desire for a special favor. But in Jer. 1:5, where Jehovah declares to the prophet: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee," the idea expressed by the verb is more likely that of choice rather than that of enduement with power.

Individuals Intrusted with Special Functions

Under this classification the writer places Eleazar. I Sam. 7:1 records: "And the men of Kiriath-jearim came, and fetched up the ark of Jehovah, and brought it unto the house of Abinadab in the hill, and sanctified Eleazar his son to keep the ark of Jehovah." The writer's opinion is that this verse could have been included among those which speak of the holiness of the priesthood. It is listed separately because Smith

reminds that "nothing is said of his belonging to the priestly family or tribe."¹

Groups Which Are Not Regularly
Constituted Orders
of Holiness

There are some select groups, not within the boundaries of the regularly constituted orders of holiness in the Old Testament, which are, none the less, characterized as holy. Of course, all these groups are within the nation, which is holy as a whole, but their designation as holy does not seem to be based upon the idea that they are holy because they belong to a holy nation. The nation is holy on the basis of the Divine decree. These groups are holy on other grounds. One such group is referred to in I Sam. 16:5, where Samuel says to the elders of the city: "I am come to sacrifice unto Jehovah; sanctify yourselves and come with me to the sacrifice." Then the comment is added: "And he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called them to the sacrifice." Here the command "sanctify yourself" seems to indicate merely the temporary condition of ceremonial purification as a requirement for participation in the feast.

Another such group is referred to in Dt. 33:3;

¹H. P. Smith, The Books of Samuel, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), p. 50.

Psa. 16:3 (LXX 15:3); 34:10 (LXX 33:10; RV 34:9); Isa. 4:3 and Zech. 1:7. The use of the term in these verses suggests a limited application of the term to those who belong to an inner circle distinguished by extraordinary piety. Moore suggests that the Pharisees may root back in such references. He supposes that the individuals referred to in the above verses devoted themselves to the Holiness Code, and remarks that "it is easy to see how those who made it their end to fulfill this ideal might take its name Perushim as a less presuming title than Kedoshim."¹

The Heathen Priests and Priestesses

A totally different application than is usual in the Old Testament is seen in the designation of sodomite priests and priestess prostitutes as $\square' \psi \gamma \rho$ and $\pi \eta \psi \gamma \rho$ respectively. These devotees to Astarte were known for their abominable orgies in connection with her worship. Upon this phase of ancient Semitic life the writers of the Old Testament looked with disfavor. Their condemnation affords evidence of the wide prevalence of the practice. The appearance of either, or both, of the above terms in this sense occurs in Gen. 38:21; Dt. 23:18 (RV 23:17); I K. 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; and II K.

¹G. F. Moore, Judaism (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927), I, 61.

23:7. Am. 2:7 and Hos. 4:11 are thought, by most writers upon the subject, to refer to the same institution, but the word $\psi\tau\phi$ does not appear in either of the verses.

While this usage contrasts with the ordinary tendency of the word to assume ethical implications in the Old Testament, it is not inexplicable. The conclusion has been reached, in an earlier chapter of this thesis, that the primary idea of holiness in its original usage was that of restriction from common use. This is doubtless the explanation of the special usage of the word in reference to the priests and priestesses of the other Semitic religions. Wood writes of the votaries to the temples of Canaan:

They lived in a convent, or a bridal chamber, a part of the time, and were expected at other times, when off duty, to lead an exemplary life, and not to degrade the performance of their sacred religious function to the level of secular gain. No blame or shame was attached to their calling. If any man falsely accused one of stooping to secular prostitution he was branded on the forehead according to the law.¹

He also gives evidence, from several locales, to prove that it was required throughout the ancient Semitic world for a woman to sacrifice her chastity, at least once in her life, at the temple of the goddess of fertility.² But in the course of time it became permissible, for various reasons, for a substitution to be made.³

¹W. C. Wood, "The Religion of Canaan," JBL, XXXV (1916), p. 53f.

²Ibid., p. 217.

³Ibid.

The majority of women sought, therefore, by the dedication either of their hair of the head, or of some obscene symbol, to be exempt; consequently, a special class of sacred prostitutes arose in connection with the temple.¹ This had its counterpart in a lascivious class of priests, who were also connected with the temple rites.² For certain celebrations the priests dressed themselves in women's clothes, and the priestesses in men's, and together they carried on unmentionable orgies. Against this background Wood traces the Old Testament contact with, and opposition to, the קדשו and קדשו as follows:

Israel first came into contact with the rite at Ba'al-beth-pe'or, where the people joined the Moabites in their religious feasts, worshipped their gods, and "played the harlot with the daughters of Moab." In Canaan they must have found similar rites, for otherwise the later survivals cannot be explained. It appears that from the time of Asa onward there were kedeshim, or sacred men, connected with the cult of the high place. The first reform which had for its aim the suppression of these "sodomites" began as early as the time of Asa, was continued by Jehoshaphat, but was not thoroughly carried out until the reformation of Josiah. In the latter reform the kedeshim were put down, and their cells which had been set apart in the house of Yahweh were destroyed. In these cells it is stated that women wove garments for Asherah. Hosea testifies that it was customary for men to "go apart with harlots, and to sacrifice with the kedeshoth"; which practice is referred to by Amos in the assertion that "a man and his father go into the same maiden."

¹Ibid.

²Ibid.

It is little wonder, then, that, with the ascendancy of ethical religion, these obscene practices should be rigorously proscribed by the prophetic writers, and by the Deuteronomic code which says "There shall be no kedeshah of the daughters of Israel, neither shall there be a kadesh of the sons of Israel. Thou shalt not bring the hire of a harlot, or the wages of a dog, into the house of Yahweh thy God for thy vow." Eunuchs also, because of physical mutilation, were excluded. "A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth to a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment; for whosoever doeth these things is an abomination unto Yahweh."¹

From this study of the holiness of man in the Old Testament, the following conclusions may be drawn:

The idea of man's holiness is derived from, and secondary to, an earlier application of holiness. There are eight different groups of people who are conceived by the Old Testament writers as holy--the first-born, the priests, the Nazirites, the nation, certain prophets, individuals intrusted with special functions, groups beyond the pale of the regularly constituted orders of holiness, and heathen priests and priestesses. In the several applications of the word to these eight groups, various connotations are present. Sometimes the description of one of these groups as holy is consistent with a single idea. The idea of choice seems adequate to explain the designation as holy persons of the first-born and those individuals intrusted with special functions in religion. As a designation of Nazirite and of heathen priests and priestesses, the word seems to mean merely that these two groups subjected themselves

¹Ibid., p. 218f.

to the restrictions which were considered to inhere in their profession. The command to the sons of Jesse to sanctify themselves meant that they should fulfill the ceremonial requirements for purification. On the other hand, the application of the term "holy" within some one of these several groups may be capable of a variety of connotations. Elisha is characterized by the word "holy" on account of his possession of supernatural power. But Jehovah's description of Jeremiah as "sanctified" is to be explained rather as indicating that the prophet is the object of Divine choice. As the concept is attached to the priesthood, in some cases the idea is that the priest is under the restrictive measures which fence in his office from secular infringement; and, in still other instances, that he is entitled to the recognition of the people, in which is involved their acceptance of his special prerogatives. Likewise, in its application to the nation the word means, in some references, choice; in others, prohibition; and again in others, the imperative of obedience.

CHAPTER IV

THE HOLINESS OF PLACES

The most frequent application of the concept of holiness in the Old Testament is that to places. These references may be catalogued under three headings: (1) plots, (2) structures, and (3) heaven. Under the plots of ground which are invested with sanctity ten sub-divisions must be made: (a) the places of the theophany, (b) the camp, (c) Palestine, (d) certain fields, (e) the tabernacle site, (f) the temple site, (g) tracts of land reserved for the temple officinary, (h) the valley of Hinnom, (i) Jerusalem, and (j) Mt. Zion. Three sub-divisions of the structures with which the concept of holiness is associated are required: (a) the sheep gate, (b) private houses, and (c) sanctuaries. In turn, those buildings which serve as sanctuaries are of three varieties: (i) private sanctuaries, (ii) the tabernacle, and (iii) the temple. It is not necessary to sub-classify the references to the holiness of heaven.

Plots of Ground

The Places of the Theophany

In Ex. 3:5, where Jehovah speaks to Moses out of

the burning bush, He says: "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." The idea of holy ground is probably the same here as that of dangerous ground. Oehler calls attention to the fact that in Gen. 28:17, on the occasion of Jacob's vision at Bethel, his persuasion that God is in the place evokes from him the comment: "How dreadful is this place! this is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven."¹ An occasion similar to Jehovah's appearance to Moses at the burning bush is recorded in Josh. 5:15. A man professing to be of Jehovah's hosts commands the military hero of the Hebrews: "Put off thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy." That the idea of danger is related to the places of the theophany is evident again in Ex. 19:23, where Moses reminds Jehovah that the people cannot go up to Mt. Sinai, because Jehovah had told Moses to sanctify it.

The Camp

In Dt. 23:13 (LXX and RV 23:14), among the regulations concerning the preservation of cleanliness during times of war, the presence of Jehovah in the midst of the camp is said to make it holy. This verse immediately follows the regulation that the Hebrews are to carry a

¹Oehler, op. cit., p. 108.

shovel among their implements of war for the purpose of burying the natural secretions of the body. The reason for this regulation is that Jehovah may be caused by neglect of sanitary precautions to withdraw from the camp.

Palestine

While the concept does not occupy nearly so large a place in the Old Testament as subsequent usage of the term "the holy land" for Palestine would lead one to imagine, the idea of Palestine as a holy land does appear in the Old Testament. In Psa. 78:54 (LXX 77:54) the word "sanctuary" refers to the whole land which the Hebrews inherited. Psa. 114:2 (LXX 113:2) uses the word more specifically of Judah. Likewise, Zech. 2:16 (RV 2:12) reads: "And Jehovah shall inherit Judah as his portion in the holy land, and shall yet choose Jerusalem." Interpreting in line with Zechariah's leading thought, that the new temple at Jerusalem will be the one and only shrine in the earth at which acceptable worship can be rendered to Jehovah, Mitchell explains this verse as follows:

When Yahweh returns,, he will take possession, or, supplying the adverb from the next clause, again take possession, of Judah as his portion in the holy soil of Palestine, the rest having been alienated through the fault of Israel, and again take pleasure in its capital, and the seat of its sanctuary, Jerusalem.¹

¹H. G. Mitchell, Haggai and Zechariah, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912), p. 144.

The reason that Zechariah describes Palestine as the holy land may be said, therefore, to be that the existence of the house of Jehovah in the midst of the land imparts holiness to it. On the other hand, Isaiah seems to conceive of the land as holy because it belongs to the holy people. This may be seen in the references to "thy holy cities" in Isa. 43:28¹ and 64:10 (LXX 64:9) and to "our holy and beautiful house" in Isa. 64:11 (LXX 64:10).

Certain Fields

Within the holy land certain fields are marked off as being more holy than the rest of the land. They become so because they are vowed to Jehovah. The last chapter of Lev. gives the details by which this shall be done. According to vv. 16 and 22, a man may sanctify either a field which he already possesses, or one which he is buying. In regard to the field which he owns, vv. 17 and 18 specify that he may sanctify it either from the year of jubilee, or after the year of jubilee. If it is after the year of jubilee, a reckoning must be made for the years which remain until the year of jubilee. If the man redeems his field, he pays, according to v. 19, one-fifth more than the priest's estimation. If he does not redeem it, it becomes, according to v. 21, "holy unto Jehovah" and a possession of the priests.

¹Cf. Torrey, op. cit., p. 235.

On the other hand, if the field which the man has sanctified is not his possession, he pays, according to v. 23, the priest's estimation in the year of jubilee "as a holy thing unto Jehovah." In reference to any devoted thing--whether man, beast, or field--v. 30 says: "Every devoted thing is most holy unto Jehovah." Thus in these references in the 27th chapter of Lev., the verb "sanctify" is used five times and the noun "holy" three times. In all five appearances of the verb--27:16, 17, 18, 19, and 22--the Hifil stem is used. Certain fields, which are themselves portions of the holy land of Palestine, may be said, accordingly, not to become individually holy until man of his own volition brings them into a special relationship to Jehovah. Such is the logic of the use of the Hifil, which has the causitive active sense.

The Tabernacle Site

Lev. 16:23 and 24 says: "And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went into the holy place, and shall leave them there: and he shall bathe his flesh in water in a holy place, and put on his garments, and come forth, and offer his burnt-offering and the burnt-offering of the people, and make atonement for himself and for the people." The portion of these

verses which is in question under the present discussion is the following clause: "And he shall bathe his flesh in water in a holy place." What is this "holy place?" Aaron is apparently still in the tabernacle. Was it necessary for the tabernacle to be pitched upon sites to which holiness had already become attached? That this is a possible explanation cannot be denied in the view of the results of the study of Semitic backgrounds which are presented by the scholars of modern times. Whitehouse writes:

In the primitive life of the Arabian desert, from which it is generally held that the Semitic peoples emerged, the main physical characteristics associated with holy spots would be fertility, the spring arising from the soil and creating a verdant oasis of shading trees in the bare desert. These manifestations of a full vitality were ascribed to the presence of a supernatural Power who took up His abode there, and some portion, or even the whole, would be regarded as His sanctuary, and invested with the restrictions of holiness. Canaan abounded in such holy places.¹

However, this is by no means the necessary, or the only possible, explanation. Nakarai suggests that the term **וִיטָה** may here simply be on the way towards becoming a proper noun.² A kindred, though not identical, view is held by Hertz, who explains the term thus: "A special chamber in the court for the purpose."³ In such cases, the expression "a holy place" would have reference to the tabernacle or its equipment, and not to its site.

¹Whitehouse, op. cit., p. 753f.

²In a personal interview with the writer.

³J. H. Hertz, The Pentateuch and Haftorahs (London: Soncino Press, 1938), p. 483.

The Temple Site

It is in reference to the temple rather than the tabernacle, that the holiness of the location of the house of worship is stated most clearly in the Old Testament. I K. 8:64 and II Chr. 7:7 relate how Solomon hallowed the middle of the court which was before the temple, because the brazen altar was not large enough for the sacrifices, and there he offered the offerings of the feast of dedication. In Ezekiel's ideal theocracy an oblation of land for the temple is required, by Ezek. 45:2, 4; and 48:21, to be in the midst of the domain of the priests, which is most holy.

Plots of Ground Reserved

for the Temple Officers

It is not surprising, in view of Ezekiel's location of the temple in the midst of the holy portion reserved for the priests, that Ezekiel is the one who most emphasizes the holiness of the priests' lands. Neh. 12:47 states: "And all Israel in the days of Zerubbabel, and in the days of Nehemiah, gave the portions of the singers and the porters, as every day required: and they set apart that which was for the Levites; and the Levites set apart that which was for the sons of Aaron." In this verse both appearances of the words "set apart" are translations of the Hifil ptep. of שָׁבַע. Except for this verse, the comparison of

the LXX and MT presents no other places outside of Ezekiel in which the lands of the temple officary are designated as holy. The teaching that the priests' portion is holy runs through Ezek. 45:4, 6, 7; 48:10, 12, 14, 18, 20, and 21.

The Valley of Hinnom

There appear, in connection with the promise of a new covenant from Jehovah, these words in Jer. 31:40 (LXX 38:40): "And the whole valley of the dead bodies and of the ashes, and all the fields unto the brook Kidron, unto the corner of the horse gate toward the east, shall be holy unto Jehovah." The reader will notice immediately that the name "Hinnom" does not appear in the Bible text itself. However, Keill and Orelli² are of the opinion that Hinnom is the valley referred to here, and there is so little opposition to the view that the American Translation includes the noun "Hinnom" in the text itself.³ The reason given for the future holiness of this valley is that its uncleanness will disappear and it will be included within the limits of the Holy City.

¹C. F. Keil, The Prophecies of Jeremiah, trans. by James Kennedy (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880), p. 46.

²C. von Orelli, The Prophecies of Jeremiah, trans. by J. S. Banks (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889), p. 236.

³The Bible: An American Translation, OT ed. by J. M. P. Smith and NT trans. by E. J. Goodspeed (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), p. 1331.

Jerusalem

The city of Jerusalem is holy. In Neh. 11:1; Isa. 48:2; and 52:1, it is described as "the holy city." The man Gabriel, when addressing Daniel in Dan. 9:24, speaks to him of Jerusalem as "thy holy city." In Psa. 46:5 (LXX 45:5; RV 46:4) the phrase, "the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High," which is in apposition to the phrase "the city of God" obviously refers to Jerusalem. Briggs takes Psa. 87:1 (LXX 86:1), "His foundation is in the holy mountains," as a reference to the whole city. He interprets the verse in this manner:

--on the sacred mountains¹, probably referring to the several hills on which Jerusalem, like Rome, Constantinople, and other great cities, was situated; especially in view of the great increase of citizens implied in the subsequent context. These hills are all regarded as sacred because they are parts of the city made sacred by the divine residence in the temple on one of them. . . .¹

Mt. Zion

Mt. Zion, upon which the temple was located, is the plot of ground most often called holy in the Old Testament. It is referred to as "the holy mount" in Isa. 27:13; Dan. 11:45; and Zech 8:3. Psa. 3:5 (RV 3:4); 48:2 (LXX 47:2) and 99:9 (LXX 98:9) designate Zion as "his holy hill." In Psa. 15:1 (LXX 14:1); 43:3

¹Briggs, op. cit., II, 239.

(LXX 42:3); and Dan. 9:16, it is described as "thy holy hill"; and in Psa. 2:6; Isa. 11:9; 56:7; 57:13; 65:11, 25; 66:20; Ezek. 20:40; Joel 2:1; 3:17; Obad. 16; and Zeph. 3:11, Jehovah calls it "my holy mountain." Jer. 31:23 (LXX 38:23) gives the following benediction, which will be revived upon the Hebrews' return from captivity: "Jehovah bless thee, O habitation of righteousness, O mountain of holiness." "O mountain of holiness" is probably an apostrophe to Zion. Daniel writes in Dan. 9:20 that his instruction about the seventy weeks was given while "presenting my supplication before Jehovah my God for the holy mountain of my God." Obad. 17 says that in the day of the Lord mount Zion will be a hospice "and it shall be holy."

Structures

The three structures which the Old Testament permits to stand in the relationship of holiness are the sheep gate, private houses, and sanctuaries.

The Sheep Gate

Neh. 3:1 records: "Then Eliashib the high priest rose up with his brethren the priests, and they builded the sheep gate; they sanctified it, and set up the doors of it; even unto the tower of Hammeah they sanctified it, unto the tower of Hananel." The structure to which this

verse refers was probably the enclosure, to the north of the temple, in which the sacred animals for the temple worship were kept. Batten has serious doubts about the accuracy of the verse. He writes:

Consecrating a gate, especially before "they erected its doors," arouses suspicion. . . . Doubtless we should read "laid its beams," as in vv. 3. 6.¹

He suggests, as the explanation of the error, that the editor had priestly sympathies and felt that laying beams was too common a work for the priests to do. While the sanctification of a sheep gate is unique in the Old Testament records of holiness, it is not inconceivable to the writer that the text may be correct as it stands. The spot where the sacred animals were kept may well have been consecrated to keep their sanctity inviolate.

Private Houses

Lev. 27:14 and 15 provide that a man may "sanctify his house to be holy unto Jehovah." This chapter is thought by most commentators of the present day to be late. It is noted that after the exile, when the community was (at any rate in the earlier years) impoverished and the maintenance of the priesthood was burdensome, the question of fixed monetary equivalents in the valuation of sacrifices and vows would become

¹L. W. Batten, Ezra and Nehemiah, ICC (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913), pl 208.

important. Thus it is specified that if a man vows his house, it cannot be exchanged with an inferior one; and that if he redeems it, he shall pay one-fifth more.

Sanctuaries

There are three kinds of sanctuaries in the Old Testament: (i) private sanctuaries, (ii) the tabernacle, and (iii) the temple.

Private sanctuaries. There are three references in the Old Testament which are best explained as references to private sanctuaries. Perhaps these sanctuaries were used for the worship of false gods. Lev. 26:31 warns: "And I will make your cities a waste, and will bring your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell the savor of your sweet odors." Inasmuch as this threat occurs in the midst of other warnings against disobedience, it seems probable that these sanctuaries were employed in idolatrous worship. In the similar tone of warning Ezek. 7:24 reads: "I will also make the pride of the strong to cease; and their holy places shall be profaned." Cooke comments upon this verse thus: "Not the temple, for that is profaned by Jahveh Himself 24²¹, but, as the pl. shews, the private sanctuaries on the roofs of the houses and in the gardens."¹ Then in Am. 7:12, Amaziah,

¹Cooke, op. cit., I, 83.

in an effort to dissuade Amos from prophesying at Bethel, says: "It is the king's sanctuary, and it is a royal house."

The tabernacle. It should be indicated that when the tabernacle and the temple are spoken of as holy places, the reference may not be simply to the building, but to various dimensions connected with the building. Thus the word "sanctuary" in the following references appears to be used in a wide signification, and to have reference to the whole sacred enclosure: Lev. 12:4; Num. 3:32, 38; 8:19; 18:1, 5; and 19:20. But in Ex. 29:43; Num. 4:12 and 16 the application of the idea of sanctity is to the tent itself. The phrase "the holy place" in Num. 28:7 may signify either the court where the altar stood, or the outer chamber of the tent. The inner compartment, or the most holy place, is the narrow sense in which the words "holy place" are used in Ex. 28:35; Lev. 16:2, 17, and 27.

The temple. The sanctuary most frequently described as holy is the temple. As in the case of the tabernacle, so in the case of the temple the reference may be either to the building and its grounds, the building alone, or special parts of the building. A general reference, comprehending the structure and its location, is perhaps intended by such references as the following: II Chr. 29:7, 21; Psa. 5:8 (RV 5:7); 20:3

(LXX 19:3; RV 20:2); 24:3 (LXX 23:3); 27:4 (LXX 26:4); 63:3 (LXX 62:3; RV 63:2); 65:5 (LXX 64:5; RV 65:4); 68:18 (LXX 67:18; RV 68:17); 74:3 (LXX 73:3); 78:69 (LXX 77:69); 79:1 (LXX 78:1); 134:2 (LXX 133:2); 138:2 (LXX 137:2); Eccl. 8:10; Isa. 62:9; 63:18; Lam. 1:10; 2:7, 20; Ezek. 5:11; 8:6; 21:7 (RV 21:2); 23:38, 39; 24:21; 25:3; 37:26, 28; 42:20; 43:12; 45:3; Dan. 9:17; 11:31; and Jon. 2:5. In I. K. 9:3, 7; I Chr. 6:49; 29:3; II Chr. 2:4; 7:16, 20; 29:5; 30:8; Psa. 73:17 (LXX 72:17); 96:6 (LXX 95:6); and Jon. 2:8 (RV 2:7), the reference seems to be more specific and designates the building itself. Smaller compartments within the building are the places of reference in Psa. 47:9 (LXX 46:9; RV 47:8); 68:25 (LXX 67:25; RV 68:24); Jer. 51:51 (LXX 28:51); Ezek. 42:13, 14; 44; 19; and 46:19. The inner-most chamber is referred to as "the most holy place" in, I K. 8:16; 7:36; 8:6; II Chr. 3:10; 4:22; 5:7; and Ezek. 41:4. "The holy place" signifies the same compartment in I. K. 8:10 and II Chr. 5:11. "The Holy oracle" in Psa. 28:2 (LXX 27:2) and "the sanctuary" in Ezek. 41:23 are also descriptions of the inner-chamber.

Heaven

Though He dwells with the Hebrews in certain spots, such as the tabernacle and the temple, heaven

is properly Jehovah's abode and is, consequently, holy. The "sanctuary" referred to in Psa. 102:20 (LXX 101:20; RV 102:19) is heaven. In Psa. 68:36 (LXX 67:36; RV 68:35); Isa. 26:21; and 57:15, heaven is indicated by the phrase "holy place." It is described as a "holy habitation" in Dt. 26:15; II Chr. 30:27; Psa. 68:6 (LXX 67:6; RV 68:5); and Zech. 2:13; and in the first two of these references an appositional phrase explains that heaven is intended by "holy habitation." Isa. 63:15 describes heaven as "a habitation of holiness," and Psa. 92:5 (LXX 92:5)'s "Holiness becometh thy house" is most likely a reference to Jehovah's celestial dwelling. In Psa. 20:7 (LXX 19:7; RV 20:6) and 11:4 (LXX 10:4), the adjective "holy" is the descriptive modifier of "heaven." Twice where the phrase "his holy temple" appears, in Hab. 2:20 and in Mic. 1:2, heaven, rather than the temple at Jerusalem, is the most appropriate explanation of the words.

The study of this chapter has demonstrated that in its application to places holiness has in the Old Testament a variety of connotations, ranging from the idea of danger to that of transcendence. The idea of danger is associated with the places of the theophany. The idea of transcendence is seen in the description of heaven as a place of holiness. In between these two contrasting views come the ideas that the camp is holy, because God is in the midst of it; that the land of

Palestine is holy for a two-fold reason--the temple, where alone God can be worshipped acceptably, is in the midst of it, and it is the possession of the holy people; that the valley of Hinnom, Jerusalem, and Zion are holy because of their relationship to the temple; and that the tabernacle and temple are holy because they are separated for the worship of the one true God. Through this chapter also runs the dual strain that there are places which are holy by virtue of the nature, such as heaven, and there are places which are holy because man has set ~~them~~ apart for Divine use, such as vowed lands and houses. All holiness of places is the result of either inherent or decreed relationship to the Deity.

CHAPTER V

THE HOLINESS OF TIMES

The periods of time which in the Old Testament are embraced by the concept of holiness consist of days, seasons, and years. Some writers in the field of Semitic backgrounds trace the concept of holiness as related to times back to the primitive man's observation that there are transitional periods in the year.¹ Thus holy times are said to have either an annual basis, and to mark the passing of summer into winter and winter into spring; or a lunar basis, and to occur at the times of the quarters of the moon.

Days

Reasoning upon the assumption that the holiness of times is derived from the phenomena of nature, Whitehouse writes that the holy days were of two varieties:

Among the early Semites the moon was determinative of the sacred days of the calendar. In the lunar month of $29\frac{1}{2}$ days the sacred days were, as we learn from the pre-Exilic Heb. prophets (Am 8⁵, Hos 2¹³ A.V. v.11, Is 1¹³; cf 2 K 4²³), the New Moon and the Sabbath.²

Admittedly there are passages in the Old Testament where

¹Wood, op. cit., pp. 57-63.

²Whitehouse, op. cit., VI, 755.

the Sabbath and the New Moon are referred to together, e. g., the references cited above. But nowhere in the Old Testament do forms of שבת appear in connection with the New Moon. Consequently, only the discussion of the Sabbath has been thought to come within the province of this thesis.

In Gen. 2:3 and Ex. 20:11 it is said that Jehovah "hallowed" the seventh day in that on that day He rested from His work. It is enjoined upon the Hebrews, in Ex. 20:8 and Dt. 5:12, "to keep it holy." The Old Testament teaches that Sabbath observance originates at Sinai. In Neh. 9:14 among the things for which Jehovah is thanked in the Levites' prayer is His making known to the people at Sinai His "holy sabbath." When the people agreed again to keep the law, which Ezra had read to them, Neh. 10:31 states that the covenant involved the following provision: "If the peoples of the land bring wares or any grain on the sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy of them on the sabbath, or on a holy day." The essential idea of the holiness of the Sabbath day, then, appears to be that it is a day on which work is forbidden.

When discussing the reference in Ex. 20:8 McLaughlin asserts: "The reason for the observance of the Sabbath, in the parallel passage in Deut. 5:11-15,

is simply that working people may rest (cf. 31¹²⁻¹⁷, Lev. 19³⁰, Isa. 58^{13, 14}, Jer. 17¹⁹⁻²⁷).¹ The idea is evident in other passages. In Neh. 13:22 it is recorded that Nehemiah told the priests to purify themselves and to come and keep the gates "to sanctify the sabbath day." In its context this command is necessitated by the practice of some merchants who have their wine presses treaded upon the Sabbath day, and of others who sell their wares upon that sacred day. Jehovah tells Jeremiah, in 17:22, to speak unto the kings of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem that they neither carry a burden nor do any work upon the Sabbath day, but rather hallow it. This provision is repeated in 17:24 as a condition necessary to the eternal preservation of the city of Jerusalem. Isa. 58:13 and 14 promise a time of spiritual renewal with the peoples' turning away from doing their own pleasure upon the Sabbath day and coming instead to honor it as the holy day of Jehovah. Profanation of the Sabbath, therefore, consisted in doing one's own ways and finding one's own pleasures upon that day. This happened in the wilderness, when the Hebrews failed to keep the Sabbath. According to Ezek. 20:20, the Sabbath was a sign between them and Jehovah. But in the time of revival which is envisioned in the later chapters of Ezek., e. g., 44:24, a characteristic of the sons of

¹J. F. McLaughlin, "Exodus," Abingdon Bible Commentary, ed. F. C. Eiselen, et. al. (New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929), p. 269.

Zadok will be that they hallow the Sabbath.

That the holiness of the Sabbath requires the restriction of work is made very clear in Lev. 23:3. In this reference the words "a holy convocation" are in apposition to the words "the seventh day is a sabbath of solemn rest." Mitchell says of the phrase "a holy convocation," which appears also in Lev. 23:2, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 26, 35, 37 and parallel passages, but which does not always refer to the seventh day:

It is clear that in this sentence **מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ** is the appositive of **שַׁבָּת-אֶחָד**, and therefore the equivalent of **מִנוּחַי' קֹדֶשׁ**. This latter phrase, however, denotes seasons devoted to Jehovah, i. e. sacred seasons, or in the exact sense of the term holidays.¹

Neh. 8:9, 10, and 11, where the statement "this day is holy" recurs three times, call for special attention. The day herein described is that which was normally set apart for the feast of Trumpets, but the observance of the day does not conform to the law's requirements for the feast of Trumpets. Batten seems to agree with Ryle that

the day became holy because the law was read, since the people would not yet know anything about this festival. The people did not know that it was a holy day until they were told, and certainly Ezra could not have been ignorant about the requirements for the feast of trumpets.²

¹H. G. Mitchell, "Miscellaneous Notes," JBL (1888-90), p. 159.

²Batten, op. cit., p. 357.

Seasons

The general assertion is made in Lev. 23:2, 4, and 37 that the set feasts of Jehovah are "holy convocations." These feasts are five in number. Lev. 23:7 and Num. 28:18 declare that the first day of the feast of Passover shall be holy. Lev. 23:8 and Num. 28:25 provide that the seventh day also, on which it closes, is holy. Lev. 23:21 and Num. 28:26 assert that the day of the feast of Pentecost likewise is "a holy convocation." The same description of the day of the blowing of Trumpets is given in Lev. 23:24 and Num. 29:1. The identical characterization is given, in addition, in Lev. 23:27 and Num. 29:7 to the day of Atonement. Three times the epithet is applied to the feast of Tabernacles. Lev. 23:35 and Num. 29:12 state that the first day is a "holy convocation." The eighth day of the feast, according to Lev. 23:36, is similarly holy. The sense of all these references is that such days are holidays: no servile work is to be done.

The time of a fast, as well as the time of a feast, is a season characterized by holiness. In Joel 1:14 and 2:15 the prophet commands that a fast be sanctified. On such an occasion the restrictions involved

in holiness are extended. Not only is abstention from ordinary work expected, as required by the holiness of the Sabbath and the set feasts; but, in addition, the pleasure of eating certain foods must be renounced.

Years

The year of jubilee is a holy year unto the Hebrews. In Lev. 25:10 they are told to "hallow" the fiftieth year, and in Lev. 25:12 it is described to them as "holy unto you." Three things characterized the year of jubilee: (1) all land was to revert to its original owner; (2) all slaves were to be freed; and (3) the land was to lie fallow. The year of jubilee marked the culmination of the series of sacred seasons based upon cycles of sevens. The connotation of holiness in this connection is again that of separation from other season by the maintenance of restrictions during the period.

In its application to days, seasons, and years, the concept of holiness is, therefore, that these are periods in which ordinary work is not to be done. The holiness of times is their restriction from work and their reservation for religious purposes.

CHAPTER VI

THE HOLINESS OF RITUALISTIC REQUIREMENTS

Three kinds of accessories to the rituals of the Hebrews will be discussed in this chapter. They are the animal offerings, the furnishings of the sanctuary, and the implements of the priestly office.

The Animal Offerings

It is hard to know what is the most satisfactory division to follow in the discussion of the animal offerings. In this chapter we shall consider first the first-born animals, then the sacrificial animals, and finally the animals required for special offerings. These groups are by no means mutually exclusive of one another. The first-born animals were used for sacrificial purposes, and the animals required for special offerings were also sacrificed. However, the most natural order of discussion seems to be that just indicated.

The First-born Animals

In Ex. 13:2 and Num. 8:17 Jehovah says that the first-born of beasts, as well as of men, are sanctified

to Him. Num. 18:17 specifies as holy "the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat." The sanctification of the male firstling of the herd and flock is commanded in Dt. 15:19. In the latter reference the three restrictions necessitated by the sanctification are (1) that no work be done with the firstling of the herd; (2) that no wool be sheared from the firstling of the flock; and (3) that these first-born provide for their owner and his household a yearly sacrificial meal. Harford explains the yearly meal thus: "Animal firstlings, as among other peoples, were sacrificed either simply in thankfulness for the fruitfulness bestowed and expected, or with the further idea of sanctioning the use and enjoyment of later offspring."¹

The Sacrificial Animals

In Ex. 29:34 the ram by which Aaron and his sons are consecrated to the priesthood is called holy. It is holy because the following restrictions surround its use: (1) it must be prepared in a holy place; (2) a stranger is forbidden to eat of it; and (3) none of the meat which remains over until morning may be eaten by anyone.

The remainder of the meal-offering, which is

¹Geo. Harford, "Exodus," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 179.

reserved for Aaron and his sons, is described as a thing "most holy" in Lev. 2:3, 10; 6:9 (RV 6:17); and 10:12. Lofthouse offers this explanation of its classification as "most holy":

Part of the offering belongs to Yahweh (i. e. must be burnt), part to the priests; this is the case with all offerings classed as "most holy" (holy in the first class). A "holy" thing (holy in the second class) could be eaten by a layman, but not by a foreigner (cf. 22₁₀).¹

While this differentiation between the "most holy" and the "holy" may apply in Leviticus, it is not consistently so in the Old Testament, as will be noted subsequently in this chapter.

Lev. 6:18 (RV 6:25) and 6:23 (RV 6:29) classify the sin-offering as "most holy." On account of its holiness, the sin-offering must be killed in the place where the burnt-offering² was killed, eaten only by the priests, and carefully guarded against transmitting its holiness to others. Four precautions are exercised

¹Lofthouse, "Leviticus," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 179.

²Cf. Oehler, op. cit., p. 284: "In respect to rank (1), the offering of atonement, as אֲשֶׁר קָדֵשׁ קָדֵשׁ a thing most holy (vi. 18, 22, vii. 1, 6, etc.) stands higher than the peace-offering, which, like presented first-fruits, is expressly called simply קָדֵשׁ, a holy thing. But since the food-offerings also are called most holy (ii. 3, 10, vi. 10, x. 12), the designation אֲשֶׁר קָדֵשׁ קָדֵשׁ is probably omitted by accident in speaking of the burnt-offering, which certainly was an offering of the higher rank." The references are to Leviticus.

to keep its holiness from being passed on. First, it must be eaten in a holy place. Second, any garment whereon its blood is sprinkled must be washed in a holy place. Third, if an earthenware vessel has been used for its preparation, that vessel must be broken. Four, if it has been boiled in a bronze vessel, that vessel must be thoroughly scoured.

The two he-lambs used in the peace-offering are described in Lev. 23:20 as "holy to Jehovah for the priest." The reference to "holy flesh" in Hag. 2:12 is probably to that share of the peace-offering which belongs to the worshippers themselves. Likewise Jer. 11:15 is a probable reference to the peace-offering.

Num. 18:8 describes as "hallowed things" those parts of the offerings which are not burnt upon the altar, but belong to the priests. The following verse lists the meal-offering, sin-offering, and trespass-offering as "most holy." That this designation does not have a consistent meaning throughout the Old Testament, as has already been indicated, is pointed out by Gray in these words:

The term "most holy" may be used of the offerings mentioned in this and the next verse, because they "obtained a higher consecration" as compared with those mentioned in v. 11ff. (see Driver and White, Leviticus, p. 63f.; or, more fully, Baudissin, Studien, ii. 52ff.); but the terms "holy" and "most holy" are used rather indifferently, as is shown by a comparison of the last clauses of v. 9 and 10.¹

¹Gray, Numbers, ICC, p. 222

Num. 18:19, the summary verse of the section, again describes as "holy things" those portions of the offerings which fall to the priests.

Curtis identifies the phrase of II Chr. 31:14, "the most holy things," as a reference to "the portions of sin-offerings and trespass-offerings which were to be eaten by the priests in the sanctuary (cf. Lv. 23. 10 610 (18) 22 (30) 76 1012. 171413 Nu. 189. 9)."¹

Ezr. 2:63 and Neh. 7:65, parallel passages, relate how the contenders for the priesthood who could not find their names in the registry were told by the governor that "they should not eat of the most holy things, till there stood up a priest with Urim and Thummim." Oesterley interprets the reference as to those objects which only the priests could touch and cites Num. 18:9-11 as the cross-reference.² Similarly, the accusation of Ezek. 22:8--"Thou hast despised my holy things"--probably has reference to the unlawful handling and eating of the things which only the priests have the right to handle and to eat. The words "my holy things" occur again in Ezek. 22:26, but here they have been profaned by the priests themselves, who failed to make a distinction between the holy and the common, between the clean and the unclean.

¹Curtis, op. cit., p. 482.

²W. O. E. Oesterley, "Ezra-Nehemiah," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, p. 326.

Those portions of the sacrifices which are reserved for the priests are carefully protected. Num. 18:29 specifies that the tithe of the tithe which the Levites offer to the priests is to be "the hallowed part." The prohibition laid upon the Levites in Num. 18:32, "ye shall not profane the holy things of the children of Israel," indicates that by the possession of the tithe the Levites will have no temptation to take, and thereby to profane, the offerings which are made by the Hebrews. Lev. 22:10 declares that a stranger, sojourner, or hired servant cannot eat of the holy thing; according to v. 11, however, a priest's slave may eat of the priest's bread, for he is a member of the household. A priest's daughter who is married to a stranger is forbidden, in v. 12, to eat of the holy things; on the other hand, v. 13 permits her to eat of her father's bread if she is either a widow or a childless divorcee. The parallelism in these verses indicates that the holy things are the priest's foodstuffs. They are holy, because they do not belong to everyone. It is provided, in vv. 14-16, that those who infringe upon the priests' rights and accidentally partake of their food shall make a guilt-offering of the valuation of the thing profaned plus one-fifth.

Ezek. 42:13 supposes that in the ideal theocracy the new temple's north and south chambers, which will

be holy, are reserved for the priests to eat the most holy things there. Along with the most holy things are catalogued the meal-offering, the sin-offering, and the trespass-offering. A special kitchen is envisioned in Ezek. 46:20 in which these three sacrifices will be prepared. The reason for the kitchen is that their preparation in the outer court would run the risk of transmitting holiness to the people. A flock, from which sacrificial animals would ever be available for the worship, will be needed in the era of rejuvenated worship at the new temple. Therefore in Ezek. 36:38 the RV's "flock of sacrifices" is literally "flock of holy things" in the MT and "holy flock" in the LXX.

The Animals Needed for

Special Offerings

A surprising usage of the word שָׁרָף, at first thought, is in reference to war. The reason for this unusual usage is that the Hebrews inaugurated their military expeditions by sacrifices. This is said to "consecrate" war in Mic. 3:5 and Jer. 6:4. Jdgs. 6:20, 26; 20:26; I Sam. 7:9 and 13:10 indicate that they offered burnt-offerings at the opening of a campaign.

In II Chr. 29:33 it is written: "And the consecrated things were six hundred oxen and three thousand

sheep." Curtis reasons that "the consecrated things" were thank-offerings and explains that "the thank-offering was a sacrifice offered for some special benefit received; here an expression of joy over the renewal of the worship of Yahweh in the Temple (for ritual cf. Lv. 7:12ff.)."¹

In the chapter of business-like provisions for the priestly income, Lev. 27:9 and 10 legislate that an animal which has once been vowed to Jehovah must be treated as holy. This involves also the principle that any attempt to substitute an inferior animal for the one vowed renders both of them holy.

Num. 5:9 provides that the person who has misappropriated property and desires to make restitution shall give the property to the priest, if the one from whom he misappropriated it is not living and has no legal heir. The subsequent verse makes it clear that the contribution belongs to the particular priest to whom the confession is made, and not to the whole priestly community.

It is said in Num. 6:20 that the wave-offering in the ceremony of purification of the Nazirite is "holy for the priest."

¹Curtis, op. cit., p. 469.

The phrase "thy holy things" in Dt. 12:26 may refer either to the obligatory or to the voluntary altar gifts, or to both.

Neh. 10:34 (LXX 20:34; RV 10:33) lists among the things for which the people taxed themselves "the holy things." This phrase is a separate item among such items as the burnt-offerings, continual meal-offerings, Sabbaths, New Moons, set feasts (or, feasts specially designated), and the sin-offerings.

The Furnishings of the Sanctuary

Not only the location of the sanctuary is invested with holiness, but also the apparatus needed within the sanctuary area for the purposes of worship. Ex. 29:36 requires the priests, after they have purged the altar by making atonement for it, to sanctify it by anointing it. The next verse states that after this process has been repeated for seven days the altar will be so holy that its holiness will be infectious. Ex. 29:44 contains Jehovah's promise to sanctify the altar, as well as Aaron, his sons, and the tent of meeting. Ex. 30:29 is a command that Moses sanctify the altar, its vessels, the laver, and the laver's base. Lev. 8:11 describes how he fulfilled this command by sprinkling the anointing oil seven times upon the altar, its vessels, the laver, and the laver's base. In addition to this, Lev. 8:15 states that the ceremony in connection

with the sin-offering also serves to sanctify the altar. The sprinkling of the blood seven times upon it on the day of atonement answers the same purpose, according to Lev. 16:19.

Ex. 40:9 states that in consequence of Moses' anointing with the anointing oil the tabernacle and all of its furniture, these will be holy. The fact that he thus sanctified them is recorded in Lev. 8:10 and Num. 7:1.

As it is used in Num. 18:3; 31:6; I Chr. 9:29; and Neh. 10:39 the phrase "vessels of the sanctuary" seems to be a general reference to the articles of furniture which were placed in the sanctuary. In I Chr. 22:19 they are described as "the holy vessels of God," and II Chr. 5:5 denominates them "the holy vessels that were in the tent."

Num. 16:37 and 38 describe the censers as holy.

If Lev. 21:22 is a reference to the shewbread, the shewbread may have two ranks of holiness, "most holy" and "holy." The verse gives no indication of the basis of differentiation. In Lev. 24:9, where the reference is made to the shewbread specifically, it is described as "most holy" to Aaron and his sons. On the other hand, in I Sam. 21:4, that familiar passage describing how David and his followers ate the shewbread, it is called only "holy bread."

II Chr. 8:11 states that "the places are holy whereunto the ark of Jehovah hath come." It is not

surprising, therefore, to find in II Chr. 35:3 that the word "ark" is modified by the word "holy."

Num. 4:4 designates the service of the Kohathites as belonging to "the most holy things." The same phrase recurs in Num. 4:19. From the context it is clear that their duty was to be porters of the furniture of the sanctuary. Gray rightly insists that the RV's translation "sanctuary" in Num. 4:15, 20; 7:9; and 10:21 should be "holy things."¹ He explains this correction of the RV in his comments under 10:21:

שְׁכֵן cannot here mean "sanctuary" (RV), though that is its usual meaning; for the building when taken to pieces is carried by the Merarites and Gershonites, v 17 3 25f. 36f. The use of שְׁכֵן here is quite exceptional and indeed improper; the nearest parallel is 18 29; in both cases the text may be at fault.²

The "shekel of the sanctuary" is referred to in Lev. 27:3, 25; Num. 3:47, 50; 7:13, 19, 25, 85, 86; and 18:16. Lengthy discussions have been given to this subject by various scholars like Kennedy.³ The fact that it is possible to translate the phrase as "sacred shekel" is admitted. In such case, it would be a mislocation to include this section of the discussion under the heading of the furnishings of the sanctuary. But excavation of numerous sites in Palestine have brought

¹Gray, Numbers, ICC, pp. 35, 36, 76, 91f.

²Ibid., p. 91f.

³A. R. S. Kennedy, "Money," HDB (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1901), III, 417-432.

to light the hundreds of weights belonging to a variety of systems of money. The standard weight seems to have been the "shekel of the sanctuary." It is not inconceivable to the writer that in the period before coined money was known, when all transactions were made by means of the balance, a balance was normal equipment for the sanctuary.

Although they may not originally have belonged to the "holy things" in the sanctuary, spoils of war in time came to have a place there. Josh. 6:19 describes the loot of silver, gold, brass, and iron which was taken at Jericho as "holy unto Jehovah." In Judg. 17:3 Micah's mother dedicates the eleven hundred pieces of silver which he had stolen from her to Jehovah, to make a graven image and a molten image. Micah seems, according to the context, to have had a sanctuary of his own, though a worshipper of Jehovah, and to have placed this idol there. II Sam. 8:11 relates that David dedicated to Jehovah the vessels of silver, gold, and brass which King Toi sent by Joram. The parallel account, I Chr. 18:11 recounts the same fact. Neither of these verses tells where David put the treasures for safe-keeping. In I K. 7:37 (LXX and RV 7:51), however, it is written:

Thus all the work that king Solomon wrought in the house of Jehovah was finished. And Solomon brought in the things which David his father had dedicated, even the silver, and the gold, and the vessels, and put them in the treasuries of the house of Jehovah.

Again, I Chr. 26:26-28 identify Shelomoth and his brethren as treasurers over "the dedicated things" which David,

Samuel, Saul, Abner, and Joash had consecrated to Jehovah.

II K. 12:18 depicts vividly the straightened condition to which the integrity of Judah was reduced by Hazael:

And Jehoash king of Judah took all the hallowed things that Jehoshaphat and Jehoram and Ahaziah, his fathers, kings of Judah, had dedicated, and his own hallowed things, and all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of Jehovah, and of the king's house, and sent it to Hazael king of Syria: and he went away from Jerusalem.

Since spoils of war became part of the furnishings of Jehovah's sanctuaries, it is not surprising that Isa. 23:18 should envision a day when Tyre's merchandise and hire would be "holiness to Jehovah."

Implements of the Priestly Office

In addition to the sacrificial animals and the various articles of furniture and furnishing found in the sanctuary, the holiness of ritualistic requirements includes the implements of the priestly office.

The recipe for anointing oil is given in Ex. 30: 22-25. It is described as "holy" in vv. 25, 31, and 32. Because it is holy it cannot be poured upon the flesh of an ordinary man, nor are the Hebrew congregation to make any like it. The oil is to be used in the anointing of the tent of meeting, its furniture, and the priests. Num. 35:25 describes the high priest in terms of one "who was anointed with the holy oil." In Psa. 89:21 (LXX 88:21; RV 89:20) Jehovah speaks of David thus: "With my holy oil have I anointed him."

In Ex. 30:35 and 37 the incense is declared to be holy. The reason it is holy is that it is dangerous to the laymen to duplicate it. Any person who tries to do so is threatened with exclusion from his people.

The priests' dress is the implement of their office most often referred to as "holy." In Ex. 28:36 Moses is commanded to engrave upon the gold plate, which Aaron is to wear in the center of his turban, the words, "Holy to Jehovah." Ex. 29:6 suggests that upon this turban he is to wear a crown, which is a "holy crown."

According to Ex. 8:30, Moses not only sanctified Aaron and his sons by sprinkling them with the anointing oil and with the blood, but also their garments. Lev. 16:4 prescribes that Aaron wear "the holy linen coat" when he goes into the holy place once each year to make atonement. In Ezek.'s picture of the restored temple, the priests who prepare the Meal-offering, Sin-offering, and Trespass-offering in the special kitchen will "not go out of the holy place into the outer court, but there they shall lay their garments wherein they minister: for they are holy: and they shall put on other garments, and shall approach to that which pertaineth to the people."

In conformity with this idea that special attire is desirable for the worship of Jehovah, the command, "Worship Jehovah in holy array," appears in I Chr. 16:29; II Chr. 20:21; Psa. 29:2 (LXX 28:2); Psa. 96:9 (95:9); and 110:3 (LXX 109:3). In all of these the sense of worshipping

in priestly garments is the explanation.

This chapter has revealed that when used of ritualistic requirements holiness carries the connotation of reservation from common usage and restriction of special usage. The restrictions surrounding the special usage are safe-guards from danger of punishment. First-born animals are reserved for sacrifice in order that the others may be used with safety; the portions of the sacrificial animals reserved for the priests are surrounded with restrictions to prevent the transmission of their holiness, which would be dangerous; animals used in special offerings are holy because, when once promised, they remain inviolable. An interesting sidelight on this latter principle is afforded in Pro. 20:25, of which the LXX's translation is: "It is a snare to a man quickly anything of his own to sanctify, for after the vow he becomes repentant." The furnishings of the sanctuary are holy because they are designated as the proper instruments for the worship of Jehovah and, as such, are restricted to those qualified to use them properly. The implements of the priestly office are holy because they cannot be duplicated or tampered with by the secular class of people without the risk of danger.

CHAPTER VII

THE VARIATIONS BETWEEN THE MT AND THE LXX

This thesis is based upon both secondary and primary research. In addition to the consultation of the dictionaries, concordances, encyclopedias, magazines and books upon the religion of the Hebrews, the writer compared the Hebrew and Greek texts. The greatest amount of time and energy were consumed by this primary research. The thesis would hardly be complete, therefore, without the inclusion of a chapter devoted to the differences between the MT and the LXX. While making the study the student noted that in a few verses the difference between the MT and the LXX was so great as to preclude comparison; that in a greater number of verses the addition of phrases and clauses in the LXX elongated the verse, or the omission of certain words and phrases in the MT shortened the verse; and that sometimes the comparison of the two revealed variations in the subject, object, or pronoun. It is not deemed necessary, however, to catalogue in this chapter any variations other than those appearing in direct reference to holiness. They fall within the five following categories:

Instances Where the MT and LXX Sustain Each
Other to Indicate an Error of Translation
in the RV

In addition to those places in Num. where the RV's "sanctuary" should be "holy things," discussed above, there are two verses which must be noted. In I Chr. 23:13 the MT and LXX both could better be translated, "Aaron was separated, to sanctify him as a most holy one," than by the RV's "Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things." The American Translation of the Bible so corrects.¹ However, in the other passage, Jer. 51:27 (LXX 28:27) it retains the RV's translation "prepare," which is an unusual rendering of the MT's שָׁקֵץ and the LXX's ἀγιάζω.

Instances Where a Word Other Than ἅγιος
Is Used to Translate שָׁקֵץ

In at least two cases שָׁקֵץ appears to be translated by a word besides ἅγιος. The way in which the LXX renders the MT's שָׁקֵץ is λειτουργήσουσιν in Ex. 35:19. It is possible for the Greek word to connote, or to assume the meaning of, holy service. Then there is another case of inexact, but not improper, translation in Isa. 5:16. The MT and the LXX resemble each other closely. If it were not for the customary substitution of κύριος for הָיָה, the two could be said to correspond exactly, with

¹The Bible, An American Translation, ed. by J. M. Powis Smith and Edgar J. Goodspeed, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1931)

one exception. $\Psi\Gamma\Gamma$ is translated by $\delta\omicron\varsigma\alpha\rho\theta\rho\iota\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$. This may be explained, as was noted in Chapter II, by the tendency of holiness to signify a particular attribute when applied to God.

Instances Where $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ Is Used to Translate Other Words Besides $\Psi\Gamma\Gamma$

More often than when a word other than $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is used to translate $\Psi\Gamma\Gamma$ are the instances where $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is a translation of some Hebrew term besides $\Psi\Gamma\Gamma$. In Ex. 13:12 the Hifil pf. 2nd p. s. of $\overline{\text{פָּסַח}}$, "pass over," appears in the MT. The counterpart in the LXX is $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$. The easiest way to explain this fact is to account for it on the basis of the influence of 13:2. The MT has $\overline{\text{פָּסַח}}$ in Ex. 29:33, whereas the LXX has $\epsilon\nu\ \omicron\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$. Perhaps this variation is to be explained by the supposition that the LXX assumed that everything that had been anointed had thereby been sanctified. Lev. 25:5's $\overline{\text{נָזִירִית}}$ is $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in the LXX. The resemblance of this word to the word for Nazirite should be sufficient justification. In I K. 8:8 $\overline{\text{נָזִירִית}}$ is translated by the pf. pass. ptc., m. pl. acc. of $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\omega$. Such is permissible because $\overline{\text{נָזִירִית}}$ has the root idea of separation, with the derived notion of component parts. Psa. 88:40 (LXX 87:40) contains the word "strongholds," of which the root is $\overline{\text{נָזַל}}$. The LXX translates with $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha$. This is possible because the root $\overline{\text{נָזַל}}$ means "to cut off" in the sense of making inaccessible. In Psa. 132:8 (LXX 131:8) the n. m. s. cons. with 2nd s. suf.,

759, from 559 "be strong" is replaced in the LXX by *ἀγίασματος*. The beginning of this divergence is in the Targum, which renders the phrase "Aaron in it thy light." In later Hebrew the word "light" came to have the idea of power and glory, and the LXX not surprisingly (in view of what has been noted above about the tendency of holiness to signify a particular attribute of God) interpreted it in terms of holiness and so translated it. The phrase "his crown" in Psa. 132:18 is "my holiness" in the LXX (131:18). Suffice it to remark that the crown to the Hebrews was a sign of consecration, as it may be illustrated in Zech. 9:16. In Isa. 14:27 the MT has *כְּדָבָר*, "splendor," as the modifier characterizing *הַיְיָ*, but the LXX has *θεός* described here as *ἅγιος*. The explanation that holiness often designated the particular attributes of the Godhead will serve, too, for an explanation of this verse. The MT's *קָשָׁה*, "hard," in Isa. 27:1 is *ἁγίαν* in the LXX. Perhaps this was an error of eyesight on the part of the translators. In Isa. 33:5 *קָשָׁה* appears in the MT and *ἅγιος* in the LXX. This Hebrew word also connotes the ancient idea of separation. For the MT's *לְהַבִּיר* the LXX has *οὐκ εἰς καθαρὸς οὐδ' εἰς ἅγιον*. It should be remarked that throughout the Bible *קָשָׁה* is the only inf. form of *קָשָׁה*, yet the LXX seem to have taken it as the Hifil inf. In Am. 2:11 the word for Nazirites is translated by *ἀγιασμένων*. Variations for which the writer prefers to offer no explanation are:

(1) the replacement of "dwelling" by "sanctification" in II Chr. 36:15; (2) the appearance of $\alpha\gamma\iota\omega\nu$ for שׁוֹכֵן in Psa. 83:4 (LXX 82:4; RV 83:3); and (3) the change of the MT's "rest" into "cleansing" in some MSS of the LXX and into "sanctification" in other MSS.

Instances Where a $\alpha\gamma\iota\omega\varsigma$ Appears in the LXX for Which There is no שׁוֹכֵן in the MT

In the following verses there is an extra $\alpha\gamma\iota\omega\varsigma$ for which the MT has no שׁוֹכֵן : Ex. 28:3, 26; 35:39; Lev. 4:17; 8:31; 10:14; 12:4; 18:21; Josh. 24:15; Jdgs. 16:17; I Sam. 2:10; I K. 8:4; II Chr. 5:9; 35:7, 15; Psa. 18:7 (LXX 17:7; RV 18:6); 27:4 (LXX 26:4 n); 138:2 (LXX 137:2 n); 143:10 (LXX 142:10); Isa. 26:31; 30:19; 44:28; 54:17; 57:15; 60:9; Ezek. 10:6, 7; and 28:14.

Instances in Which the Number is not the Same in the MT and the LXX, the MT in These Cases Usually Being Singular and the LXX Plural

There is a difference in the number of שׁוֹכֵן in the MT and $\alpha\gamma\iota\omega\varsigma$ in the LXX in these verses: Ex. 29:30; Lev. 10:10; 19:8, 30; 20:3; 21:12; 22:10, 14; 26:2; 27:25; Num. 3:28, 32; 4:15; 8:19; 10:21; 16:5; 18:1, 3, 5; 19:20; Dt. 26:13; I K. 8:8; I Chr. 9:29; 24:5; 29:3, 5, 21; 30:19; Psa. 74:3 (LXX 73:3); 134:2 (LXX 133:2); Isa. 4:3; 41:16; 43:28; 62:9; Jer. 28:5; Ezek. 9:6; 23:38, 39; 24:21; 25:3; 37:26, 28; 41:21; 43:21; 44:1, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 19; 45:7; 46:19; 47:12; Zeph. 3:4; and Mal. 2:11.

CONCLUSION

Four considerations will bring this thesis to its conclusion. First, a summary of the conclusions reached in the foregoing chapters is needful to give the complete picture of the result of the investigation. Second, the uses of the word "holy" which would not fit logically into the outline of the thesis proper need to be indicated. Third, cognizance should be taken of objects, not discussed in this thesis, which some writers consider to have been sacred, though the word "holy" is not applied to them in the Bible. Fourth, the statement of purpose ought to be reviewed.

The conclusions derived from the foregoing discussion may be summarized according to chapters. From Chapter I, "The Hebrew Concept of Holiness," it was concluded that the original concept of holiness was restriction from common use because of a relationship to the Divine; that the ethical connotations of the word entered through the relationship sustained by holiness and cleanliness; and that the fundamental idea of holiness, by which the ancient and the modern usages of the word are unified, is a relationship to the Divine, the difference between this and the original concept being only the way in which the relationship to the Divine is conceived. At times

holiness was considered in the Old Testament as a transmissible quality; but to identify this concept with the original one, just because it seems magical, may not be accurate. It is possible, since some scholars have thought the dates of the portions of the Old Testament literature in which these references to the transmissible quality of holiness occur to be late, that the view which regards holiness as a physical quality as contagious as disease may be a degenerated concept. It was shown also in this chapter that the dual relationship of holiness to both uncleanness and cleanness is very difficult to grasp, either for one's self, or to explain to another. That holiness, though it should be located on the opposite side of the algebraic scale from uncleanness, nevertheless resembled uncleanness in several particulars, cannot be questioned. Yet cleanness, the opposite of uncleanness, was a prerequisite of holiness. The writer concluded, therefore, that the ethical content of the word originated in the Hebrews' perception that cleanness was moral, rather than ceremonial.

It was observed regarding the holiness of God, which was discussed in Chapter II, that the word "holy" was descriptive of Jehovah as the Godhead, or supreme Divinity. However, He was not simply holy because He was supreme. The tendency of the word to become affixed to His various attributes and to bring particular sides of His nature into prominence, was also called to attention.

Furthermore, it was noted that the application of holiness to His agents illustrated the same characteristic of holiness to be used in a particular, rather than a general, sense. While God's agents were called holy, either on account of sharing His nature, or because of their proximity to Him, they were, when so called, functioning either as intercessors, worshippers, watchers, or companions.

In the discussion of the holiness of man, in Chapter III, holiness was observed to stand in a secondary position and to have a derived meaning from whatever its first application was. The descriptions of people as holy were summed up under eight headings. The most startling discovery made by the writer in this chapter was that the king is not described in the Old Testament as a holy person. The writer had supposed that the holiness of the king would consume a considerable portion of the chapter's discussion. The king was most certainly anointed, but the Old Testament does not use $\omega\tau\kappa$ in reference to the king. In the Psalms, where the New Testament identifies Jesus as "the holy One," the word is $\gamma\delta\eta$. Those individuals whom the Old Testament describes as holy were thus designated because they were entrusted with special functions by the Divine; they adhered to the prohibitions by which their status was marked off from others; they were occasionally permitted to exercise supernatural power; and their choice by the Divine bound them, not only to prohibitions, but also to activities which were as pleasing

to God as the things prohibited were abhorrent.

Chapter IV was devoted to the discussion of the holiness of places. In this chapter it was demonstrated that places were called holy because they were characterized by God's presence. To the holiness of places man reacted in various ways. The emotion produced by the places of theophany was fear of physical danger from having seen the Lord; the response produced by the holiness of Jerusalem and Zion was praise; the thought of heaven as a holy place, which thought was a reminder of God's transcendent nature, made man conscious of his insignificance.

The subject of Chapter V was "The Holiness of Times." The conclusion from this discussion was that the times which are called holy are such because they require a cessation of work for religious purposes.

The ritualistic requirements discussed in Chapter VI were shown to be holy because they were restricted from common use, reserved for purposes of worship, and safeguarded from profanation because even those who had the right to use them could do so only after the fulfillment of certain conditions.

Having summarized the conclusions of the vital chapters of the thesis, the writer must indicate two special uses of the word "holy" which would not fit, logically, into the general outline of the thesis. In Zech. 14:20 it is written: "In that day shall there be upon the

bells of the horses, HOLY UNTO JEHOVAH." The idea that these words should be an insigne is not strange. The priest's mitre was engraved in this manner, as was noted in the discussion of the ritualistic requirements. This reference could hardly have been discussed there, however. The Hebrews did not use horses in their rituals. Horses may be regarded, in some cases, as symbolical of the influences opposed to the purpose of Jehovah in the Old Testament. But here the prophet, in describing the conditions which will prevail when Jehovah comes to enjoy universal reign, foresees a day when even horses will be dedicated to the execution of His will.

Again, references not discussed elsewhere in the thesis are Dan. 11:28 and 30. Each of these vv. speak of a "holy covenant." This portion of the Old Testament is very difficult to interpret. Considerable uncertainty must remain about the identification of the person spoken of here.¹ Several emendations of the text have been suggested.² The writer does not know what the holy covenant was, nor why it was holy.

It would not be fitting to bring the thesis to a close without recognizing that some scholars consider the Old Testament idea of holiness to include other objects than those discussed herein. The writer has assumed that

¹Montgomery, op. cit., p. 451.

²Charles, op. cit., p. 249f.

the Old Testament uses of the word $\psi\tau\pi$. Some scholars who make research into Semitic backgrounds, however, profess to find in names, like 'En-mishpat and 'En-ha-tannin,¹ evidence of sacred springs; in references to trees, as in Gen. 35:4 and Jdgs. 4:4 and 5, evidence of sacred trees; and in instances of the erection of pillars, as in Josh. 24:26 and 27 and I Sam. 6:24, evidence of sacred stones.² However, these illustrations were not included in this thesis, inasmuch as the concept of holiness does not actually occur in them.

Attention is called, finally, again to the purpose and method of the thesis. The purpose of the thesis has been to ascertain the Old Testament idea of holiness. The method was a comparison of the MT and LXX in those verses where $\psi\tau\pi$ and $\alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ appear respectively. In accordance with this purpose and method it has been deemed impossible, within the scope of this thesis, to delve into philosophical or theological aspects of the question. Rather, the writer humbly believes that philosophical or theological discourse of holiness should begin from the bases brought forth in this thesis.

¹This proper name appears in some sections of the Old Testament as 'En-hat-tannim.

²Oesterley and Robinson, op. cit., pp. 32-47.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Source Materials

The American Revised Standard Edition of the Bible. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1929.

Letteries, Meyer, and Hallevi. Torah, Neviim, we-Kethuvim. Vienna: Adolph Altzhoyzan, 1909.

Rahlfs, Alfred. Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Privilegierte Wurttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Commentaries

Abingdon Bible Commentary. Edited by F. C. Eiselen, et al. New York: The Abingdon Press, 1929.

Batten, W. L. Ezra and Nehemiah, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Briggs, C. A. Psalms, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907.

Charles, R. H. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1929.

A Commentary on the Bible. Edited by A. S. Peake. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1919.

Cooke, G. A. The Book of Ezekiel, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1937.

Curtis, E. L. and Madsen, A. A. The Books of Chronicles, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910.

Driver, S. R. and Gray, G. B. The Book of Job, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Gray, G. B. Numbers, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1903.

Gray, G. B. Isaiah I, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.

- Harper, W. R. Amos and Hosea, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905.
- Hertz, J. H. The Pentateuch and Haftarahs. London: Soceno Press, 1938.
- Keil, C. F. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. Trans. by J. Kennedy. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1880.
- Mitchell, H. G. Haggai and Zechariah, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Montgomery, J. A. The Book of Daniel, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- Smith, H. P. The Books of Samuel, ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Torrey, C. C. The Second Isaiah. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.
- Von Orelli, C. The Prophecies of Jeremiah. Trans. by J. S. Banks. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1889.

Encyclopedias

- Kohler, K. "Holiness," JE. Edited by Isidore Singer. Vol. VI, 1904.
- Lambert, J. C. "Holiness," ISBE. Edited by James Orr. Vol. IV. Chicago: The Harvard-Severance Co., 1937.
- Mann, Louis L. "Holiness," UJE. New York: Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, Inc., 1941.
- Whitehouse, O. C. "Holiness," HERE. Vol. VI. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1914.

Books

- Barton, G. A. The Religion of Israel. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918.
- Davidson, A. B. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.
- Kohler, K. Jewish Theology. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918.

- Moore, G. F. Judaism. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.
- Oehler, G. F. The Theology of the Old Testament. New York: Funk & Wagnales, 1883.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, T. H. Hebrew Religion. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930.
- Peters, J. P. The Religion of the Hebrews. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1914.
- Robinson, W. H. The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1927.
- Schultz, Hermann. Old Testament Theology. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1892.
- Wallis, Louis. God and the Social Process. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.

Magazine Articles

- Mitchell, H. G. "Miscellaneous Notes," JBL. 1888-90.
- Nordell, P. A. "Old Testament Word-Studies: 3. Moral Good," The Old Testament Student. Edited by W. R. Harper. Vol. VIII.
- Otto, Rudolf. "In the Sphere of the Holy," Hibbert Journal. Vol. XXXI, 1932-33.
- Waterman, Leroy. "The Ethical Clarity of the Prophets," JBL. Vol. LXIV, 1945.
- Wood, W. C. "The Religion of Canaan," JBL. Vol. XXXV, 1916.

Unpublished Materials

- Lambert, John W. "The New Testament Idea of Holiness." Unpublished B. D. thesis, New Testament Department, School of Religion, Butler University, 1945.