Andrews University

Digital Commons @ Andrews University

Dissertations

Graduate Research

1992

The Use of nś' in the Pentateuch and its Contribution to the Concept of Forgiveness

Gudmundur Olafsson
Andrews University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Olafsson, Gudmundur, "The Use of nś' in the Pentateuch and its Contribution to the Concept of Forgiveness" (1992). *Dissertations*. 115.

<https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/dissertations/115>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.32597/dissertations/115>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research at Digital Commons @ Andrews University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Andrews University. For more information, please contact repository@andrews.edu.

Seek Knowledge. Affirm Faith. Change the World.

Thank you for your interest in the

**Andrews University Digital Library
of Dissertations and Theses.**

*Please honor the copyright of this document by
not duplicating or distributing additional copies
in any form without the author's express written
permission. Thanks for your cooperation.*

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313. 761-4700 800. 521-0600

Order Number 9334300

**The use of $\pi\delta^2$ in the Pentateuch and its contribution to the
concept of forgiveness**

Olafsson, Gudmundur, Ph.D.

Andrews University, 1993

Copyright ©1992 by Olafsson, Gudmundur. All rights reserved.

U·M·I

300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Andrews University
Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

THE USE OF נָשָׂא IN THE PENTATEUCH
AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE
CONCEPT OF FORGIVENESS

A Dissertation
Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Gudmundur Olafsson
December, 1992

© Copyright by Gudmundur Olafsson 1992
All Rights Reserved

THE USE OF NS³ IN THE PENTATEUCH
AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE CONCEPT OF FORGIVENESS

A dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
Doctor of Philosophy

by

Gudmundur Olafsson

APPROVAL BY THE COMMITTEE:

Faculty Advisor: Jacques
Doukhan, Professor of Old
Testament Interpretation

Richard Davidson, Professor
of Old Testament Exegesis

William H. Shea, Adjunct
Professor of Archeology and
History of Antiquity

Gerhard F. Hasel, Professor of
Old Testament and Biblical
Theology

Bruce Waltke, Professor of
Old Testament, Regent College

Werner K. Vyhmeister, Dean
SDA Theological Seminary

December 26, 1992
Date Approved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	x
INTRODUCTION	1
General Background	1
The Problem	4
Justification of Study	7
Purpose and Delimitations	11
Purpose	11
Delimitations	12
Methodology	15
Chapter	
I. SURVEY OF EARLIER STUDIES	19
Lexical Listings	20
G. Gesenius	21
General Scope	21
Specific Meanings	22
J. Fuerst	24
General Scope	24
Specific Meanings	25
F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs	27
General Scope	27
Specific Meanings	28
L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner	29
General Scope	29
Specific Meanings	30
W. L. Holladay	32
General Scope	32
Specific Meanings	32
Summary	34
Basic Meaning	36
Semantic-Theological Studies	36
F. Stolz	37
D. N. Freedman and B. E. Willoughby	39
J. J. Stamm	41
R. Knierim	44
W. Zimmerli	47

R. N. Whybray	49
Summary	51
II. SURVEY OF EXTRA-BIBLICAL USAGE	54
Akkadian	56
Našû as Transport	57
Data	57
Comments	58
Našû as Support	59
Data	59
Comments	61
Našû as Utilization	62
Data	63
Comments	63
Našû and Interpersonal Relations	64
Data	64
Comments	66
Ugaritic	67
Nša as Transport	68
Data	68
Comments	69
Nša as Support	70
Data	70
Comments	70
Nša as Utilization	71
Data	71
Comments	72
Aramaic	72
Nšā ³ as Transport	73
Data	73
Comments	74
Nšā ³ as Support	74
Data	74
Comments	75
Nšā ³ as Utilization	76
Data	76
Comments	76
Nšā ³ and Interpersonal Relations	77
Data	77
Comments	77
Summary	78
III. SURVEY OF BIBLICAL USAGE	79
The Old Testament in General	79
Introduction	79
Distribution and Usage	82
General	82
Nominal Forms	83
Verbal Forms	91

Man as Subject	93
God as Subject	97
Other Subjects	98
Summary	100
The Pentateuch in Particular	102
Morphology	102
Syntax	109
Object Linkage	109
Subject-Object Linkage	111
Positional Indications	112
Synonyms and Parallels	113
Literal Usage	114
Metaphoric Usage	115
Idiomatic Usage	117
Sequels	118
Literary Context	120
Summary	121
IV. SEMANTIC SCOPE OF NĀŠĀ ² IN THE PENTATEUCH . . .	123
Nāšā ² and Movement	123
Formal Indications	124
Data	124
Comments	127
Contextual Indications	129
Data	129
Comments	131
Nāšā ² as Supporting	133
Data	133
Comments	135
Nāšā ² as Utilizing	146
Weapons as Object	146
Data	146
Comments	146
Body Parts and Functions	147
Eyes as Object	147
Data	147
Comments	148
Head as Object	153
Data	153
Comments	154
Voice as Object	158
Data	158
Comments	158
Hand(s) as Object	159
Data	159
Comments	159
Feet as Object	162
Data	162
Comments	162
Soul as Object	163

Data	163
Comments	163
<i>Māšāl</i> as Object	164
Data	164
Comments	164
Heart as Subject	165
Data	165
Comments	166
Summary	167
V. <i>Nš³</i> AND WRONGDOING IN THE PENTATEUCH	169
<i>Nāšā³</i> and Wrongdoing	169
<i>Nāšā³</i> and Own Wrongdoings	170
Data	170
Comments	173
<i>Nāšā³</i> and Wrongdoings of Others	179
Man as Subject	180
Data	180
Comments	182
Animal as Subject	197
Data	197
Comments	198
Divine Beings as Subject	202
Data	202
Comments	203
Summary	216
VI. <i>Nš³</i> AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS	219
People as Object	220
Data	221
Comments	222
Face" as Object	229
Data	230
Comments	231
"Head" as Object	246
Data	246
Comments	247
"Place" as Object	249
Data	249
Comments	250
Unspecified Object	251
Data	252
Comments	252
Summary	255
VII. <i>Nš³</i> AND FORGIVENESS	257
Linguistic Basis	258
<i>Nāšā³</i> and <i>kpr</i>	258

<i>Nāšāʾ</i> and <i>sālah</i>	264
heological Context	269
Social Context	275
God as Forgiver	279
Other Parallels	281
Summary	287
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	290
APPENDICES	308
A. General Distribution of <i>Nšʾ</i> in the OT . . .	309
B. Literary Context	310
C. Pentateuchal Usage	311
D. "Lifting the Head"	313
BIBLIOGRAPHY	314

LIST OF TABLES

1. Meanings of <i>Nāšāʾ</i>	35
2. Distribution of the Root <i>Nšʾ</i> in the OT	83
3. Distribution of Nominal Forms of <i>Nšʾ</i>	84
4. Distribution of Verbal Root <i>Nšʾ</i>	92
5. Distribution of Verbal Aspects in the OT	92
6. Distribution of Subjects with <i>Nšʾ</i> in the OT	94
7. Distribution of Literal Usage in the OT	96
8. Distribution of Metaphoric Usage in the OT, Subject: Man	97
9. Distribution of Metaphoric Usage in the OT, Subject: God	98
10. Distribution of Metaphoric Usage in the OT, Subject: Non-human	99
11. Distribution of Verbal Aspects of <i>Nšʾ</i> in the Pentateuch	103
12. Distribution of Verbal Forms in Pentateuch	106
13. Morphological Distribution (Finite Forms)	107
14. Distribution of Waw-Consecutive Forms in the Pentateuch	108
15. Morphological Distribution (Non-finite Forms)	109
16. Syntactical Distribution	110
17. Subject-Object Linkage	111
18. Position Indicators	113

19.	Distribution According to Literary Forms . . .	120
20.	<i>Nāśā</i> ³ Own Wrongdoings	176
21.	<i>Nāśā</i> ³ Wrongs of Others	214
22.	"Forgiveness" in the Pentateuch	281

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
<u>Afo</u>	<u>Archiv für Orientforschung</u>
<u>ARET</u>	<u>Archivi Reali di Ebla: Testi</u>
ASV	American Standard Version
<u>BASOR</u>	Bulletin of the American Oriental Research
<u>BHS</u>	<u>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</u>
BDB	Francis Brown, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. <u>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</u>
<u>BibOr</u>	<u>Biblica et Orientalia</u>
BSC	Bible Students' Commentary
<u>BZ</u>	<u>Biblische Zeitschrift</u>
CAD	<u>Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</u>
CBAT	The Complete Bible: An American Translation
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
<u>EvTh</u>	<u>Evangelische Theologie</u>
Gesenius	<u>Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar</u>
HAL ₃	<u>Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. 3rd edition</u>
<u>IDB</u>	<u>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</u>
<u>JAOS</u>	<u>Journal of the American Oriental Society</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>

JPSV	<u>Holy Scriptures According to the Masoretic Text.</u> Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America
JQR	<u>Jewish Quarterly Review</u>
JSOT	<u>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</u>
JSS	<u>Journal of Semitic Studies</u>
KAI	Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Röllig, <u>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</u>
KBL	Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, <u>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros</u>
KJV	King James Version
LXX	Septuaginta
MT	Masoretic Text
NAB	New American Bible
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NEB	New English Bible
NIV	New International Version
OT	Old Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
PEQ	<u>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</u>
RB	<u>Revue Biblique</u>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
TDNT	<u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u>
TDOT	<u>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament,</u> (English translation of <u>TWAT</u>)
TEV	Today's English Version
TgN	Targum Neophyti
TgO	Targum Onkelos

<u>THAT</u>	<u>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</u>
<u>TLZ</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
<u>TWAT</u>	<u>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</u>
<u>UF</u>	<u>Ugarit-Forschungen</u>
<u>UT</u>	Cyrus H. Gordon, <u>Ugaritic Textbook</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
<u>VTs</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u> , Supplement
<u>ZAW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>
<u>ZDMG</u>	<u>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</u>

ABSTRACT

THE USE OF NŠ^2 IN THE PENTATEUCH
AND ITS CONTRIBUTION TO THE
CONCEPT OF FORGIVENESS

by

Gudmundur Olafsson

Adviser: Jacques Doukhan

ABSTRACT OF GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH

Dissertation

Andrews University

Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary

Title: THE USE OF NŠ^3 IN THE PENTATEUCH AND ITS
CONTRIBUTION TO THE CONCEPT OF FORGIVENESS

Name of researcher: Gudmundur Olafsson

Name and degree of faculty adviser: Jacques Doukhan,
D.H.L., Ph.D.

Date completed: December 1992

This study investigated the use of the root nš^3 in the Pentateuch in an attempt to discover its semantic relationship to the concept of forgiveness. Survey of the available literature revealed a near vacuum in this area, apart from a couple of careful but brief treatments. Other studies were either very cursory or only partially relevant to the present study. Most writers tend to relegate the concept of forgiveness to the derived meaning of "remove" without substantiating it exegetically.

Cognate languages affirmed the existence of the root and its range of meanings. The widest range of

meanings and closest affinity to Hebrew was found in Akkadian. Besides its usual meanings, both languages used it in the context of caring and in handling wrongdoings.

Biblical usage reveals a syntactically and semantically flexible root. Its basic sense is a deliberate, supportive upwards/onwards movement, both literal and metaphoric. Metaphoric meanings are based on the literal, either in the form of metonymy or by concretizing the abstracts. Idiomatic expressions involving body parts were found to indicate purposeful utilization rather than just some measureable movement.

In the context of *nš*³, sin and wrongdoing are viewed as concrete objects which the wrongdoer must carry. Ultimately, it leads to the death of its carrier. Symbolically, the burden of sin was transferred from the wrongdoer, who carried (*nš*³) it, to the sanctuary via the priests who bore (*nš*³) them on/in his body into the presence of the Lord, whose very nature it is to bear (*nš*³) the iniquities of the people. Once a year these wrongs were removed from the sanctuary and the camp by means of a goat which carried (*nš*³) them into the wilderness. No longer were they held against the people, and they were accepted by God. They could enjoy his blessings, evidenced by his caring concern for all their needs, whether spiritual or physical. Humans are to participate actively in this fatherly care, working towards the restoration of others. This whole process is

involved in *nš*³-forgiveness. It is not a forgetful declaration of innocence; neither does it allow the wrong to affect the relationship. Instead, it involves an active, caring concern for others and their well-being.

INTRODUCTION

General Background

Some twenty-five years ago Klaus Koch complained about the scarcity of literature and research dealing with the subject of forgiveness in the Old Testament.¹ He, in fact, refers to only a half dozen authors, all of whom were German, who at that time had published anything substantial on the subject.² He then concludes his survey of earlier literature with the following observation: "Ein trostloser Ergebnis! Wir stoßen auf ein schändlich vernachlässigtes Gebiet unserer sonst so aktiven und produktiven Disziplin."³

¹Klaus Koch, "Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit," EvTh 26 (1966):217-239. This opinion is also shared by Th. Raitt who at the same time was writing on "The Concept of Forgiveness in the Pre-Exilic Prophets in Relation to Its Form-Historical Setting" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1964), 2, where he observes that "surprisingly little has ever been written on the subject of forgiveness in the Old Testament. In fact it has brought forth no published work in English."

²Since their discussion is, however, mostly outside the scope of this research, their contribution will only be discussed insofar as their comments become relevant to the topic.

³Koch, 218.

In the intervening years very little has appeared to change the picture. The problem is evidently partly rooted in the fact that:

1. There seems to be uncertainty among scholars about which Hebrew terms are to be translated as 'forgiveness' and when.¹

2. Some scholars do not see forgiveness as very prominent in the Old Testament. Even when it is present it is not seen as basically altering the relation between God and His people and is "certainly not the centre of its scheme of salvation."²

3. There are different views as to what constitutes forgiveness really and many are not satisfied with Raitt's definition that it is "any act or expression

¹This becomes quite apparent as one looks at concordances to various English translations. The frequency with which 'pardon' or 'forgiveness' occur in the OT seems to be more dependent on the understanding of the translator than on the text itself. A random sampling of "complete" concordances to nine different versions revealed the following:

Moffatt	35x
New King James Version (NKJV)	70x
King James Version (KJV)	72x
New International Version (NIV)	74x
American Standard Version (ASV)	79x
New American Bible (NAB)	81x
New American Standard Bible (NASB)	83x
Revised Standard Version (RSV)	84x
Living Bible (LB)	131x

²See Ludwig Köhler, Old Testament Theology, trans. A. S. Todd (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), 217-18, quoted in Raitt, 45.

of undeserved mercy by the offended party toward the offending party."¹

There are mainly three Hebrew terms translated 'forgive': *sālah*, *kpr* (piel), and *nāšā*², of which *nāšā*² is the most ambiguous. It has a wide range of meanings, both literal² and metaphoric.³ Some of its meanings are quite obvious; others are more ambiguous, especially when it is used to refer to interpersonal relations or in the context of sin or wrongdoings. The question is whether it is just a figure of speech in these contexts or whether its use there might signify something important about the Biblical concept of forgiveness.

We are actually faced with a surprising paradox: Is it really a fact that one of the key concepts of salvation/redemption is almost totally absent from the religious literature of the Hebrews in the pre-Christian era? Was it entirely unknown or little understood?

A systematic study of the Hebrew terms for forgiveness has yet to be undertaken. What is available

¹Raitt, 27.

²In this dissertation **literal use** denotes an act in which a concrete subject physically acts upon a concrete object in such a way that a measureable change or movement takes place.

³As used in the present study **metaphoric use** denotes an action which a given subject performs in which a measureable change may not be visible, or the change does not involve a physical manipulation of the object.

is limited either by scope, approach, or space. The intent of the present study is to remedy that situation in Biblical scholarship.

The Problem

As the present writer began researching this topic he was also struck by the scarcity of any serious literature on the subject matter of both the usage of *nāšā*³ in general and how it relates to the concept of forgiveness in the OT in particular. What was found was less than a handful of discussions in German,¹ five dissertations and/or theses in English² during the last one hundred

¹The main ones which deal substantially with the issue of forgiveness in the OT are the following: S. Herner, "Sühne und Vergebung in Israel," Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1941-1942 (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups förlag, 1942): 47-121; Koch, 217-239; Bernd Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982); Herbert Leroy, Zur Vergebung der Sünden (Stuttgart: K B W Verlag, 1974). Rolf Knierim, Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im Alten Testament (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1967); Christa Göbel, "'Denn bei dir ist Vergebung . . . ' sālah im Alten Testament," Theologische Versuche 8 (1977): 21-33; Hans Joachim Stoebe, Gott, sei mir Sünder gnädig (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1958); and Hartwig Thyen, Studien zur Sündenvergebung (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).

²Elmer William John Schmitt, "Sin and Forgiveness in the Old Testament" (Ph.D. dissertation, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, NJ, 1943); Sidney Oscar Hills, "A Semantic and Conceptual Study of the Root KPR in the Hebrew Old Testament with Special Reference to the Accadian Kuppuru" (Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, 1954); Pieter de Jong, "Divine and Human Forgiveness: An Investigation into the Biblical Data about God's and Man's Forgiveness and the Relation between Them, Followed by a Comparison of the Biblical

years, a few incidental notes in articles, and two, quite informative, articles in OT theological dictionaries.¹ None of them, however, deals with the present issue. At most, they may mention the fact that sometimes forgiveness is translated from *nāšāʾ*. Then they launch upon a theological discussion of events where forgiveness occurs without investigating what it is or what it involves.

Some scholars, like Stamm,² Zimmerli,³ and Whybray,⁴ limit their discussion to a very narrow aspect of *nāšāʾ*, the expression *nāšāʾ ʿāwōn*. Stamm presents a general image represented by that expression and mentions only a few examples. Zimmerli, on the other hand, classifies all the passages in which the expression

Data and Some of the Systematic and Ethical Approaches to the Problem" (Ph.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1951); Viggo Nørskov Olsen, "The Doctrine of Forgiveness in the Light of Biblical Hebrew and Greek Words" (M.A. thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, Washington, DC, 1950); and Raitt, "The Concept of Forgiveness in the Pre-Exilic Prophets in Relation to Its Form-Historical Setting."

¹One by Fritz Stolz on "*נָשָׂא* *nśʾ* **aufheben, tragen**," THAT (1971), 2:109-117. The other by D. N. Freedman and B. E. Willoughby on "*נָשָׂא*," TWAT (1986), 5:626-643.

²Johann J. Stamm, Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament. (Bern: A. Francke, A.-G. Verlag, 1940).

³Walther Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," ZAW 66 (1954):1-26.

⁴R. N. Whybray, Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet. (Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 4, 1978). For more detailed discussion of their views see chapter 1.

occurs, both according to sources and contents. Whybray challenges that classification, especially where Zimmerli sees substitution, which Whybray does not believe in.

Others, like Stolz, on the one hand, and Freedman and Willoughby, on the other hand, in their highly informative articles, are, by the very nature of the articles, limited to some general observations regarding the significance and interrelationship of the data involved. This does not mean that they are unaware of the issues, but rather that space prevents them from doing more than giving a few hints which need to be picked up and pursued further.

For Knierim the study of the use of *nāšāʾ*² is only secondary to his main project, but he succeeds in bringing out some interesting implications, which invite further investigation: subjects such as its use in interpersonal relations, or its use with wrongdoing as an object.

Most of these articles are, however, only tangentially relevant to the present study since they deal almost exclusively with the theology or ethics of forgiveness and usually omit any serious discussion of the Hebrew terms employed for the concept. They are, therefore, only referred to briefly when they relate directly to the issue at hand.

Justification of Study

The contention of the present study was that a systematic contextual¹ study of the uses of the root *nāšā*² in the Hebrew Bible is needed, especially its usages in interpersonal relations and in the context of sin or wrongdoing for a clearer understanding of what it might possibly reveal concerning the Biblical concept of forgiveness. Dictionaries present quite a wide range of meaning, and the Bible translations often reveal the fact that the translators appear to be more dependent on their preconceived ideas about forgiveness than the particular meaning the terms may have.

James Barr, the principal advocate today of the importance of the Biblical context over against etymology and root meanings, has repeatedly pointed out its importance for determining the meaning of a particular word within it.² Some scholars, such as J. F. A. Sawyer,

¹In contrast to a pure **etymological** word-study, which traces the origin of a word back to its known or theoretical root; and **semantic** study, which is the historical and psychological study and classification of changes in the signification of words and forms; a **contextual** study looks at how the immediate verbal context, in which a particular word occurs, helps to explain the meaning of that word or expression.

²James Barr has in several books and articles attacked the popular trend, especially associated with the Biblical Theology Movement, to build theological castles on the shifting sands of Hebrew and Greek morphology, syntax, and etymology. Of his books on the subject the most influential was definitely The Semantics of Biblical Language (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961). Its main

wonder, however, whether there is not still some evidence that the "'root'. . . [as a] recurring group of consonants common to several words, carries with it some common element into words and contexts in which it occurs?"¹ He comes to the conclusion that there is definitely evidence "for the significance of the root as a sense-bearing element in some contexts,"² but these must be tempered by "the context of situation,"³ which he feels is a more important factor in determining the meaning of a word than

thesis is that "theological thought of the type found in the NT has its characteristic linguistic expression not in the word individually but in the word-combination or sentence. . . . [Since] important elements in the NT vocabulary were not technical . . . the attempt to relate the individual word directly to the theological thought leads to the distortion of the semantic contribution made by words in contexts; the value of the context comes to be seen as something contributed by the word, and then it is read into the word as its contribution where the context is in fact different. Thus the word becomes overloaded with interpretative suggestion" (233-234). Moisés Silva, in his book Biblical Words and Their Meaning (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1983), 25-26 summarizes Barr's criticism in this respect in the following way: (1) paying much attention to a word and (usually) its derivatives often leads to an exaggerated estimate of etymological studies, (2) the danger of "illegitimate totality transfer," meaning that any one instance of a word will not bear all the meanings possible for that word, (3) ignoring what may look like small differences between the ways the word is used, (4) concentrated study of one word seldom leads to the very important examination of semantically related terms, and (5) a fundamental danger to confuse the word for reality.

¹John F. A. Sawyer, "Root Meanings in Hebrew," JSS, 12/1 (1967):41.

²Ibid., 49.

³Ibid., 47.

the lexical context. Therefore, there must always be a balanced interchange between the "meaning" of a word and the thrust of the context in which it is found, as Freddy De Meyer has pointed out.¹

In regard to the etymological rendering of the words it must be noted that a word obtains its specific meaning by its use in the sentence. One has always to investigate how a word is used in a particular context.

The story of Joseph's interpreting the dreams of the baker and butler² illustrates this point. In both cases he uses the same expression--*nāšā³ ro³š*--which he then further qualifies to indicate the different fates that awaited them.

Speaking to the butler Joseph says:

Within three more days Pharaoh will lift up your head (*yīššā³ par^{coh} et-ro³šekā*) and restore you to your office (*wah³šībkā al-kannekā*) and you will put Pharaoh's cup into his hand according to your former custom when you were his cupbearer.

The whole context clearly indicates that the king's act of *nāšā³*-ing the butler's head meant returning him to his former position of honor before the king. The concept of forgiveness is definitely present, as some translations indicate.³

¹Freddy De Meyer, "Buber's Translation of the Bible," Louvain Studies 7/3 (1979):217.

²Gen 40:13, 19-22.

³NASB and NAB do so in a footnote, as does Traduction oecuménique de la Bible (Paris: Alliance biblique universelle--Le Cerf, 1982).

To the baker Joseph says:

Within three more days Pharaoh will lift up your head from you (yissā³ par^coh ʔet-ro³škā mē^cālēkā) and will hang you on a tree (wʔtālāh ʔōtkā ʔal-^cēs); and the birds of heaven will eat your flesh off you.

The structure of Joseph's answer is the same in both cases: (1) introductory statement, (2) judgment, (3) qualification of the judgment, and 4) the results of the judgment. The fact that Joseph qualifies the intent of nāsā³ in these two instances leads to the inevitable question: Is this just a play on words (homonyms), or does this indicate one root with a basic meaning which is then qualified by the context?

Another example is found in the concluding plea of Moses as he intercedes for the people of Israel following their rebellious attitude as the spies reported on their findings in the promised land.¹

Pardon, I pray, the iniquity of this people (sʔlah-na³ la^cwōn hā^cām hazzeh) according to the greatness of Thy lovingkindness, just as Thou also hast forgiven this people (ka³ʔšer nāsā³tāh lā^cām hazzeh) from Egypt even until now.

Both the parallel structure and the context seem to support the 'forgiveness'-aspect of nāsā³, but at the same time they connote God's protective support of and sustaining paternal care for his people.² Again we are

¹Num 14:19.

²This concept is amply represented in the Pentateuch and is considered in more detail in this research. We find texts where God is likened to a father who carries his

faced with similar questions: Is there a 'forgiveness' aspect in *nāšā*², or is this just a play on homonymous words, one meaning 'forgive,' the other 'carry' or 'sustain'?¹ Is the meaning in these contexts somewhat different from the one where God is presented as someone who *nš*² his people like a father his son?² And, how does this usage relate to expressions like *nāšā*² *pānīm* and *nāšā*² *rošš*, both of which, at times, convey an attitude of forgiveness? Or, to summarize: Does *nāšā*² really include the concept of forgiveness as we understand it, or is that meaning simply a matter of interpretation? But, if it is, what aspects of forgiveness does it reveal?

Purpose and Delimitations

Purpose

It was the purpose of this research to investigate the usages of the Hebrew verbal root *nāšā*² in the Pentateuch, especially in the context of interpersonal relations and in connection with sin and wrongdoing in order to ascertain if the context and usage might provide

young son (Deut 1:31) or like an eagle carrying her young ones (Deut 32:11).

¹That impression is inevitable as one looks at various translations. Some translate here 'carry,' others 'forgive.' Of English translations, only NEB translates here 'bear with'; others use 'forgive,' 'pardon.' The French Traduction oecumenique de la Bible uses 'support.'

²Deut 1:31; 32:11.

a clearer understanding of the Biblical concept of forgiveness by determining the following:

1. Is there any indication if the root *nāšāʾ*¹ has a basic meaning--"root-meaning"--which informs the various usages, or are the various shades of meaning exclusively determined by the context in each case?
2. Does the Biblical concept of forgiveness fit within the semantic range of *nāšāʾ*, or is there some evidence of more than one root?
3. What--if anything--does the use of the root *nāšāʾ* about forgiveness suggest about the Pentateuchal and/or the Biblical concept of forgiveness?

Delimitations

With that purpose in mind the following delimitations were established:

1. The study was a Biblical contextual¹ study, avoiding, as far as possible, to enter into the areas of systematic theology, philosophy, and ethics.
2. The research limited itself to the use of the verbal root *nāšāʾ* in the Pentateuch. A survey of the general usage in the Old Testament revealed that it was fairly evenly distributed throughout. The decision to limit the study to the Pentateuch was based on the following considerations:

¹See p. 7, footnote #1 for definition.

a. Practical. With its 169 occurrences of the verbal root *nāšā*³ the Pentateuch appeared to present a good cross-section of the general usage in the Old Testament, and an examination of all 654 cases would have extended the study considerably.

b. Semantic. The Pentateuch was found to have the highest ratio of metaphoric uses, within which the concept of forgiveness is most likely to be found.

c. Theological. The Pentateuch is traditionally seen as the theological foundation of both the Bible and Hebrew/Christian religion.

For the sake of clarification some of its synonyms are noted and similar usages in other books of the OT examined for comparison and/or corroboration. The nominal derivations are acknowledged and briefly examined for the sake of completeness, since they do not appear to contribute significantly to the current discussion.

3. It was outside the range of present research to trace in detail the etymology of the root *nāšā*³. Its existence and usage in some major cognate languages are noted, but the emphasis is rather on its usage in the final form of the Massoretic text of the OT.¹ The

¹Several scholars have in recent years stressed the importance of viewing the present text as a unit in reaction to the atomizing effect of the dominant historical-critical method. Brevard S. Childs in his Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 76-77, claims that

Biblical text is accepted in its present form without attempting to analyze its "sources" or tracing its development, since that appears irrelevant for the understanding of its message. The texts are viewed in their cultic or non-cultic setting, the standard literary categories of narratives, poetry, or legal texts are considered, and the usages within these categories evaluated and compared.

4. Many of the usages are quite obvious, as they deal with the lifting or carrying of literal objects. Those texts are not analyzed individually in detail, but rather examined in groups. Contextual analysis is reserved for those passages in which *nāšā*³ is used in the context of sin and/or wrongdoing or in interpersonal relationships.

5. However tempting it might be to establish a complete Pentateuchal concept of forgiveness, it is not attempted here. Such a study would have to include as well all terms related to that process and their contexts.

"it is only in the final form of the biblical text in which the normative history has reached an end that the full effect of this revelatory history can be perceived. . . . The final form of the text performs a crucial hermeneutical function in establishing the peculiar profile of the passage." Rolf Rendtorff, The Old Testament, trans. John Bowden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 130, concurs with Childs: "The final form of the Old Testament books and the theological intentions expressed in them must be taken seriously in a quite different way from what has so far been the norm in Old Testament scholarship."

Many of them are used outside of texts where *nāšā*³ is used and therefore fell outside the scope of the present research. This study limited itself to investigating that aspect or 'theology' of forgiveness which is revealed by the term *nāšā*³.

These delimitations are not to imply that other aspects are unimportant, but rather it is believed that a thorough investigation of a representative sample of the use of *nāšā*³ provides a reliable clarification of its meaning and usage and will enhance the understanding of the term in general and its use in interhuman and divine-human relations in particular.

Methodology

In order to reach this goal the present research followed this general procedural outline:

1. The overall approach was from the general to the specific. Therefore the research begins with a survey of the lexical meanings of *nāšā*³ as listed by major lexicographers. In many cases this provides the first and only indication of what a word means. A review of the few articles dealing with the semantic and theological significance of the term then follows.

2. Next an examination of the root *nāšā*³ in Semitic languages is undertaken. Because of the undisputed pan-Semitic distribution of this term, the

study limited itself to considering examples from three representative languages: Accadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic. These are selected because (a) they are 'older' and/or contemporary with Hebrew, (b) considerable body of documents is readily available in all of these languages, and (c) there is reasonable evidence of cultural interaction between these peoples in the period under investigation.

This information is not automatically taken to be determinative for the Biblical meaning, however, for studies have shown that the Biblical meaning of terms should be evaluated in their own literary and cultural context, even though the etymology may relate them to terms in 'older' and/or contemporary languages.¹

3. After this general survey the field of investigation is narrowed down to that of the Old Testament in general and the Pentateuch in particular. The use of *nāšā*² is analyzed statistically according to

¹See Bernd Janowski's abstract of his dissertation "Sühne als Heilsgeschehen" in *TLZ*, 106 (1981):779, where he discusses this problem in connection with the root *kpr*: "kann, die Wahrscheinlichkeit einer sprachlichen Übernahme von akk. *kaparu* oder von arab. *kafara* ins Hebräische vorausgesetzt, zugleich mit sachlicher Entsprechung gerechnet werden? Selbst wenn, wie wir annehmen, die sprachliche Übernahme von akk. *kuppuru* "kultisch reinigen" . . . ins Hebräische wahrscheinlich ist, . . . sind dennoch zahlreiche, über idiomatische und syntaktische Unterschiede hinausgehende Sachdifferenzen zu konstatieren, die die Annahme einer sachlichen Entsprechung zwischen hebr. *KPR* und akk. *kuppuru* als sehr problematisch erscheinen lassen."

the Hebrew division of the Old Testament. The purpose is (a) to establish if any particular morphological/ semantic patterns or usages are in any way related to either (i) the time, (ii) the kind of literature, (iii) sources, or (iv) authorship, and (b) to discover if there are any indications of more than one root of *nāśāʾ*.

4. The general use of *nāśāʾ* in the Pentateuch is then investigated, classified, and evaluated, with the classification system coming--as far as possible--from within the texts themselves rather than being imposed from without. Along the way we will be looking for any hints or indications of *nāśāʾ* being used as a technical term.

5. Then follow two sections containing exegesis of those texts in which the 'forgiveness' aspect most likely appears; texts involving (a) interpersonal relations in expressions such as *nāśāʾ* + human beings as objects, *nāśāʾ roʾš* or *nāśāʾ pānīm*, and (b) sin or wrongdoing such as *nāśāʾ ʿāwōn*, *nāśāʾ pešaʿ*, or *nāśāʾ ḥēṭ*. An attempt is made to discover how, or if, these expressions are related to a basic meaning of *nāśāʾ* or if they are simply idiomatic expressions devoid of any relationship with the basic meaning of *nāśāʾ*. These particular terms have been selected, because they are used in contexts within which the concept of forgiveness is frequently found, and until now they have received only a

limited attention, in spite of their importance for the understanding of this crucial issue in Biblical theology.

6. The paper finally looks at the relationship between the meaning of *nāšā*³ and the concept of forgiveness and how it relates to, or what it reveals about, the Biblical concept of forgiveness.

7. Finally, the evidence is summarized and evaluated within the framework of the stated delimitations.

Unless otherwise indicated, translations of Biblical texts are from the New American Standard Bible.

CHAPTER I

SURVEY OF EARLIER STUDIES

Three sources are basically available for this aspect of the present research. First are Hebrew lexica,¹ which by definition merely acknowledge the existence of a given term, give a few examples of its usage, and mention its closest equivalents in a modern language. Second are semantic/theological studies, which deal directly with the basic concept of the term in general, give its shades of meaning in a given context, and add the significance for the theological understanding of a particular passage. And third are books and/or articles which deal with it indirectly, often more or less incidentally in relation to some other topic or term.

The fact that these make up only a handful of authorities, and they are all limited in their treatment by the nature of their articles or subject, means that the traditional critical evaluation of their material does not seem fair. Instead, their work is acknowledged, surveyed, and briefly evaluated and commented upon as needed.

¹I.e., translations from Hebrew to one of the modern Western languages such as English, French, German, etc.

Lexical Listings

In this section we examine the data as presented by five major lexicographers in the last 150 years, beginning with G. Gesenius,¹ "the father of modern Hebrew lexicography,"² his revisers and followers both in Germany³ and the Anglo-Saxon world,⁴ down to the most recent contributions in our time.⁵ Since more than 90 percent of the Biblical usage is in the Qal (see table 5), we concentrate on that form. Not all of the translation possibilities are noted, but the emphasis is on the general rendering of the term, indicating its semantic

¹Guilielmi Gesenius, Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti (Lipsiae: Sumtibus Typisque Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelii, 1835).

²Edward F. Miller, The Influence of Gesenius on Hebrew Lexicography (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927), 11.

³Julius Fuerst, A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament, trans. Samuel Davidson (London: Williams & Norgate, 1867).

⁴Edward Robinson, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Cambridge: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1882). Francis Brown, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds., The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981).

⁵Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, published in 1953. It has since been updated and revised by a group of scholars as a third edition under the name Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967-90). In spite of the fact that both of the original authors have died, they are, however, still listed as the main authors. The two editions will be referred to as KBL and HAL, respectively.

scope and those expressions in particular which are most relevant to the present study, expressions involving interpersonal relations (i.e., *nāšāʾ roʾš* and *nāšāʾ pānīm*) and those that involve sin and/or wrongdoing.

G. Gesenius

General Scope

Gesenius¹ published his major Hebrew lexicon in 1835. In it he classifies the meanings of *nāšāʾ* into four main groups or categories which have both a literal and metaphoric sense. The first (Category I) has the sense of "take up," "lift up," "raise"; the second (Category II) has the meaning of "to take," "to take away." In the third group (Category III) are meanings such as "to get," "to receive," or "to obtain." The final group (Category IV) has the meaning "to take upon oneself," "to bear," or "to carry" both literal burdens and responsibility or sorrow.²

¹Gesenius has become the basis for several translations and/or editions. One of them is Edw. Robinson, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, on which the following discussion is based, since it follows the Latin edition of Gesenius closest, according to Miller, 96.

²In the 17th edition of Gesenius' lexicon--Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament, ed. Frants Buhl (Berlin: Springer Verlag, 1915/1949), 523-24--the three basic meanings are listed as (1) **heben, erheben, aufheben** (both literal and metaphoric); (2) **tragen, ertragen, führen**; and (3) **nehmen, wegnehmen**, i.e. **aufheben**, which is equated with forgiveness. Another dictionary with similar approach is D. Eduard König, Hebräisches und aramäisches

Specific Meanings

The expression $nāšā^{\text{p}}$ together with body parts or functions Gesenius regards as "a series of pleonasms common to the Hebrews"¹ and basically synonymous with or used as metonymy for a specific action characteristically performed by that body part and further defined by the context. These involve such objects as the hand for taking an oath, doing violence, in prayer or adoration, or beckoning; the eyes for beholding, longing, or desire; the voice for weeping, rejoicing, shouting, or uttering; the soul in longing; or the heart in adoration. All of these expressions are listed in Category I. The translations and comments indicate that Gesenius considers them mostly literal.

$Nāšā^{\text{p}}$ $ro^{\text{p}}š$ has basically a literal meaning, according to Gesenius' listings. In certain contexts it may mean "being cheerful and happy" or to "lift up anyone's head from prison" (which were mostly underground), implying "to bring one out of it" (Category I), or it may imply "the removal of the head," as in the case of Pharaoh's baker (Category II). Finally, it is used in

Wörterbuch (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936), 288-89. He also lists three basic meanings: (1) **aufheben, erheben**; (2) **wegnehmen** especially used about guilt, therefore = forgive. This meaning leads to **nehmen** in general, and finally (3) **tragen**, especially as it relate to consequences of guilt.

¹Robinson, 696.

the context of "taking the sum" of or "numbering" (Category III).

Another related expression is *nāšāʾ pānīm* "lift up one's own countenance," which may imply "conscious rectitude, cheerfulness and confidence," or "beholding with kindness" (Category I). It is also used concerning the acceptance of someone, and "is primarily used of a king or judge, who receives or admits those who visit him with salutations and presents, and favors their cause."¹ This acceptance can have both a positive connotation--"to accept" and "grant one's request"--or a negative one of "being partial" (Category III).

When *nāšāʾ* is connected with words for sin or wrongdoing, it may either have the sense of removal, thus "to expiate," "to make atonement for," "to forgive," or "pardon" (Category II); or it emphasizes the aspect of carrying, thus "bearing the sin (or guilt) of anyone," i.e., "to take upon oneself and bear the punishment of sin" (Category I & IV).²

Gesenius classifies the Hebrew expressions according to their various meanings rather than giving the various meanings of each expression. He interprets most expressions involving body parts and functions as

¹Ibid., 696. There is, however, no textual evidence for this interpretation.

²Ibid., 697.

involving an upwards movement or an increase in magnitude, and he gives no indication of the existence of idiomatic expressions conveying the idea of utilization of some body part or function, even though he has alluded to that idea.¹ Forgiveness is associated with the the idea of removal, and in interpersonal relations *nāšā*² implies acceptance.

J. Fuerst

General Scope

Fuerst² published his lexicon to the OT in 1857, some twenty years after Gesenius' Thesaurus. In many respects he is quite heavily influenced by Gesenius.³ He gives the basic meaning of *nāšā*² as "to stretch up," "raise up," "make ascend," based on Arabic cognates which have the idea of "extending upward," "to rise high," "be prominent" or "stretched out." These he considers forming the background for the Biblical meaning.⁴

From these basic meanings he classifies the usages of *nāšā*² into five main groups, the first of which (Category I) is related to bodily functions and has the meaning "to raise." The second group (Category II)

¹See p. 22 above.

²Julius Fuerst, A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament.

³Miller, 96.

⁴Ibid.

consists only of intransitive meanings such as "to be high, eminent, prominent," whereas the third (Category III) is transitive and contains the sense of removal, i.e., "to take away (or: off)," "to lift up (or: away)," "to carry off (or: away)" or "to lead." The fourth group (Category IV) has the basic idea of "to take" derived from the meaning of "to raise." As such it is parallel to *lāqah*. The fifth and final group (Category V) has the meaning of "to bear," based on the idea of lifting.

Specific Meanings

When body parts or functions are involved, the meaning basically indicates an upwards movement, either literal or quantitative. Most are in Category I. When *lēb heart* is the subject, it means "to make proud or haughty" or "to stir up" (Category I). Other expressions involve the following body parts as objects: feet for walking, hand for swearing, entreating, praying, or waving; eyes for looking, beholding, or longing; voice for weeping, exulting, rejoicing, or uttering aloud; and soul for striving.

Nāšā³ ro³š can have several meanings, depending on its context. Basically, it means to lift up the head and "going along with a cheerful spirit" (Category I).¹ It can also imply the taking "up of one's person (from

¹Ibid., 951.

humiliation, the depth of a prison), i.e., to redeem, to free him" (Category III),¹ or it may have the sense of "take the sum of" or "to number" (Category IV).

Nāśāṅ pānīm has basically a similar connotation, that of "going along with the face raised aloft" (Category I),² but on the basis of the meaning "to take" it also implies "accepting the person, i.e., to have a friendly regard for one, to admit and not to turn away from one," "be gracious, kind," "to have regard to," "to favour," or "to take the side of one with partiality" (Category IV).³

When used with words for sin or wrongdoing it means "to carry off" or "to take away sin," i.e., to forgive it, or "to expiate an offence" (Category III). In certain contexts it may also indicate the "bearing of the punishment (for sin) which one takes upon oneself."

Fuerst does not depart greatly from Gesenius' approach. The groups are similar, but Fuerst appears freer and more interpretative in his translations. He holds basically to the literal meanings and does not point out the idiomatic use of many of the expressions, even though he frequently supplements them with metaphoric

¹Ibid., 952.

²Ibid., 951.

³Ibid.

interpretations. In interpersonal relations *nāšā*² implies the process of lifting an individual from humiliation. Forgiveness is equated with the removal of sin.

F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs

General Scope

The dictionary by Brown, Driver, and Briggs,¹ or BDB as it is usually referred to, is probably the most popular Hebrew dictionary on the market. Nominally, it is based on Gesenius' lexicographic works, but in many respects it is a new work both as to material and arrangement.² The meaning of *nāšā*³ is classified into three major groups, the first of which (Category I) is "lift," or "lift up," both in a literal and figurative sense. The latter meaning is mostly related to body parts or functions. In the second group (Category II) are those expressions which have the sense of "to bear," or "to carry" including "support," "sustain," "suffer," and "endure," whereas the final group (Category III) consists of meanings indicating removal (i.e., "to take" or "to take away").

¹The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.

²Miller, 99.

Specific Meanings

Most expressions involving body parts or functions are in Category I, such as lifting up the feet for walking; hand for display of power or taking an oath, in prayer or blessing; eyes implying worship or desire; voice for loud utterance; soul for desire, or uttering a name. All of these are interpreted as involving some form of a literal movement, even though that move may not be the primary thrust.

$Nāśā^{\supset} ro^{\supset}š$ implies "restoring someone to honor" when it is used to refer to someone else's head (Category I). In certain contexts it refers to "numbering" or "counting" (Category III). $Nāśā^{\supset} pānīm$ indicates the "lifting of someone's face," in the sense of "granting his request," or "receiving him graciously" (Category I).¹

When used together with words for wrongdoing, $nāśā^{\supset}$ sometimes indicates the inevitable that the wrongdoer will "take up (or: incur)" sin or iniquity for his wrong actions (Category I). At other times it refers to "being responsible for" or "bearing of guilt (or punishment)" (Category II), or it may refer to the removal of the sin, thus "to take away guilt, iniquity or transgression" which BDB equates with forgiveness

¹BDB, 670.

(Category III).¹ In these contexts it is parallel in meaning with *sālah* and *‘ābar* (high).

BDB follow basically the same classification as their predecessors and the relatively literal sense of expressions with *nāšā’*. They do not point out any idiomatic use, even though they imply it in some of their comments. In interpersonal relations *nāšā’* may signify restoration. In other contexts it may suggest the idea of support or sustaining, but BDB do not relate that sense to human beings. When it is used concerning sin or wrongdoing, it may refer to three aspects: the incurring of guilt, carrying the guilt or punishment, or the taking away of the guilt or iniquity, which is equated with forgiveness.

L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner

General Scope

The most recent of the major Hebrew lexica on the market today is a revision of a classical work by two German scholars, L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner.² Instead of classifying the meanings like their predecessors, they enumerate eighteen different meanings, with "carry" (*tragen*) listed first in the latest edition.³ Next they

¹Ibid., 671.

²See above, p. 20, note 5.

³In the first edition, KBL of 1953, this meaning is

have a series of expressions with *nāšā*³, most of which involve body parts and are based on the meaning "lift," "raise" (*heben, auf-, er-, hoch-*). With terms related to speaking, it implies "utter," "express" (*aussprechen, anstimmen*). When it is in the context of burdens it refers to "take," "bear," "carry" (*fassen, (er)tragen*), and finally, there are meanings such as "take," "remove" (*nehmen, wegtragen*).

Specific Meanings

Following the meaning "to carry" various burdens, HAL₃ lists several expressions involving body parts or functions. You may lift the feet for walking, the hand either against someone or in an attitude of prayer, plea, or taking an oath; the voice for weeping, uttering, or pronouncing; the soul in desire; or the heart may *nāšā*³ man by driving him or making him willing.

*Nāšā*³ *ro*³*š* may refer to the freeing of an individual and is related to Akkadian and Egyptian expressions for caring or healing--"sich kümmern um" or "einem Kranken die Kräfte wiedergeben."¹ In those

listed in the 12th place, whereas "lift" is first. This interesting shift in rank appears to be more in line with the Biblical usage. (Translations of German terms from the third edition, HAL₃, are my own.)

¹HAL₃, 684. KBL, 635, on the other hand, gives "lift the head" (indicating independence), and "restore one's repute."

contexts it is parallel to *nāšāʾ pānīm*. It may also refer to simple "head-count" (parallel with *pāqad*), or the literal removal of the head.¹

Nāšāʾ pānīm may refer to the recovery of an individual, "being partial towards" someone, either for good or bad, or "accepting one in a friendly manner." Basically, both of these expressions are seen as literal with some metaphoric connotation.

When sins are involved, *nāšāʾ* refers to the "bearing of the guilt," either one's own or someone else's, or it may refer to the "removal of the guilt (or punishment)," which is forgiveness.

HAL₃ breaks away from the classification approach and the usual "basic idea." Instead it lists the various meanings sequentially. The Hebrew expressions are still listed according to their meaning rather than lexical morphs. There is no explicit indication of the existence of idiomatic expressions; they are mostly explained literally with a few metaphoric connotations. Interpersonal relations are not pointed out, only vaguely hinted at by expressions such as "showing favor" or "accepting kindly." To bear someone else's guilt or removing it is referred to as forgiveness.²

¹Ibid., 684, 685.

²HAL₃, 685.

W. L. Holladay

General Scope

Holladay's dictionary¹ is basically an abridged translation of KBL. Holladay makes his own judgments, however, in many cases. In his treatment of *nāšā*² he combines the listings of KBL with a classification of the meanings similar to Gesenius and Fuerst above. Holladay does this by emphasizing some of the meanings, giving the impression of groups, the first of which (Category I) has to do with body parts which you "lift," or "raise (high)," mostly in a literal sense. His second emphasis (Category II) is on "to contain," relating to measuring. Then follows (in Category III) "to bear" or "carry" in both a literal and metaphoric sense. The fourth emphasis (Category IV) is on concepts such as "to support," or "bear," whether misery, guilt, or other burdens, both physical and mental. Finally, there is the idea of "to take" or "to take away" (Category V).

Specific Meanings

Under Category I Holladay lists several expressions involving body parts and functions, such as lifting the feet for walking, the hand in taking an oath, entreaty, or prayer; the eyes for looking up, the voice

¹William L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971).

for calling, rejoicing, or weeping; the soul in longing, or the heart may lift one by driving him or making him willing.

$Nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ $ro^{\text{ṣ}}$ refers to "lifting one's own head high," "lifting someone else's head," which Holladay sees as a legal expression for forgiveness, "lifting the head of Israel" by counting them, or, literally, "removing the head by beheading."

$Nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ $pānīm$ indicates "lifting one's own face," implying confidence or being favorably disposed to someone; "lifting someone else's face," i.e., "accepting him favorably," "paying attention to," or "being partial towards" someone.

Under Category III Holladay gives examples of children being carried, a yoke being borne, or fruit being yielded. Category IV emphasizes meanings involving bearing a plight or bringing objects or loads.

When $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ is connected with words for sin it suggests "bearing one's own guilt" and taking its consequences, "bearing someone else's guilt" and paying the penalty, or "taking his guilt away," which is forgiveness.

Holladay has basically broken away from both the rigid classification and the listing-approach of his predecessors and developed a system that combines some of the benefits of both. He lists his entries according to

the lexical morphs rather than their meanings. He does not, however, specifically point out the idiomatic use of some of the expressions and translates them, therefore, quite literally. He has not benefited from volume three of HAL,¹ which gives "carry" as the first meaning of *nāšāʾ*, and he does not connect the idea of support with persons. Holladay is, on the other hand, the only one of these lexicographers to state explicitly that *nāšāʾ roʾš* may in certain contexts indicate pardon.² Other interpersonal relations are demonstrated by being favorable towards someone. To take away someone's guilt and punishment is seen to be the meaning of forgiving.

Summary

Table 1 summarizes what these five representative lexicographers have to say about major aspects of the root *nāšāʾ*: its basic meanings, *nāšāʾ* with expressions indicating interpersonal relations, and *nāšāʾ* with expressions for sin and wrongdoing. When it comes to other body parts or functions such as *yād* the hand, *qôl* the voice, *ʿênāyim* the eyes, *nepeš* the soul, or *lēb* the heart, all these lexicographers give meanings involving the idea of lifting, either literal or metaphoric, such as an upward

¹Not published until 1983 whereas Holladay's lexicon appeared in 1971.

²Holladay, 246.

TABLE 1
MEANINGS OF NĀŠĀ³

	Nāšā ³	nāšā ³ ro ³ š	nāšā ³ pānīm	nāšā ³ ʿāwōn/peša ³ hēt ³
G e s e n i u s	a)take up lift up raise b)take away c)get receive d)bear, carry	a)take, lift up (out of sub- ter. prison) c)take the sum (number)	a)lift up the face (behold with kindness) c)accept a per- son be favorable be partial to	d)bear sin receive pun- ishment b)expiate pardon
F u e r s t	stretch up raise up a)raise b)be high prominent c)take away d)take, accept e)bear	c)take away one's head take one from humiliation or prison redeem, free d)take the sum	d)be gracious towards accept one esteem highly be partial to	c)carry off sin take away (forgive) expiate an offence e)bear sin or punishment
B D B	a)lift (up) b)bear, carry c)take (away)	a)restore to honor c)number	a)grant request receive grac- iously	a)incur sin b)bear guilt or punishment c)take away guilt
H A L	a)carry b)lift, raise c)take, bear, carry d)take remove	b)lift the head (independence) c)take the sum d)take away the head	b)lift up the face show favor (of God) accept	c)bear guilt d)take away guilt or punishment
H o l l a d a y	a)lift, raise b)contain c)bear, carry d)support, bear e)take (away)	a)lift the head of self =(in- dependence) of others = pardon of nation = (census)	a)lift the face of self = (be favorable) of others = accept, be partial	d)bear penalty/ consequence e)take away guilt or punishment

move or increased loudness or intensity.

The first column gives the basic or key meanings according to the lexicographers; the alphabetic enumeration in the other columns refers to the basic meaning from which the meaning of a given expression is derived. Words in parenthesis indicate explanations by the authors rather than translations. As the table reveals, all the dictionaries relate forgiveness to the meaning "take away" or "remove" the guilt. Only Holladay explicitly equates $nāšā^{\text{ׇ}}$ $ro^{\text{ׇ}}$ š with pardon.

Basic Meaning

The enumeration of data gathered from the lexicographic studies reveals a basic consensus as to the semantic range of the root $nāšā^{\text{ׇ}}$. It is apparently quite a neutral term which is strongly colored by its context. The closest English equivalent appears to be the verb "carry" and its wide semantic range, including the concepts of "lifting" and "moving." The exact nuance is then adapted to the needs of, and is honed by, a given context.

Semantic-Theological Studies

The first in-depth article devoted to the Hebrew root $nāšā^{\text{ׇ}}$ appeared only a few years ago. In this section I first analyze the few discussions of $nāšā^{\text{ׇ}}$, in general, and then look at articles which examine some of the

specific expressions related to the present topic, in particular.

F. Stolz

Apparently, the first article written in this century to deal exclusively with *nāšāʾ* was written by F. Stolz¹ and appeared in a two-volume theological dictionary in the early 1970s. Due to space limitations, however, it is little more than a lexical entry in the form of an essay.

Stolz sees the basic meaning of *nāšāʾ* as "lift," "carry," "take away"--(*aufheben*, *tragen*, *wegtragen*)--based on the Arabic intransitive verb *nāš* "raise oneself." The usage, according to Stolz, is mostly literal or with literal overtones when referring to bodily gestures. From the meaning "carry" is derived the sense of "suffer," "endure," "tolerate," and the subject may be the land, man, or God.

Nāšāʾ roʾš implies freedom, power, and self-consciousness, but its flexible meanings also form the basis for a play on words as Joseph interprets the dreams of the baker and butler. In the case of the butler the expression indicated freedom, whereas in the case of the baker the same expression is used literally for "taking

¹[XV] *nāš* *aufheben*, *tragen*," THAT (1971), 2:109-17.

the head = execute."¹ In certain contexts this expression refers to the taking of a census or numbering.

*Nāšā*² *pānīm* is "an expression of a good conscience or expectation."² Used transitively it indicates to "be favorable towards," "grant," "please." When used of God it has a saving connotation.³ In texts such as Lev 19:15 the expression is used about partiality, and in Deut 10:17 it is parallel with *lāqah šoḥaḍ* "take a bribe."⁴

When *nāšā*⁵ is used in connection with terms for transgression, wrongdoing, or sin, Stolz distinguishes between "incurring guilt" and "carrying (the results of) the guilt." At the same time he follows Knierim⁶ with regard to the possibility of a substitutional carrying.⁶ The concept of forgiveness is related to the meaning "take away," "remove," in line with Stamm.⁷

¹Ibid., 111.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., 112.

⁴Apparently the expression by itself is neutral, but depending on the context it may convey a positive or negative image.

⁵See pages 44-47 below.

⁶Stolz, 113: "Dabei ist allenfalls Stellvertretung möglich, die durch den Priester (Ex 28,38), die Söhne (Num 14,33), den Propheten (Ez 4,4-6) und schließlich den Gottesknecht (Jes 53,12, par. *pāga*⁷ hi. "eintreten für", womit das aktive Moment bei der Stellvertretung durch den Gottesknecht in Sicht kommt) vollzogen werden kann."

⁷Stolz, 114. See Johann J. Stamm, Erlösen und

D. N. Freedman and B. E. Willoughby

The most extensive discussion to date of the term *nāšā*¹ is the result of a collaboration of Freedman and Willoughby.¹ Their basic definition of *nāšā*² is "lift," "carry," "take," indicating the physical act of lifting and/or carrying with all its ramifications and a primary emphasis on a plight rather than pleasure.

Sie bezeichnet die physische Bewegung des Hochhebens und Tragens mit allen denkbaren Assoziationen. . . . Das Hauptgewicht, sowohl materialiter als auch in emotionaler und spiritueller Hinsicht, liegt auf der Vorstellung vom Ertragen oder Aushalten: sei es von Strafe, Schmach o.ä.²

The term is used in both literal and metaphoric contexts, and similar usage is also found in cognate languages. In Ugaritic and Aramaic there are only a few occurrences of the term, whereas in Accadian it occurs quite frequently in various contexts.

Freedman and Willoughby devote a good portion of their study to the various metaphoric usages of *nāšā*³. First of all they point out that it may have the connotation of participation and caring. The term may also express God's attitude toward His people as He not only leads but also supports and sustains them. This idea

Vergeben im Alten Testament (Bern: A. Francke A.-G. Verlag, 1940), 67-69. See pages 41-43 below.

¹Freedman and Willoughby, TWAT (1987), 5:626-43.

²Ibid., 627.

is sustained by the prophets where the verb implies acts such as "help," "lead," "support," "care for," and also-- in connection with shame and guilt--"to suffer."¹

When *nāšāʾ roʾš* is used about someone else's head, it may have a literal sense of "removing the head," a metaphoric sense of "restoring to honor" or a technical sense of "taking a census" or "numbering."

Nāšāʾ pānīm may have the literal sense of "lifting one's own face (as a sign of good conscience)" or a metaphoric one of "lifting someone else's face," implying the idea of being favorable or gracious towards someone.

When the root is used together with terms for sin or wrongdoing, it means literally "carry/bear (the wrong)." This has three aspects, according to Freedman and Willoughby, the first of which is accepting the responsibility for one's own wrongdoing and paying the price. The price in itself cannot, however, bridge the breach in relationship caused by the wrongdoing. Forgiveness comes in and eases the burden and bridges the gap.² Second, it may involve carrying the guilt and/or the consequences of someone else's wrongdoing. This includes taking the responsibility for what was done wrong and reconciling with the wrongdoer, as in the case of

¹Ibid., 632.

²Ibid., 634.

Joseph who had suffered wrong from his brothers, but then needs to be reconciled with them. But it may also involve a symbolic act performed by or with the aid of a prophet, a priest, or a goat.¹

Finally, it may involve God carrying the guilt of man, which is the essence of divine forgiveness.² In this act the different connotations of *nāšā*³ come together-- "lift," "carry," "endure," or "carry responsibility." That does not mean, however, that God ignores the wrongdoing, but rather that He does not retaliate. "He forgives but does not reject." He does not remove the consequences, but neither does he prolong them.³

J. J. Stamm

In his treatise on redemption and forgiveness in the OT⁴ Stamm states that it is his goal to analyze and establish the meaning of the terms and images used for forgiveness and redemption in the OT, or

die für Erlösung und Vergebung im Alten Testament üblichen Termini bsw. Bilder zu analysieren, ihre Herkunft nach Möglichkeit zu bestimmen und ihre Bedeutung innerhalb der sonstigen alttestamentlichen Heilsterminologie zu erkennen.⁵

¹Ibid., 636-37.

²Ibid., 637.

³Ibid., 638.

⁴Stamm, Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament.

⁵Ibid., 5.

It is therefore disappointing to note that he omits, or only briefly mentions, some key terms which might enrich the understanding of the concept of forgiveness. Of the expressions involving the root *nāšā*² Stamm only briefly discusses one, *nāšā*² *‘āwôn*;¹ but he omits completely parallels such as *nāšā*² *ḥēṭ*² and *nāšā*² *peša*^c.² He argues that the expressions involving *nāšā*² come primarily from the sphere of the cultus, possibly also the legal,³ but he gives no evidence or support for the latter. The former image, he maintains, on the other hand, goes back to the act performed with the goat for Azazel on the Day of Atonement when the goat *nāšā*² the sin of the people into the desert, away from the camp. This, he contends, is what forgiveness is about.

Diese aus dem magischen Stellvertretungsgedanken erwachsene Vorstellung liegt nun vielleicht auch der Wendung *nāšā*² *‘āwôn* "die Sünde wegnehmen = vergeben" zugrunde. Danach würde der Unschuldige die Sünde des

¹Ibid., 67-70.

²He acknowledges their existence on pp. 69-70 but does not discuss their significance.

³Ibid., 67, 86. However, as he considers the fact that the expression *nāšā*² *‘āwôn* in pre-exilic literature is found exclusively in narratives, he wonders if that implies that the expression might have had its origin in non-cultic context. Finally, he leaves the topic with one further unanswered question concerning its origin, whether it derives from the imagery of sin as being an object that needs to be taken away, or if it is derived from some particular (but unknown) custom in ancient Israel.

Schuldigen wegnehmen oder sie wegtragen, was ins Geistige übertragen, der Vergebung gleichkommt.¹

When *nāšāʾ* is without *ʿāwôn* or related words as an object, Stamm argues that it has an abstract meaning and is parallel in meaning to *sālah*,² which is the *terminus technicus* for forgiveness in the Old Testament. The few examples he gives³ do not, however, substantiate his claim, for other evidence indicates that it also retains its literal meaning of "lifting" and "carrying" in that position.⁴

Stamm's brief discussion leaves much to be desired and many unanswered questions, for it provides only a brief and somewhat inaccurate and superficial view of this particular term. He does not accomplish what he intended since he leaves the term *nāšāʾ* without establishing its meaning and significance in its context.

¹Ibid., 70.

²Ibid., 69. "Sicher ist, daß *nāšāʾ* ohne *ʿāwôn* etc., als Objekt eine ganze abstrakte Bedeutung hat und sinnbegleich mit *sālah* ist."

³He quotes such texts as Hos 1:6, Gen 18:22b-33a, Num 14:19, and Ps 99:8.

⁴In Num 4:15 sanctuary objects are implied, in Num 7:9 and 11:17 the implied object is "responsibility," in Ps 89:9 it is related to "waves," in Ps 93:3 "floods," and Ps 24:4 "doors."

R. Knierim

Rolf Knierim¹ is much more thorough in his treatment of the term *nāšāʾ* as it relates to various terms for sin and wrongdoing, even though that aspect is only secondary to his main topic. He remarks that when *nāšāʾ* is used with terms for sin, it implies the carrying of the consequences of that wrongdoing as a real burden.² It may either be carried by the wrongdoer himself or by someone else, in which case the wrongdoer is "released," which is the idea of forgiveness. In both these cases the Hebrew expression is the same--*nāšāʾ* *ʿāwôn/hētʾ*/*pešaʿ*. This leads to a question which is quite pertinent to the present study:

Liegen hier zwei verschiedene Vorgänge zugrunde, so daß die Konformität der Bezeichnung rein zufällig und darum unsere herkömmlich verschiedene Übersetzung der Vorgänge sachlich richtig ist? Oder drückt die Wendung beidemal vor allem den gleichen Grundvorgang aus, während die Verschiedenheit der Träger nicht aus der Wendung, sondern nur aus dem Zusammenhang erschlossen werden kann?³

He points out that the expression *nāšāʾ hētʾ* indicates that a wrongdoer must carry the results of his wrongdoing like a burden, and at times it may lead to

¹Knierim, Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im Alten Testament.

²Ibid., 52, 53 passim.

³Ibid., 52.

death.¹

The wrongdoer cannot rid himself of that burden. He is condemned to carry it. That leads to a crucial question in the mind of many: "Is it possible that someone else--a substitute--may carry the burden?" The answer, according to Knierim, is not an unqualified "yes," "sondern von Fall zu Fall ein ungewisses Fragen und Bitten, ohne Garantie der Entlastung," but it is still a "yes."² There is no magic involved, as Stamm maintains,³ but rather a dynamic relationship between the "forgiver" and the "forgiven."⁴

Knierim argues that what really is involved in the process has been largely lost sight of in translations. Hebrew does not differentiate between *nāšāʾ* *ḥēṭ*, *nāšāʾ* *ʿāwôn*, and *nāšāʾ* *pešaʿ* when they relate to the wrongdoer, on the one hand, and when they relate to the "wronged," on the other. In Hebrew the expression remains the same;

¹Ibid. Die Formel 'er soll seine Verfehlung tragen' zeigt zunächst, daß ein Täter die Folgen seiner Verfehlung zu tragen hat, und zwar als eine Last, die ihn unter Umständen zu Tode bringt.

²Ibid.

³Stamm, 70.

⁴Knierim, 221 passim. He also points out (p. 220) that "in 15 Fällen [in the OT] haben die Schuldigen den *ʿāwôn* selbst zu tragen. In 20 Fällen wird der *ʿāwôn* eines Schuldigen durch einen anderen getragen, sei es durch den Bock, Aaron mit seinem Söhnen, die Leviten, einen Mann (für seine Frau), Vater oder Sohn, den Propheten, schließlich durch Gott selbst."

only the subject of the sentence changes.¹ The differentiation is found only in translations, with the result that the active role of the "forgiver" and the substitutionary aspect of the process, which is an integral part of the Hebrew understanding, is lost sight of.

Ist der Schuldträger ein anderer als der Schuldige, so liegt für den Ausdruck *nāšāʾ* ^ʿ*āwôn* die Auffassung von Stellvertretung oder Tausch näher als die von Vergebung, in der nicht mehr sichtbar wird, was der Träger eigentlich tut.²

Knierim maintains that it is only natural and to be expected that the wrongdoer has to carry his own wrongs and suffer the consequences, but the surprising element is the fact that someone else, even God himself, may take over the burden and thus release the wrongdoer from the ultimate consequence--death.³

Irgend jemand trägt den ^ʿ*āwôn*. Daß der Bock den ^ʿ*āwôn* wegträgt und daß der ^ʿ*āwôn* infolgedessen vom Schuldigen 'weggenommen' wird, ist dabei eine bestimmte Ausprägung des Grundvorgangs. Nur daß ein anderer den ^ʿ*āwôn* eines Schuldigen trägt, ist das Neue und Erstaunliche, in dem aus dem Ganzheits- oder Solidaritätsdenken stammenden Stellvertretungsgedanken begründete. Erst recht erstaunlich ist es, wenn gesagt wird, daß Gott den ^ʿ*āwôn* der Menschen trägt.⁴

¹Ibid., 53.

²Ibid., 221-22.

³Ibid., 51. "Einmal muß der Mensch seinen *hēt* selbst tragen (und sterben), das andere Mal trägt Jahwe oder ein anderer Mensch den *hēt* des Menschen weg, und der Täter lebt."

⁴Ibid., 221.

Knierim's approach to the text is form-historical in which he evaluates the individual expressions in light of the literary form in which they are found. Expressions containing *nāšā*¹ and words for sin or wrongdoing are strongly formularic,¹ according to Knierim. The contextual connotation is also more that of "carrying" than "lifting," and forgiveness has to do with carrying the burden of guilt of someone else and releasing him from the ultimate consequence, death.²

W. Zimmerli

In 1954 Zimmerli published an article about the prophetic speeches in Ezekiel³ in which he discussed among other things the expression *nāšā*⁴ *ʿāwōn* in the Old Testament. Altogether he finds the expression thirty-five times. In seven of them God is the subject,⁴ and the implication is that He forgives the sinner.

The remaining twenty-seven texts have persons as the subject, except in one instance: the scapegoat in Lev 16:22. He divides these texts into three categories: (1)

¹Ibid., 51.

²Ibid.

³Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," 1-26, especially 9-12.

⁴Ibid., 9. He lists the following texts: Exod 34:7; Num 14:18; Ps 32:5; 85:3; Isa 33:24; Hos 14:3; Mic 7:18. He adds Gen 4:13 as a possible eighth, depending on the interpretation of that text.

those containing priestly verdict or diagnosis in which the priest confirms a certain sinful action or transgression against the sphere of that which is holy, the consequence of which is the exclusion from the congregation;¹ (2) a "weakened" sense--that of being responsible for something;² and finally (3) the idea of substitution or vicariously bearing the guilt of others.³ He contends that this is especially true in such texts as Ezek 4:4-6 and Isa 53:11.

Zimmerli only emphasizes the "bearing" or "carrying" aspect of *nāšā*³, involving either one's own wrongs and responsibilities, or those of others

¹Ibid., 10. He lists the following: Exod 28:43; Lev 5:1,17; 7:18; 17:16; 19:8; 20:17,19; 22:16; Num 5:31; 30:16; Ezek 14:10; 44:10,12. He adds: "'Seine Schuld tragen' ist fast etwas wie eine priesterlich-medizinische Diagnose über einen Menschen, der von einem gefährlichen Krankheitszustand befallen ist, dessen Auswirkungen sich unweigerlich einstellen werden" (p. 12).

²Ibid. He lists these texts: Num 18:1 (2x); 18:23; Ezek 18:19,20 (3x).

³Exod 28:38; Lev 10:17; 16:22; Num 14:34; Ezek 4:4,5,6. He says: "In Szenen der Stellvertretung kann er das 'Schuld Tragen' des Stellvertreters aussagen. So trägt der Sündenbock die Schuld des Volkes auf sich in die Wüste hinaus (Lev 16,22); der Sündopferbock ist von Jahwe "gesetzt, die Schuld der Gemeinde zu tragen, um für sie Sühne zu erwirken" (Lev 10,17). Gehört es auch in diesen Zusammenhang, daß Aaron in seinem Stirnblatt 'die Verschuldung des Heiligen (Opfers)' trägt (Exod 28,38)?" W. Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 1:117.

vicariously, but he does not associate this with the idea of forgiveness.¹

R. N. Whybray

In his study on Isa 53 R. N. Whybray² takes issue with Zimmerli's three categories mentioned above, especially the idea of a vicarious bearing of punishment on behalf of others. He asserts that it is never present.³ On the basis of that presupposition he re-examines all the occurrences of *nāšā* *ʿāwôn* in the OT, and its parallel expression *nāšā* *ḥēṭ*. He comes to the conclusion that all of the texts, which according to Zimmerli imply vicarious bearing of punishment or guilt, can and should be explained differently, and the idea of vicarious suffering is "not the correct interpretation."⁴

Instead of Zimmerli's three categories, Whybray suggests six. He feels that only Zimmerli's first

¹In fact, the expression "forgive/forgiveness" is strangely absent in his theology. According to Chong-Hyon Sung "Sündenvergebung Jesu bei den Synoptikern und seine Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum" (Inaugural-Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch Theologischen Fakultät an der Eberhard-Karls-Universität zu Tübingen, 1984), 6, note 19 it is only found three times in Zimmerli's Grundriß der alttestamentlicher Theologie, once in connection with festivals, the others in the context of rituals (pages 112 and 113).

²Whybray, especially pages 31-57.

³Ibid., 31.

⁴Ibid., 56, 31.

category--dealing with a priestly verdict confirming some wrong act having been committed--is sound. He adds, however, two texts dealing with substitution and vicarious suffering--Num 18:1 and 23--which Zimmerli included in his third category. Zimmerli's second and third categories "must be deleted as erroneous."¹ Whybray replaces them with five new categories. The first expresses a sense of a priestly verdict, but is different from Zimmerli's in that it does not involve "a divine warning as to what will happen if a certain sin is committed, but [rather] a divine judgement on a sin already committed."² The second category expresses the sense of 'taking away guilt,' which is somewhat comparable to God's forgiving sins. The third has to do with a physical act involving the removal of guilt as in the process involving the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement which literally 'removed' the people's guilt to a distant place in the wilderness. The fourth category expresses a participation or sharing in a punishment together with the wrongdoer rather than in his place. Finally, there is the carrying (into the sanctuary) of an object representing the people's guilt, objects such as

¹Ibid., 56.

²For these categories, see *ibid.*, 56, 57.

the twelve stones with the names of the tribes, the Urim and Thummim, and the "flower" on the headgear.¹

Whybray uses a very literal interpretation of *nāšā*² in the context of sin and wrongdoing. Each wrongdoer must carry his own guilt or the consequences of his actions like a burden. In the cultus the priests then carried literal objects "representing" the wrongs of the people without involving themselves in any other way. He does not associate *nāšā*² with forgiveness, for that would contest his idea of non-substitution.

Summary

Stamm, Zimmerli, and Whybray only discuss a very limited aspect of *nāšā*², the expression *nāšā*² *‘āwôn*. Stamm sets the stage for further exploration and discussion by pointing out the relationship between forgiveness and substitution. Zimmerli classifies all the passages in which the expression occurs and shows among other how the cultic use of *nāšā*² is related to vicarious carrying or suffering, without explicitly associating it

¹On his discussion of this theory, see *ibid.*, 39-40. He argues that in the same way as the stones and the Urim and Thummim are real objects, which can be put on and carried, "represent" the people or their wrongdoings, the parallel structure of the passage "requires" that the headgear must have included some tangible object, such as a flower, which could have "represented" the people's wrongdoings in some way. This interpretation, however, appears quite conjectural since there is no textual evidence for such an item.

with the concept of forgiveness. Whybray challenges Zimmerli's classification because he is opposed to the idea of substitution. He argues rather for individual responsibility where each individual must carry the consequences of his own wrongdoing. No one else can do that.

The dictionary article by Stolz is little more than a lexical entry, whereas the one by Freedman and Willoughby is much more comprehensive, but by its very nature it can only touch upon a few significant issues based on the evidence presented. This does not mean that the authors are unaware of them, but rather that space prevents them from developing them further.

For Knierim the study of the use of *nāšāʾ* is only secondary to his main project, but he succeeds in bringing out some interesting implications, which invite further investigation--subjects such as the use of *nāšāʾ* involving interpersonal relations or its use with wrongdoing as an object.

The evidence gathered from these sources indicates a general consensus that the basic meaning of *nāšāʾ* has to do with "lifting," "carrying," or "taking," either in a literal or metaphoric sense. This triple concept is repeated with minor variations in all the sources examined. Most of the authors stress the literal sense, almost to the exclusion of the metaphoric, and they

usually fail to point out the idiomatic use of certain expressions involving *nāśā*³.

No one has suggested the existence of a homonymous root for the concept of forgiveness, even though they seem to suggest that the concept of forgiveness is more or less "appended" to the root rather than being an integral part of it. All of the studies see forgiveness as the removal of sin, guilt, transgression, or wrongdoing. Four of the authors--Knierim, Stolz, Zimmerli, Freedman and Willoughby--point out a substitutionary aspect of forgiveness; three--Knierim, Holladay, Freedman and Willoughby--include the aspect of forgiveness in interpersonal relations, and only two--Knierim, Freedman and Willoughby--give some evidence for the caring, supporting aspect of *nāśā*³. But none of them associates that aspect with the idea of forgiveness.

It seems evident, therefore, that a further study of this term, its etymology, connotations, possible relationship to phonetically related terms, and general usage is called for in order to determine its meaning and establish its significance for the concept of forgiveness. This is the subject of the present investigation in chapter 2.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF EXTRA-BIBLICAL USAGE

Cognate languages can be a boon or bane in lexical studies. The fact that a particular term exists in different languages usually implies that they are related, but its meaning may be quite different in these languages.¹ Nevertheless, its presence and usage in one language always provides some information which may be helpful in determining its range of meanings.

The purpose of this chapter is basically twofold: (1) to establish the presence and acknowledge the existence of the root *nś*² in the larger Semitic context, and (2) to examine examples of its usage, in order to determine whether they throw some light on the Biblical usage, either by means of contrast or confirmation.

Since it is a generally accepted fact that *nś*² is a common Semitic root and is found with similar meanings in practically all Semitic languages,² it seems most

¹Compare, for instance, the root *škh*, which means "to forget" in Hebrew, but "to find" in Aramaic.

²See Charles-F. Jean and Jacob Hoftijser, Dictionnaire des inscriptions semitiques de l'ouest

profitable to examine the range of meanings within those languages which have the closest affinity with Biblical Hebrew: Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic.¹ They have been selected for three reasons: (1) they represent major geographical areas and branches of the Semitic languages: the East--Akkadian; the Northwest--Ugaritic; and the North--Aramaic, and they cover an area that had close historical and cultural ties and interchange with the Hebrews in the Biblical period; (2) they represent usages that are older and/or contemporary with the Biblical usage, and (3) there is a substantial body of documents available in these languages. That survey elucidates the

(Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), 186-187; BDB, 669 and HAL₃, 683, which list the following occurrences: Middle (=Mishnaic) Hebrew and Palmyrene (in both of which it is also written *nāšāʾ*), Samaritan, Syro-Palestinian, Ugaritic, Canaanite, Amorite, Moabite Aramaic (where it was increasingly replaced by *nāsab*) Old Aramaic, Egyptian Aramaic, Biblical Aramaic, Arabic (where it means "push out," "grow," or "lift oneself up"), Old South Arabic, Ethiopic, Tigri, Amharic, and Akkadian. The presence of this root in Eblaite is debated. Mitchell Dahood, "Ebla, Ugarit, and the Bible," in Giovanni Pettinato, The Archives of Ebla (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 287 argues that the root *na-se*, meaning "prefect" has "a clear etymology in *nšʾ*, 'to lift up'." Others, e.g. Edmond Sollberger, Administrative Texts Chiefly Concerning Textiles, ARET VIII (Rome: Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria, 1986), 63; and Maria Giovanna Biga and Lucio Milano, Testi Amministrativi: Assegnazioni di Tessuti, ARET IV (1984), 314, see it rather derived from Akkadian *nišū*, meaning "people."

¹See William S. LaSor, David A. Hubbard, and Frederic Wm. Bush, Old Testament Survey (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982), 27-29, and David Ewert, From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), 39-44.

general use of the root *nāšā*¹ in the Semitic world in the Biblical period. The usages are examined in the four basic semantic categories usually given in lexica, i.e., 'transport,' 'support,' 'utilization,' and relationships/attitudes. Usually, only one example is given for a given meaning, but in some cases more than one may be mentioned if it illustrates noticeable variation in meaning.

Akkadian

Akkadian¹ provides us with the greatest variety and frequency of the use of *našû* which is the cognate equivalent of the Hebrew *nāšā*². A detailed analysis of all of the available data in Akkadian is not called for in the present research, but samples of its usage and meanings are helpful in providing a basis for better understanding the pan-Semitic range of this root.

The root *našû* appears frequently in Akkadian inscriptions.² It has a wide range of meanings which CAD groups under five major headings, besides idioms, in the basic G form: (1) "to lift," "take up an object," (2) "to

¹This section is based on data listed in The Assyrian Dictionary published by The Oriental Institute in Chicago (hereinafter CAD), 11:80-112; Friedrich Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896), 484-85; and Wolfram von Soden, Akkadisches Handwörterbuch (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1972), 2:762-765.

²CAD lists 33 two-column pages of various usages of *našû*.

transport," "carry" or "bring," (3) "to take," "accept," "receive," (4) "to remove," "take off," and (5) "to rise," "heave," "move on." The general idea appears to be one of a (usually) upward movement which the context places almost exclusively in a durative rather than a momentary setting.

Našû as Transport

In many contexts *našû* conveys the idea of the movement of an object from its place. This movement may be either 'real' or 'symbolic,' that is to say, the movement itself is not the aspect being emphasized but is closely associated with the action, and often even symbolic of it.

Data

1. *LU.MES ša šarra iš-ši-ú-ni.*

"The men who had carried the king."¹

2. *šābum ša karānam ana GN i-na-aš-šu-ú.*

"The men who transported the wine to GN."²

3. *dīni ša talbultu ša šarri . . . ša ultu Eanna iš-šu-ú.*

"The case of the garment of the king which they stole from Eanna."³

4. *mé . . . ta-na-aš-ši-ma ana muḥḥi qaqqad immeri tana[qqi].*

¹Ibid., 88a.

²Ibid., 87b.

³Ibid., 102b.

"You take the water and pour it over the sheep's head" (as a part of a ritual).¹

5. áš-ši [re]-ši-ia ana Sin akarrab.

"I lifted my head to address a prayer to Sin."²

6. šumma šubātīšu šārum i-tí-ší.

"If the wind has carried off his textiles."³

7. u lu mimma maššīta eriqqašu šimittašu imēršu u amēlšu la na-še-e.

"And not to make any levy on his wagon, his team, his donkey, (or) his driver."⁴

8. lumunšunu litbalu [lumunš]unu liš-šu-u.

"Let them take away their wickedness, let them remove their wickedness."⁵

Comments

These examples are only a small sample of a variety of texts in which *našû* is used in the context of a movement of some object, whether it be real or imaginary, from one place or position to another. The setting may be either daily events or cultic rituals, and we find both man and inanimate things as subjects and objects, and it involves such differing activities as carrying, stealing, taking or imposing a charge, or plain transport. It may

¹Ibid., 83a.

²Ibid., 85b.

³Ibid., 100b.

⁴Ibid., 98b.

⁵Ibid., 100b.

also include the literal movement involved in raising the head or hands in prayer, in the context of prayer and supplication to the gods, or the metaphorical act of levying taxes or removing wickedness. In the last example (8) *našû* is used as parallel to *tabalu* "take away, remove." This text, and others like it, indicate that Akkadian concretized wickedness and saw it as a burden which must be carried or removed, an idea for which there is apparently only textual evidence in Akkadian and Hebrew among these Semitic languages.¹

Našû as Support

In other contexts *našû* conveys the idea of a support, either literally holding and carrying or caring and nurturing.

Data

1. *ana šamaš bēlija qá-ti lu aš-ši [su]pītī [lu] išme.*

"I prayed with uplifted hands to my lord Samas and he listened to my supplication."²

2. *iš-ši Gilgāmeš ḥaṣṣinna ana idišu.*

"Gilgames took [or: held] the ax in his hand."³

3. *ina kilattēša nignakka na-šá-at.*

¹This does not, however, "prove" that it did not exist in other Semitic languages. It only indicates that no textual evidence has been found in other languages.

²Ibid., 106b.

³Ibid., 84a.

"She carries a censer in her two hands."¹

4. *mala emārū i-na-šī-ú-ni.*

"(Inform me) as to how much the donkeys can carry."²

5. *elippu kuttumu ša 110 GUR i-na-áš-šu-ú.*

"A covered boat that carries 110 gur."³

6. *ina šumēliša šerra na-šat-ma.*

"In her left arm she [the demon] carries a child [it sucks her breast]."⁴

7. *aḫaka ṭurdamma lu-ut-ta-ši-ka.*

"Send me your brother so that I can provide for you"
(lit.: "lift/carry you").⁵

8. *illak šarru...ilāni na-šu-šu.*

"The king goes forward, the gods give him support."⁶

9. *ta-at-ta-na-áš-ši la lē³amma.*

"You always support the powerless."⁷

10. *šúm-ma qī-pu-tu^{med} an-nu-tu la-a iq-ṭi-b[i]-ú
ḫi-i-ṭa i-na-áš-ši-ú.*

"If these agents do not point him out they become guilty
(or: have to suffer punishment)."⁸

¹Ibid., 88a.

²Ibid., 89a.

³Ibid., 89b.

⁴Ibid., 88a.

⁵Ibid., 96a.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Ibid.

⁸Ernst Weidner, "Hof- und Harems-Erlasse assyrischer Könige." AfO 17 (1954-56):276:51. Cf. 278:55.

11. *šumma ana sibûṭ se^ḡim u kaspim úsī^ḡam aran
su^ḡati it-ta-na-as-si.*

"If he has come forward for the purpose of (false) testimony concerning grain or money, he shall bear the penalty of that judgment."¹

12. *kabtāt qāssu ul ale^ḡe na-šá-šá.*

"His hand was heavy, I could not bear (it)."²

Comments

In the context of support we find a variety of usages and meanings. The social context is both daily life and the cultus. Animals, human beings, or inanimate things are both the subject and object, and the support may be in the form of holding something in an upward position, containing, sustaining and providing for, or enduring and suffering. Of special interest for the present study are the contexts involving both suffering and sustenance.³ In the case of wrong actions or neglect the consequences are seen as a burden which must inevitably be carried by the perpetrator.⁴

¹Code of Hammurabi, law #4 in David Marcus, A Manual of Akkadian (New York: University Press of America, 1978), 30.

²CAD, 87a.

³As in examples 6-12.

⁴See examples 10 and 11.

Physical needs are also seen as a "burden" but they can be alleviated by someone outside of the subject.¹ By meeting these needs, whether they are literal and tangible such as food or other sustenance, or such intangible ones as suffering, the supplier becomes a "bearer" or provider of the needy.² Present research did not, however, find any evidence in Akkadian of this root referring to someone carrying or suffering the consequences of somebody else's wrongdoings, which would indicate the concept of forgiveness. The emphasis is usually durative and frequently includes a caring attitude.³ Which of these meanings is present at any given time is, however, determined only by the context.

Našû as Utilization

In some cases the emphasis is not directly on the literal action of the verb *našû*, but rather on its effects as the object is utilized. Expressions involving body parts as objects appear to be periphrastic idioms, probably based on the original, literal movement which later became symbolic of or a metonym for a particular action.

¹Example 7.

²As in examples 7-9.

³This idea is also present in the noun form *našû* "provider" (CAD, 113).

Data

1. *nakru dannu kakkēšu ana māti i-na-šá-a.*

"A powerful enemy will brandish weapons against the country."¹

2. *áš-ši qa-ti la šulputa ušalp[it].*

"I stretched out my hand, I touched what should not be touched."²

3. *iš-ši-ma īnīšu ītamar awīlam.*

"He looked up (lit.: lifted up his eyes) and saw the man."³

4. *enūma eliš . . . [ana Bēl i]-na-áš-ši mala ša enūma eliš ana Bēl [i]-na-áš-šu-u.*

"He recites Enuma elis [before Bel], all the time he is reciting Enuma elis before Bel."⁴

5. *ūmu 2-šú 3-šú re-e-šú šābē in-na-áš-šú.*

"Every day the workmen are mustered several times."⁵

6. *la emūqaja balattuššunu re-eš hurāši la a-na-áš-ši.*

"I cannot possibly check on the gold without them."⁶

Comments

The general idea conveyed by these expressions is the employment of the object for a stated purpose. The

¹Ibid., 84a.

²Ibid., 85a.

³Ibid., 104b.

⁴Ibid., 87a.

⁵Ibid., 107b.

⁶Ibid., 107a.

objects of *našû* are mostly tools or weapons, but in a few cases parts of the body, (i.e., the hand, eyes, or head). In some of these expressions, many involving body parts, it is obvious that *našû* is to be taken metaphorically as a part of an idiom rather than a literal description of actions. The last five usages show this fact. In one (4) a poem, the *Enûma Eliš*, is being "utilized" in recitation; in the last two passages (5) and (6) the literal expression is "to lift the head of. . . ." but it clearly indicates a process of checking the objects or persons for some assignments. The exact semantic background for this idiom is not clear, especially when it is used about inanimate objects, but its meaning is not disputed.¹ One possible idea is that *ršû* in these contexts signifies "what is on top" or "quality" which is then "lifted up" for inspection.

Našû and Interpersonal Relations

In other instances *našû* describes an attitude or a relationship, either explicitly or implicitly.

Data

1. RN . . . *ana šarrûte ana muḥḥišunu iš-šû-û.*

"They elevated RN to be king over them."²

¹For a discussion of this expression in Hebrew for census-taking, see chapter 4 below.

²Ibid., 84b.

2. *ilum re-eš awīlim i-na-aš-ši.*

"The god will give honors to the man (or: "lift the head of the man")."¹

3. *i ni-iš-ši-a ina šubtišu.*

"Let us remove him from his seat (of office)."²

4. *lu šabbu[tu] adu šarru re-su-[nu] i-na-áš-šu-u-ni . . . išālūni.*

"They should be retained until the king summons them and questions (them)."³

5. *minā ṭubbāti eliš na-šá-ti-ma.*

"Why do you assume, outwardly, a friendly attitude?"⁴

6. *būnišunu ša balāṭim nawriš iš-šu-šum-ma.*

"They turned radiantly toward him with their lifegiving faces."⁵

7. *alkamma ul ta-na-áš-šá-an-ni.*

"Come here, will you not help me?"⁶

8. *PN pu-ut PN₂ aḫišu na-ši.*

"PN assumes guaranty for his brother PN₂."⁷

¹Ibid., 108a.

²Ibid., 102a. This may also be seen as a literal "transport," but the emphasis appears to be more on the particular attitude towards the individual in the given position than on the physical removal, even though that may also have been involved.

³Ibid., 107b.

⁴Ibid., 86b.

⁵Ibid., 104a.

⁶Ibid., 96a.

⁷Ibid., 106a.

9. *pa-ḥa-at puqurrānāe ša aḥāiš la i-na-ši-ú.*

"They do not assume responsibility for each other's claimants."¹

10. *ana mimmūšu ĩnka la ta-t[a-aš]-ši.*

"Do not covet anything belonging to him."²

11. *ana makkūrika rapši at-ta-ši pa-ni-[ia].*

"I coveted (or: lifted my face towards) your great riches."³

12. *ana epēšu Esagil na-ša-an-ni li-ib-bi.*

"I dearly wanted to (re)build Esagil."⁴

Comments

These expressions involving *našû*, indicating certain attitudes, are evidently based on an original, literal lifting up of an individual to be honored,⁵ or lifting him from his place,⁶ letting him face the "act-or" for better or worse,⁷ or else the "act-or" himself stands up for someone else taking on himself the responsibility to meet the needs of the other.⁸ This might involve

¹Ibid., 105b.

²Ibid., 104b.

³Ibid., 105b.

⁴Ibid., 105a.

⁵See examples 1 and 2.

⁶Example 3.

⁷Example 4.

⁸Examples 5 and 6.

liability for his actions¹ or befriending him and helping in a time of need.² Finally, the eyes, face, or heart might be turned towards something, implying coveting or desiring it.³

Akkadian presents us with seemingly endless variety of usages of the root *našû* in widely different contexts, both literal and metaphoric. The term itself appears to be neutral so the meaning is quite heavily dependent on the immediate context. However, it always retains its basic sense of an upward/onward moving action which is the result of either a deliberate move by or a natural consequence of something being done by the "actor," the effect of which is durative rather than momentary.

Ugaritic

In Ugaritic the root *nša* appears eighty-four times⁴ all except twelve of which are in the basic G form. The remaining occurrences are in the Gt or simple passive/

¹Examples 8 and 9.

²Examples 5, 6, and 7.

³Cf. the English idioms "to set one's heart upon," "to make eyes at," and "set one's face toward," all of which have a similar connotation.

⁴According to Richard E. Whitaker, A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972). This section is based on the information found there and in Cyrus H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), hereinafter UT.

reflexive form. All the occurrences are in poetical passages and the usages are both literal and metaphoric. Sixty-three are in the 'imperfect' which is the most common narrative form, and the "Sitz-im-Leben" is almost exclusively mythological with gods and/or other deities being the subject in about fifty texts, or some 60 percent of the cases.¹

Nša as Transport

In a few texts the verb indicates a conscious (upward) movement of an object.

Data

1. ^cms.m^c.ly.aliyn.b^cl.tšm^c.nrt.ilm.špš.tšu.aliyn.
b^cl.lktp.^cnt.ktšth.

"Please, load Aliyn Baal on me! The Luminary of the gods, the Sun, hearkens. She lifts Aliyn Baal, on the shoulders of Anat she places him."²

2. hw.t^c.nt^cy.hw.nkt.nkt.ytšī [l ab.bn.il].ytšī.l
dr.bn.il.l mphrt.bn.[il].

"It is the offering offered, it is the sacrifice sacrificed; it is brought [to the father of the gods], it

¹Analysis based on Whitaker reveals other subjects, e.g., Danel--a king who sought the company of the gods--16 times; the blind ones, 2 times; and plow-oxen, 1 time. Besides, there are 10 passages in the passive with no "subject" indicated, but the fact that sacrifices are being brought implies human beings as the subject. Finally, in three cases the tablets are too damaged for identification of the subject or the general context.

²UT 62:12-15.

is brought to the dynasty of the gods, to the assembly of the [gods]."¹

3. *šu.ilm.raštkm.lzr.brktkm.ln.kḥt.zblkm.*

"O gods, lift your heads from the top of your knees on the throne of your prince-ship."²

4. *apnk.dnil.mt.rpi.a[p]hn.ḡzr.mt.hrn[m[y]].ytšu ytb.bap.tḡr.tḥt.adrm.dbgrn.*

"Then Danel, the man of Rpi, then the warrior, the man of Hrnmy, lifts himself up, sits in the opening of the gate among the dignitaries who are in the threshing-floor."³

Comments

These four passages show different uses of *nša*, but all imply a transport or movement of some kind. In the first example it is an act of placing someone on a higher level, in the second the point of reference is the destination to which the object is brought; in the third there is a literal lifting of the head from resting on the knees indicating a change in attitude from one of fear and humility to courage and boldness. Finally, in the last example we find a human king sitting up, taking his place among other dignitaries.

¹UT 2:1, 17.

²UT 137:27, 28. The same idea is also found in UT 137:29, except there it is in the narrative form. Baal is rebuking the gods for lowering (*ḡlt*) their heads in the presence of the messengers of the Sea. The third occurrence is in UT 126:III,12 where 'they' are said to have 'lifted the head of the plow-oxen on top of [. . .] Dagan'.

³UT, 2Aqht 5:4-7. Another passage, 1Aqht 21, is damaged but is apparently identical to this one. A similar expression is also found in UT 52:53, 54 and 65.

Nša as Support

In certain other contexts *nša* places the emphasis on the process of 'upholding', 'carrying' an object rather than the movement itself.

Data

1. *yḥd.bth.sgr.almnt.škr.tškr.zbl.^cršm.yšu.^cwr
mzl.ymzl.*

"Let the recluse scrutinize his house, the widow indeed be hired, the invalid carry the bed, the blind (?)."¹

2. *nša.[y]dh.šmmh.dbḥ.lṭr.abh.il.šrd.[b^c]l.bdbḥ
bn.dgn.bmšdh.*

"He lifted his [ha]nds towards heaven, he sacrificed to Tōr, his father Il, he honored [Ba]al with his sacrifice, the son of Dagan with his meal-(offering)."²

3. *ša.ḡr.^cl.ydm.ḥlb.lṣr.rḥtm.*

"Lift the mountain on the hands, the hill on top of the [?]"³

Comments

Even though *nša* is translated as "lift" in the last two passages, the context seems to indicate a sustained action in which the hands and mountain are held 'up' rather than just the upward movement itself. In other words, the action described by the verb *nša* is not

¹UT, Krt 96-100. Also Krt 187, 3 times in this kind of a context. The meaning of *mzl* is uncertain.

²UT, Krt 167-171. This form occurs 2 times. In Krt 75 the same form is used as a command.

³UT 51:VIII, 5-6. The same expression is also found in UT 67:V, 13. The meaning of *rḥtm* is not certain.

primarily the act of lifting but rather keeping the "object" up.

Nša as Utilization

The usages involving utilization are almost exclusively related to body parts and functions. In these cases the verb *nša* has practically lost its literal meaning and appears rather to draw the attention to the employment or utilization of a particular object or organ. One example implies the use of some weapon, probably a bow and arrow.

Data

1. *yšu.gh.wyṣḥ.*

"He lifts his voice and shouts."¹

2. *wyšu.^cnh.aliyn.b^cl.wyšu.^cnh.wy^cn.wy^cn.btlt^cnt.*

"And Aliyn Baal lifts his eyes, yea, he lifts his eyes and sees yea, he sees the virgin Anat."²

3. *tšu knp btlt.^cn[t] tšu.knp.wtr.b^cp.*

"The Virgin Anat lifts wing, she lifts wing and takes off in flight."³

4. *il.ḥṭh.nḥt.il.ymnn.mṭ.ydh.yšu.yr.šmmh.yr.bšmm^csr.yḥrṭyšt.lphm.*

¹UT, 1 Aqht 117-18. This expression occurs altogether 39 times in Ugaritic.

²UT 76:II, 13-15. Similar expression is found 13 times.

³UT 76:II, 10, 11.

"Il lowers his staff; Il lowers the staff of his hand; he raises, he shoots towards heaven, he shoots in the heavens a bird, he plucks (it), he places (it) on the coals."¹

Comments

In Ugaritic *nša* is used metaphorically fifty-four times or about 65 percent of the occurrences, compared with the Biblical 54 percent (see table 6). By far, the most common expression involving *nša* is *nša gh* "lifting (or simply: "using") the voice" for communicating a particular message. Other expressions involve the eyes or wings. These expressions are always followed by a sequel which indicates the purpose for which the particular organ was employed, i.e., shouting (1), seeing (2), flying (3), or shooting (4). The employment of this verb in this context does not necessitate a measureable upward movement of the organ or object involved but rather the utilization of it. In Ugaritic, *nša* is never found in the context of interpersonal relations, referring to attitudes, or in the context of sin and wrongdoing.

Aramaic

The root *n'sā*² is found eighteen times in Aramaic inscriptions and documents up to and including the Elephantine documents.² It occurs twice on the Zakir

¹UT 52:37-39. This meaning is only found here.

²The Elephantine documents are usually dated "in the days of Nehemiah" in the second half of the 5th century

stela, eight times in the Proverbs of Ahigar, six times in the Sfire inscription, and twice in the Elephantine Papyri.¹

Nʿšāʾ as Transport

In a couple of texts *nʿšāʾ* implies the movement of an object from one place to another or the changing of a position.

Data

1. *šʾ lk zy t[n]šʾ mnn ʾnḥnh [. . .] ky lʾ bydy ʾn[šʾ] mn[šʾ] rglhm wmnḥt[w]thm mn blʿ[dy ʾlhn]*

"Take whichever of us you will take, we [. . .] for it is not in man's power to lift their feet or set them down apart fro[m the gods]."²

2. *[. . .]m whn lthb lhmy . . . [.]šʾ ly lhḥ [] hl ltšʾ lhḥ ʾnh*

"And if you do not give me my bread [and you do not calrry bread for me [and if you are] not able to carry the bread of distress."³

B.C. Emil G. Kraeling, The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953), 3. Scholars usually agree that Ezra-Nehemiah is among the last books of the OT, even though some see the book of Daniel coming later, or in the 2nd century B.C. S. B. Frost, "Daniel" in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (1962), 1:767 and J. A. Montgomery, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1950), 2-5, 58.

¹It is found 3 times in the Aramaic sections of the OT.

²Ahigar 121-123, in James M. Lindenberger, The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahigar (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983), 110.

³Sfire I 222:B,38,39, in Herbert Donner and Wolfgang

3. whn ysq ^ˈl lbbn wtš^ˈ ^ˈl šptyk lhmtty wysq ^ˈl
lbb br brk wyš^ˈ ^ˈl šptwh . . . wyš^ˈ ^ˈl šptyh lhmtt . . . mn
yš).

"If the idea to kill me comes to your mind and you bring
it upon your lips - and it comes to the mind of your son's
son and he brings it upon his lips . . . and he brings it
upon his lips to kill . . . whoever brings up. . . ."¹

Comments

In all of these texts it is evident that the emphasis is on the movement from one place or position to another. In the first example n'šā^ˈ is contrasted with n'ḥaṭ "come (or: set) down," in the second the context indicates the idea of bringing, and the final example of four occurrences implies a "movement" of an idea from the mind to the tongue or lips for expression.² The subject is usually man, whose actions are deliberate.

N'šā^ˈ as Support

Data

1. šbq hmr wl^ˈ ysblnhy ynš^ˈ bwt mn knth [wyn]š^ˈ
mw[b]l^ˈ zy l^ˈ zyl[h] wṭ^ˈwn gml^ˈ yṭ^ˈnnhy.

Röllig, Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften,
hereinafter KAI, (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966),
1:42.

¹Sfire III, 224:14, 15, 16, 26, in KAI:1,45.

²Two of the Biblical references, ṭēlh mā^ˈnayyā^ˈ šē^ˈ
"take these vessels" (Ezra 5:15) and ūn'šā^ˈ himmôn rūhā^ˈ
"and the wind carried them away" (Dan 2:35), also indicate
the movement of certain objects to a different location.

"The ass abandons his load and will not carry it. He will bear shame from his fellow and will carry a burden which is not his own; he will be laden with a camel's load."¹

2. $n\acute{s}^{\circ}yt \dot{h}l^{\circ} wt^{\circ}nt mlh wl^{\circ} \circ yty zy yqyr mn$
 $[zp]t[t^{\circ}] n\acute{s}^{\circ}yt tbn^{\circ} wnsbt prn w\dot{l}^{\circ} \{wl^{\circ}\} \circ yty zy qlyl mn$
 $twtb.$

"I have carried sand and hauled salt, but there is nothing more burdensome than [de]b[t]. I have carried straw and lifted bran, but there is nothing taken more lightly than a foreigner."²

3. $kpn lmn\acute{s}^{\circ} m\acute{s}h . . .$

"Ladles/bowls for carrying ointment. . . ."³

4. $w^{\circ}\acute{s}^{\circ} ydy \circ l b^{\circ}l\acute{s}[my]n w^{\circ}nny b^{\circ}l\acute{s}myn.$

"I lifted my hands to Baalshamyn and Baalshamyn heard me."⁴

Comments

The concept of support may be present in the form of holding a burden, containing or holding it in an upwards position. Whereas the previous category emphasized the movement from one place or position to another this category places the emphasis more on the static, durative aspect of the action than the act itself. The metaphoric usage is syntactically not different from the literal use. The subjects and objects may be persons

¹Ahiqar 90 in Lindenberger, 62. The parallel structure of this passage indicates that $n\acute{s}^{\circ}$ is here used synonymously with sbl "bear," "carry."

²Ahiqar 111, 112 in *ibid.*, 98, 99.

³Elephantine Papyrus 7:19, in Kraeling, 204.

⁴Zakir A:11. See also B:27, quoted in KAI 1:37.

or inanimate things, and the only thing that differentiates between literal and metaphoric use is the context.

Nʿšā as Utilization

Only one passage comes close to expressing the idea of utilization. It is not followed by a sequel, however, but the context seems to imply that the taking of the grant may be for the purpose of using it.

Data

1. *psmšk brh šlym yhwh lmnš dšn zky tmh*
bm[šryn]

"Psamshek, his son, shall be allowed to take up that grant there in Egypt."¹

Comments

There are no available texts in Aramaic which use *nʿšā* in the context of body parts, which is so prominent in the other Semitic languages. One reason is that this root is, to a large extent, replaced with the synonymous roots *nʿtal*, *nʿsab*, *sʿbal* and *šʿgal*.²

¹See Godfrey R. Driver, Aramaic Documents (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957), 22, 23.

²Cf. KBL, 1101.

nʿšāʾ and Interpersonal Relations

Similar to Akkadian the Aramaic also uses the root *nʿšāʾ* in the context of relationships and attitudes. In the available extra-Biblical data only one was found in the Ahiqar corpus.¹

Data

bš[my]n šymh hy ky b^cl qdšyn nšʾ[h]

"She has been established by Shamayn; yea, the holy lord has exalted her."²

Comments

In this passage *nʿšāʾ* is parallel to *šym*, and the context is quite positive. Because of some merits, Shamayn has established and lifted someone up for the purpose of honoring and exalting her. None of the usages in Aramaic implies any kind of concern or caring, nor is it ever used in the context of wrongdoing.

¹One text is found in the Biblical corpus: *min-yômāt ʿāl-māʾ ʿal-malkīn mitnaššʾāh* "from of old it [the city] has been rising up in rebellion against the kingdom" (Ezra 4:19).

²Ahiqar 95, in Lindenberger, 68. Here it is in parallel with *šym*. Both this text and the Biblical quoted in the footnote above are quite interesting in that they exemplify the neutrality of the term *nʿšāʾ* itself. In the Biblical text, which is a part of a formal complaint against the city of Jerusalem that its history is replete with rebellions and now it appears to be repeating that history, it has a negative connotation, whereas it is clearly positive in Ahiqar. The indicator is only to be found in the context.

Summary

The evidence from the cognate Semitic languages, Akkadian, Ugaritic, and Aramaic, indicates that the root $nš^3$ or its equivalent was widely used, both in literal and metaphoric senses. Based on the available data, the widest range appears in Akkadian, and the narrowest in Ugaritic. All have the ideas of transport, support, and, to some extent, utilization in common. Akkadian and Aramaic include the concept of interpersonal relations, which can either be favorable or unfavorable, but it is not found in the extant material of Ugaritic. Only Akkadian uses it in the context of providing for or caring concern for someone in need. Akkadian also uses it in the context of carrying the consequences of one's own wrong actions or removing the wrong from one's own life. All of the examples indicate that the contextual emphasis is usually more on the durative aspect of either holding or carrying than merely on the momentary act of lifting.

CHAPTER III

SURVEY OF BIBLICAL USAGE

The Old Testament in General

Introduction

The root $nš^3$ is found both in verbal and nominal forms in Hebrew. Before narrowing this research down to its usage in the Pentateuch, it may be helpful to examine its general usage in the Hebrew Bible.

In classical Hebrew there were only two characters-- $\aleph$ and ε --to represent three sounds: s , $\acute{s}$, and $\check{s}$.¹ Since the same character-- ε --symbolized two sounds in Hebrew it has led some scholars and certain Talmudic interpretations to imply the possibility of an interchange between $nāšā^3$ and $nāšā^3/h$ "forget"² in certain contexts relating to forgiveness. Their arguments, however, appear

¹Werner Diehm, "Das Problem von ε in Althebräischen und die kanaanäische Lautverschiebung," ZDMG 124 (1974): 222. Karl Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961), 1:128-129. Edward Y. Kutscher, "Contemporary Studies in North-Western Semitic," JSS, 10/1 (1965): 35-41. Joshua Blau, On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages (Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970), 147.

²See Holladay, 248.

to be based more on post-biblical interpretation than on the Biblical text.¹ In one case there is, however, an interplay on the ambiguity of the expression *nāšā*² *ro*³ indicating, on the one hand, restoration of an individual to a former position and the literal lifting off of the head, in the other.² In another case there is also an

¹Nisan Ararat has suggested this in certain cases in an article, "אֲשָׁרָא לֹא אֵלָּא אֲשָׁרָא" Beth Mikra 19 (1974): 536-548), where he argues that as you do wrong you incur guilt--you are in debt--towards whomever you wronged. This debt (guilt) needs to be paid, except in cases where the wronged *nāšā*² your guilt and becomes your *nošē*² thus setting you free. Ararat sees this only when the *nāšā*²/*nāšā*² is in the context of *āšām* or the *āšām* offering. In the "Talmud Yerushalmi," J. Neusner, The Talmud of the Land of Israel (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983), 32:1:6 art. "Shebuoth," there is another attempt to indicate a *š*/*š* interchangeability, but with a different root, as Rabbi Huna is quoted as saying in the name of Rabbi Abbahu: "The Holy One--blessed be He--before him there is no forgetting [*škh*]; but it is as if, on the account of Israel, there is forgetting [*škh*], like it is said, 'Who, O God, is like you, a forgiver of iniquity?'--written *nošē*²--for David said, 'You have forgiven the iniquity of your people'." It is clear from the immediate context that these references are to be read with a *š* rather than a *š* because of their parallel with *škh*. This idea of reading *š* instead of *š* when it relates to forgiveness is also expressed in the Pesikta Rabba, referring to Ps 32:1, "Happy is the man whose sins are forgiven" - the term to be read with a *š* rather than a *š* - "da Gott unsere Sünden am Versöhnungstag in jedem Jahre in Vergessenheit bringt," quoted in Jacob Levy, Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midrashim (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963), 3:446. He does not, however, connect the root with the idea of "debt" in the same way as Marcus Jastrow in A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature (New York: Judaica Press, 1975), 938.

²Gen 40:13, 19, 20.

interplay between the meaning of forgiveness and caring.¹

Two parallel texts present problems, and scholars are divided whether to read $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ or $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ I "lend,"² (hence: "obligate"). These texts are 1 Kgs 8:31 and 2 Chr 6:22, "If a man sins against his neighbor and is made to take an oath ($w'nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}-bō \text{ } ^{\text{ṣ}}ālāh l'ha^{\text{ṣ}}loṭō$). Most commentators make no comment on the use of the root $nš^{\text{ṣ}}$ in this passage. Some apparently "assume" $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ without any discussion or evidence,³ others read $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ with the MT.⁴ The meaning is fairly clear in spite of this textual problem, whether it emphasizes that the man becomes obligated to take an oath or he is put under an oath,⁵ the basic idea is the same. There is thus no textual evidence

¹Num 14:19,20. This becomes evident when different translations are compared. Some translate $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$ as "carry," others as "forgive" (KJV, RSV, NASB, NIV).

²Holladay, 247.

³E.g., John Gray, I & II Kings (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963), 206 and Charles F. Burney, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1903), 118; HAL₃, 687, probably on the basis of LXX which has λαβε ἐπ' αὐτον "he takes upon himself an oath" which indicates original Hebrew $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$.

⁴Albert Sanda, Die Bücher der Könige (Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1911), 229, and Arnold B. Ehrlich, Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1908, reprint 1968), 7:233, supported by the Syriac Peshitta which uses a periphrastic passive meaning literally "they cause him (i.e. he is made) to take an oath" apparently based on Hebrew $nāšā^{\text{ṣ}}$. This is apparently also the understanding of NASB.

⁵See Holladay, 246.

for any interchange between the "traditional" meaning of *nāšāʾ* and any apparent homonym or phonetically related root.

Distribution and Usage

General

The root *nāšāʾ* and its derivatives occur 885 times in the OT. They are found in all but two of its books, Obadiah and Zephaniah.¹ Of these, 654 are the verbal root, while the rest is made up of derived denominatives. Table 2 indicates that the root is fairly evenly distributed throughout the OT corpus, especially the verbal root. The nominal forms are mostly concentrated in the Pentateuch and the Later Prophets, which also have the highest, and practically equal, concentration of the root. The Pentateuch makes up 22.4 percent of the total OT corpus, and has 29.7 percent of the total occurrences, or .75 occurrences per printed page. The Later Prophets account for 31.9 percent of the occurrences in 26.2 percent of the total text, or .68 per printed page. The lowest concentration is in the Writings which account for only 21.7 percent of the occurrences in 30.9 percent of the total text, or .39 per page.

¹See appendix A.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF THE ROOT NŠ³ IN THE OT

	BHS ¹ %		Verb	Nouns		Sum %		Average ³
				Nāšf ²	Other ²			
Pentateuch	353	22.4	169	70	24	263	29.7	.75
Early Proph	322	20.5	125	15	8	148	16.7	.46
Later Proph	412	26.2	201	39	42	282	31.9	.68
Writings	487	30.9	159	9	24	192	21.7	.39
Total	1574	100	654	133	98	885	100	.56

Nominal Forms

The nominal derivations of the root *nāšā³* are found 231 times in the OT, of which ninety-four are in the Pentateuch. They are:⁴ *nāšf²* "chief," "minor king," "leader"; *maššā²* "carrying," "burden," "hardship," "pronouncement"; *maššā²āh* "lifting up (of heavy clouds)"; *maššo²* "partiality"; *maš²ēt* "lifting up," "tax, offering"; *maš²ôt* "pulling up," "pronouncement," "share"; *š²ēt* "raising oneself up," "dignity," "nobility," "exaltation," "swelling," "blotch"; and *šf²* "height."

Nāšf² is by far the most common of the nominal forms (see table 3). Of the seventy occurrences in the

¹Number of pages of printed text according to BHS.

²*Maššā²*, *maššā²āh*, *maš²ēt*, *maššo²*, *maš²ôt*, *š²ēt*, *šf²*.

³Average distribution per page.

⁴Translations are based on Holladay's lexicon.

Pentateuch sixty-one are found in the book of Numbers, four in each of Genesis and Exodus, and one in Leviticus. Outside of the Pentateuch, thirteen are found in the book of Joshua, two in 1 Kings, thirty-seven in Ezekiel,¹ and two in Jeremiah.²

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF NOMINAL FORMS OF *NŠ*³

	Penta- teuch	Prophets		Writings		Total
		Early	Later	Wisd.	Other	
<i>nāšf</i> ³	70	15	39	2	7	133
<i>maššā</i> ³	13	5	34	4	10	66
<i>maššo</i> ³					1	1
<i>maššā</i> ³ <i>āh</i>			1			1
<i>maš</i> ³ <i>ēt</i>	3	3	5	1	3	15
<i>maš</i> ³ <i>ôt</i>			1			1
<i>š</i> ³ <i>ēt</i>	8		1	4		13
<i>šf</i> ³				1		1
Total	94	23	81	12	21	231
%	40.7	10	35.1	5.2	9.1	

*Nāšf*³ is a qatil form, a *nomen professionis*³ similar to *nāḥf*³ and *naḡf*³. Some see it as a reflexive formation of the verbal root, "one who exalts oneself" or in the words of van der Ploeg: "Le *nāšf*³ aurait donc été

¹All of which refer to persons.

²Both of which refer to ascending clouds.

³See Herbert Niehr, "X' V] *nāšf*³" in *TWAT* 5:647-657. Also Oliviera Calberini, "Il *nāšf*³ biblico nell'epoca patriarcale e arcaica," *BibOr* 20 (1978):65.

l'homme qui s'élève au-dessus des autres."¹ Others see it rather as a passive form, "the one brought/carried or lifted up."² Still others see an active meaning derived from such phrase as *nāšāʾ qôl* "to raise one's voice," thus being a spokesman for someone, or *n'šûʾ pānīm*, "one with a lifted-up countenance."³ Speiser suggests a more plausible and less forced interpretation as "duly elected chieftain" or "someone elected to that position by the appropriate council."⁴

Of the thirteen occurrences of *maššāʾ* in the Pentateuch, eleven are in the book of Numbers, but it is not found in the books of Genesis and Exodus. It is a *maqṭal* form which frequently functions as the object of the verbal action,⁵ and its basic meaning is "what is being carried," whether it be a literal load or burden or a concern in the form of an utterance in certain prophetic passages. In the Pentateuch and the Early Prophets the

¹Johannes van der Ploeg, "Les chefs de peuple d'Israel et leurs titres," RB 57 (1950):50.

²See Moshe H. Gottstein, "מִשָּׁאָה וְכֶבֶד (Gen 23:6)," VT 3 (1953):298-9.

³So Martin Noth, Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966), 162.

⁴Ephraim A. Speiser, "Background and Function of the Biblical *Nāšif*," CBO 25 (1963):111-17, especially p. 114.

⁵See H. P.-Müller, "מִשָּׁאָה *maššāʾ*," TWAT 5:20-25, and Henrik S. Nyberg, Hebreisk Grammatik (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1952), 205.

term is almost exclusively used in the literal sense of "a burden," whereas in the Later Prophets it has become a technical term introducing some prophecies.¹ Scholars have debated whether this means there are two different homonymous roots, one meaning "burden," the other "utterance,"² or if there is only one root meaning "burden." When used in prophetic introductions, many see the term then indicate a "burdensome" oracle--frequently one of doom--which the Lord has commissioned the prophet to deliver,³ especially against foreign nations.⁴

Both of these postulations are, however, inaccurate and unnecessary. As McKane⁵ has correctly pointed out, this expression does not always introduce oracles of doom.⁶ Even today we have no problem with such

¹See Henry S. Gehman, "The 'Burden' of the Prophets," JQR 31 (1940-41):107-21, and Pieter A. H. de Boer, "An Inquiry into the Meaning of the Term *maššā*," Oudtestamentische Studiën, ed. P. A. H. de Boer (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948), 5:214.

²So William McKane, "𐤍𐤏𐤍 in Jeremiah 23:33-40" in Prophecy, ed. John A. Emerton (New York: Walter Gruyter, 1980), 35-54. He lists several scholars who have subscribed to that view from Rashi down to our time (p. 39). See also HAL, 604; Holladay, 217; BDB, 672.

³So for instance Johannes Calvin in his commentary on Jeremiah. This interpretation is also proposed by Gehman, 107-21, and H. P.-Müller, 20-25.

⁴See H. P.-Müller, 20-25.

⁵McKane, 38.

⁶See Prov 31:1; Lam 2:14; and Zech 12:1.

expressions as "to carry a message" without it having any reference to its contents being burdensome. *Maššā*² in these contexts refers simply to a message being carried or brought by the prophets.

*Maššo*³, *maššā*²*āh*, and *maš*²*ôṭ* occur only once each, the first in the expression *maššo*² *pānīm*,¹ "partiality" or "favoritism." This nominal form indicates usually "the act of -ing" something,² and is here equivalent to *nāšā*² *pānīm*, signifying "showing favor," or "being favorable."³ Others suggest that it might also be taken as an "Aramaic-like *qal* infinitive of *nāšā*² with a *mem-* prefix."⁴

*Maššā*²*āh* is a *hapax legomenon* in Isa 30:27 and may have a meaning similar to *maššā*², "a burden," "an utterance," or it may mean "lifting up of heavy clouds."⁵ Theodotian and the Syriac versions evidently took the first meaning and read the final *-h* as *mater lectionis* for the masculine singular suffix *-ô*, thus translating it as "his burden/oracle."⁶ The inverse parallelism in the verse seems to support that reading:

¹2 Chr 19:7.

²See Nyberg, 207.

³E.g., Holladay, 246.

⁴Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20*, AB, vol. 22 (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1983), 313.

⁵Holladay, 217.

⁶See apparatus in *BHS* on Isa 30:27.

- (a) *bo^cēr ʔappô*
 (b) *w^ekobed maššāʔāh*
 (b₁) *š^epātāyw māl^eʔû za^cam*
 (a₁) *ûl^ešônô k^eʔēš ʔokālet*
- (a) Burning [is] his anger
 (b) and weighty [his] message
 (b₁) his lips filled with indignation
 (a₁) and his tongue like consuming fire

In lines (a) and (a₁) "his anger" (lit.: his nose, ʔappô) and "his tongue" (l^ešônô) are both "on fire"; similarly, the "weight" of the message in (b) fills his lips with indignation in (b₁). Sabottka suggests a different vowelizing of the problematic *kobed maššāʔāh* of the MT by reading *kābed miššāʔāh* instead, meaning "unerträglich"--literally "too heavy to carry"--taking it as an infinitive construct with a feminine -āh ending.¹ Oswalt² has pointed out that most modern translations³ take it, however, to refer to a dense cloud of smoke accompanying the fire of his anger in light of Judg 20:38, 40 (where the cloud is, however, explicitly mentioned). His alternative proposal is to take it as referring to the

¹Liudger Sabottka, "Is 30,27-30: Ein Übersetzungsvorschlag" *BZ*, 12 (1968):242. Cf. also *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 2nd edition. Emil Kautzsch, ed., revised by Arthur E. Cowley (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1980), §45d.

²John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah 1-39*, *NICOT* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986), 566.

³So for instance RSV, CBAT, NIV, and TEV.

heavy burden of punishment which God will impose upon the Assyrians.¹

Maśōt, "hoist," is probably also "an Aramaic-like qal infinitive of *nāśā* with a prefixed *mem* and *-ōt* ending of late Hebrew final *℣*- verbs.² It occurs only once in the MT with the meaning of "pulling up" by the roots.

Maśē is a segholated feminine noun formation of qal infinitive construct with a *mem* prefix,³ and is translated as "lifting up," "tax, offering,"⁴ or "uprising," "burden," "utterance," "portion."⁵ It occurs fifteen times in the MT, of which three are in the Pentateuch, all in the same verse⁶ where it has the sense of "portions"; four times it has the sense of "gifts";⁷ three times it is used about "tax" or "tribute";⁸ twice it refers to a "rising smoke,"⁹ and once each of "hands

¹So also NEB and JPSV.

²Greenberg, on Ezek 17:19.

³See Benjamin Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), §39,4 rem. 2.

⁴E.g., Holladay, 217.

⁵BDB, 673.

⁶Gen 43:34.

⁷2 Sam 11:8; Esth 2:18; Jer 40:5; Ezek 20:40.

⁸2 Chr 20:6,9; Amos 5:11.

⁹Judg 20:38, 40.

lifted/held up" in prayer,¹ a "burden" to be borne,² and a "signal" or "message."³ All of these meanings convey the same basic idea of something that is carried, brought, or held.

š'ēṭ is a segholated qal infinitive construct, translated "exaltation," "dignity," "uprising," or "swelling."⁴ It occurs thirteen times in the MT. Eight are in the Pentateuch, seven of which refer to a swelling in the skin.⁵ All the remaining texts⁶ convey the idea of "exaltedness" or "highness."⁷

Šīṭ occurs only once in the MT.⁸ KBL takes it as possibly a qal infinitive construct,⁹ while Davidson

¹Ps 141:2.

²Zeph 3:18.

³Jer 6:1.

⁴BDB, 673; Holladay, 348.

⁵Lev 13:2, 10(2x), 19, 28, 43; 14:56.

⁶Job 13:11; 31:23; 41:17; Ps 62:5; Hab 1:7, and Gen 49:3--where BHS apparatus suggests a different reading šo'āh "trouble" or "storm," or else š'ēṭ "roaring (of a destructive ocean)," see Herrmann Gunkel, Genesis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969), 479. There is, however, no urgent reason for an emendation. The idea of being exalted is quite in line with the context and presents a balanced picture. Vs. 3 gives the positive aspects of Reuben's character which is then contrasted with the negative results of his wrong actions.

⁷E.g., Holladay, 348; BDB, 673.

⁸Job 20:6.

⁹KBL, 919.

considers it as derived from a shortened form of *nāšf*¹.
Its meaning is evidently similar to *š'ēṭ*, "exaltedness,"
or "highness."

All of the noun forms give the impression of a more or less literal object in the form of a burden or weight which is then lifted or carried either literally or metaphorically and thus brought to the attention of others.

Verbal Forms

The distribution of the verbal forms is more uniform than that of the nouns, as table 4 shows. Of the 654 occurrences of the verb in the OT, 598 are in the Qal, or 91.4 percent.² The proportional distribution is practically the same for the Pentateuch and the Later Prophets, or .48 and .49 per page respectively with the Early Prophets and Writings having a noticeably lower proportion. This distribution is, however, not necessarily an indication of a difference in usage related to the age of the document. Rather, the distribution seems to be more related to the contents.

Table 5, showing the distribution of the various aspects of the Qal stem in the same corpus, indicates

¹Davidson, 711.

²For that reason the expression "verbal form" in the remainder of this research means the Qal except in a few cases which are then specified.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF THE VERBAL ROOT NŠ³

	Qal	Other	Total	%	Average*
Pentateuch	164	5	169	25.8	.48
Early Prophets	119	6	125	19.1	.38
Later Prophets	172	29	201	30.7	.49
Writings	143	16	159	24.3	.33
Total	598	56	654		.41
%	91.4	8.6	100		

* Average refers to distribution per printed page.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF VERBAL ASPECTS IN THE OT

QAL	Pentat.		Prophets		Writings		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Infinitive	24	14.2	15	4.6	11	6.9	50	7.6
Perfect	29	17.2	59	18.1	29	18.2	117	17.9
Imperfect	83	49.0	127	39.0	68	42.8	278	42.5
Participle	14	8.3	58	17.8	23	14.5	95	14.5
Imperative	14	8.3	32	9.8	12	7.5	58	8.9
OTHER FORMS	5	3.0	35	10.7	16	10.1	56	8.6
Total	169		326		159		654	

that the various aspects of the verb *nāšā³* are also fairly evenly distributed in the OT corpus. This may indicate that the term evidently never "froze" in a fixed expression as a technical term, associated only with any one kind of action. It is rather a quite general term

being used in connection with a variety of common, universal actions which were 'timeless,' (i.e., they did not change significantly with time). It also appears that the most frequently used aspect of the verb is the imperfect, which may imply that the highest concentration could be found in past narratives with *waw* consecutive.¹

When it comes to usage, the flexibility of the verb becomes even more apparent, as the following tables indicate. Table 6 shows the distribution of usages in general in the OT. Man is most frequently the subject -- 491 times or 75.1 percent of the total occurrences. In the Pentateuch, man is the subject 135 times out of 169 instances, or 79.8 percent. The highest ratio is found in the Writings, outside of the Wisdom literature; and Early Prophets, or 89 and 91.2 percent respectively, and the lowest in the Wisdom literature and Later Prophets, or 61.6 and 61.7 percent respectively.

Man as Subject

The verb may be used with either a literal or metaphoric meanings. Table 6 also shows that the literal meaning is by far most prevalent in the Early Prophets with 89 occurrences out of a total of 125, or 71.2 percent, whereas the average for the OT is 34.7 percent.

¹See further discussion of the distribution of forms in chapter 4 below.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS WITH $N\dot{S}^D$ IN THE OT

Subj.	Pentat.		Prophets				Writings				Total	
			Early		Later		Wisdom		Other*			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
M lit	42	24.8	89	71.2	40	19.9	8	9.3	48	65.7	227	34.7
A met	93	55	25	20	84	41.8	45	52.3	17	23.3	264	40.4
N met	17	10	6	4.8	44	21.8	17	19.8	2	2.8	86	13.1
GOD met	3	1.8	1	0.8					1	1.4	5	0.8
A M lit	1	0.6	1	0.8							2	0.3
N A met	11	6.5	3	2.4	14	7.0	13	15.1	2	2.8	43	6.7
I L met	1	1.2			19	9.4	3	3.5	3	4.2	26	4.0
INANIM.												
NONE												
Total	169		125		201		86		73		654	
%		25.8		19.1		30.7		13.1		11.2		

In the tables where "Writings" are divided, "Wisdom" covers Psalms, Job, and Proverbs, whereas "Other" includes Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the two Chronicles.

In the Wisdom literature we find the literal meaning eight times out of a total of eighty-six. This is the lowest ratio, or about 9.3 percent. In the Pentateuch the ratio is 24.8 percent. Table 7 indicates that the greatest variation in distribution is found when weapons or cultic objects are the object of the verb. Of thirty-four passages having weapons or instruments as objects twenty are found in the Early Prophets, or close to 59 percent. The distribution of the metaphoric usages is less variable than the literal, as table 6 clearly indicated. The

Pentateuch has by far the highest ratio. Ninety-three out of a total of 169 occurrences in the Pentateuch involve metaphoric usage or 55 percent, whereas the Early Prophets have only twenty-five out of 125, or 20 percent, and the Writings outside of the Wisdom seventeen out of seventy-three, or 23.3 percent. The highest ratio outside of the Pentateuch is in the Wisdom literature, forty-five out of a total of eighty-six, or 52.3 percent. The OT average is 40.4 percent.

As we analyze the metaphoric use further (table 8), we find an interesting similarity between the Pentateuch and the Later Prophets with 35.2 and 31.8 percent of the metaphoric uses respectively. Two types of expressions are especially noticeable, *nāšāʾ* + eyes and *nāšāʾ* + sin and wrongdoing, which are used with remarkably similar frequency in these two divisions of the Bible. This similarity in frequency is, however, more related to the demands of the contents than the age of the document. It is also a fact that the messages of the prophets were strongly influenced by the Pentateuch, and they constantly appealed to the people to "return" to their religious foundation. Therefore, the similarity between these two sections of the Bible is rather to be expected on the basis of common concerns of the authors.

TABLE 7

DISTRIBUTION OF LITERAL USAGE IN THE OT

Subject: man	Penta- teuch	Prophets		Writings		Total
		Early	Later	Wisd	Oth	
Animate objects						
wife		1			6	7
persons	6	6	5	2	6	25
animals	1					1
Inanimate objects						
Wealth/poss		8	9		8	25
weapons/instr	1	20	3	1	9	34
food	5	5			4	14
burden		3	8	2	4	17
idols		1	2			3
other	8	13	12	3	3	39
Cultic objects						
furnishing	20	32	1		7	60
other	1				1	2
Total	42	89	40	8	48	227
%	18.5	39.2	17.6	3.5	21.1	

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION OF METAPHORIC USAGE IN THE OT
(Subject: Man)

Object:	Penta- teuch	Prophets		Writings		Total
		Early	Later	Wisd	Oth	
Body parts						
soul/heart	1		3	4	1	9
voice	4	8	4	1	1	18
eyes	18	6	22	4	3	53
face/head	8	7	4	4	1	24
hand	1	2		4	1	8
feet	1					1
Persons	10		1	3	2	16
Sin/wrongdoing						
sins	27	2	29	7		65
judgm. etc	6					6
Other objects						
name	4					4
covenant				2		2
report	1					1
lament			11			11
responsib	2					2
parable	7					7
favor					4	4
other	3		10	16	4	33
Total	93	25	84	45	17	264
%	35.2	9.5	31.8	17	6.4	

God as Subject

God is the subject of *nāšāʾ* eighty-six times in the OT, or some 13 percent of the total. All of these occurrences are metaphoric. More than half of them, forty-four, are in the Later Prophets. It is also interesting to notice that the Pentateuch has only

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF METAPHORIC USAGE IN THE OT
(Subject: God)

	Penta- teuch	Prophets		Writings		Total
		Early	Later	Wisd	Oth	
Animate objects						
persons	6	2	11	7		26
animals			1			1
Body parts						
face	2		2	1		5
hands	3		12	2	1	18
'wings'			3			3
Inanimate obj						
sins	4	1	5	5		15
place	2					2
Other objects		3	10	2	1	16
Total	17	6	44	17	2	86
%	19.8	6.9	51.2	19.8	2.3	

seventeen occurrences, or the same as the Wisdom literature. When it comes to the combination "God + $n\dot{s}$ + sin and/or wrongdoing" we find surprisingly that the Pentateuch uses it only four times, whereas it is found five times in the Later Prophets and five times in the Wisdom literature.

Other Subjects

The frequency of other subjects with $n\dot{s}$ is very low (see table 10). Animals are the subject eight times, five of which are in the Pentateuch. In three of these

TABLE 10
DISTRIBUTION OF METAPHORIC USAGE IN THE OT
(Subject: Non-human)
Animals

Object	Penta- teuch	Prophets		Writings		Total
		Early	Later	Wisd	Oth	
Literal	3	1			1	5
Metaphoric	1					1
sins	1	1				2
other						
Total	5	2			1	8
%	62.5	25			12.5	

Inanimate

Total	11	3	15	13	2	44
%	25	6.8	34.1	29.5	4.5	

None

Total	1	19	3	3	26
%	3.8	73.1	11.5	11.5	

the animals are presented as carrying literal loads;¹ in one passage the verb is used reflexively about a lion rising up,² and in one the goat of Azazel is represented as carrying the iniquities of the people into the desert.³

Inanimate subjects are found forty-four times in the OT, eleven of which are in the Pentateuch. They are mostly elements of nature (e.g., wind or water), which maybe supporting boats⁴ or transporting chaff⁵ and grasshoppers.⁶ Twenty-six times the verb is used without any specified subject. The majority of those, or nineteen, are found in the Later Prophets, with only one in the Pentateuch.⁷ Apart from variations as to the subject, none of these passages reveal any differences in morphology, syntax, or word associations.

Summary

The root *nāšāʾ*³ is common Semitic. In spite of different developments of the *s*-phoneme in the various

¹Camels carrying spices in Gen 37:25; asses and donkeys carrying grain and bread in Gen 45:23.

²Num 23:24.

³Lev 16:22.

⁴The rising water in Gen 7:17.

⁵The wind in Dan 2:35.

⁶The wind in Exod 10:13, 19.

⁷In Gen 4:7 where it is in the context of Cain's wrongdoing.

languages, there is, however, no evidence of any interchange between the various s-phonemes in the languages under investigation, as far as this root is concerned. The contextual evidence indicates, rather, only one root *nāśāʾ*, with the idea of a sustained upward/ onward movement, which is quite adjustable to the needs of a given context.

The nominal forms predominantly indicate something that needs to be upheld, whether it is a real burden that must be carried, a message brought, a position held, 'social status,' or an attitude of prayerfulness. The usage of both the nominal and verbal forms seems to indicate that the verbal root *nāśāʾ* and its derivatives convey the idea of a sustained upward-onward movement, which may have either a positive or negative effect, depending on the context in which they are found. The words themselves are quite neutral. Their distribution and use is quite universal and non-technical. No significant differences are noticeable in their distribution and basic meaning through the various parts of the Old Testament, except those that can be expected due to variations in subject matter. This survey of the distribution and usage of *nśʾ* in the OT also indicates that the Pentateuchal usage is quite similar to that in the OT in general. It seems therefore reasonable to

conclude that a study of its use in the Pentateuch will give a fair picture of its use in the MT in general.

The Pentateuch in Particular

Morphology

Table 4 above indicated a surprisingly even distribution of the verbal forms throughout the entire OT corpus. One thing was quite noticeable, however: the disproportionate distribution of infinitives and participles in the Pentateuch compared to the rest of the OT. Out of fifty infinitives in the OT, twenty-four are found in the Pentateuch, whereas only fourteen participles out of a total of ninety-five are found there, as can be seen in table 11.

Sixteen of the infinitives have a *l'* prefix,¹ which twice expresses a statement 'with respect to' a particular condition,² once functions similar to the sign of the infinitive in English "to";³ once it expresses a result,⁴ while in the remaining passages it implies a

¹Gen 36:7; 45:27; 46:5; Exod 25:14, 27; 30:4; 37:5, 14, 15, 27; 38:7; Lev 10:17; Num 4:15; 11:14; 18:22; Deut 10:8.

²The land's inability to support a large herd (Gen 36:7) and Moses' expressed inability to take care of the needs of the people (Num 11:14).

³Num 4:15 about the things in the sanctuary which the sons of Kohath were to carry.

⁴In Num 18:22 about the Israelites' not coming near the tent of meeting "so that" they would not incur guilt

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF VERBAL ASPECTS OF *NS*³ IN THE PENTATEUCH

QAL	Gen		Exod		Lev		Num		Deut		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Infin	6	12.8	9	28.1	1	4.8	5	6.8	3	15.0	24	14.2
Perf	5	10.6	10	31.3	5	23.8	8	15.9	1	5.0	29	17.2
Imperf	27	57.4	11	34.4	10	47.6	23	52.3	12	60.0	83	49.0
Part.	3	6.4	1	3.1	4	19.2	3	6.8	3	15.0	14	8.3
Imp.t	6	12.8	1	3.1	1	4.8	5	18.2	1	5.0	14	8.3
Total	47		32		21		44		20		164	

purpose.¹ One infinitive has prefixed *min* of comparison,² one a prefixed *b'* indicating the time "when,"³ four times the infinitive is in the construct state,⁴ and twice in the absolute form.⁵ The reason for the heavy concentration of infinitives in the Pentateuch appears, however, to be purely pragmatic-contextual rather than stylistic.

and die.

¹Gen 45:27; 46:5; Exod 25:14, 27; 30:4; 37:5, 14, 15, 27; 38:7; Lev 10:17; Deut 10:8. Cf. Gesenius, 348; and Choon L. Seow, A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), 190.

²Gen 4:13. See Seow, 41.

³Exod 27:7. See Seow, 190, 191.

⁴Gen 4:7; 44:1. Deut 1:9; 14:24.

⁵Num 4:2,22.

As to the participles, seven are masculine singular,¹ two of which are parallel passages where the participle is used as an attribute of God² (*nošē* ^ʔ*āwōn*) one is used as an appositive³ (*ʔēlāyw hū* ^ʔ*nošē* ^ʔ*et-napšō*) while the remaining four are used nominally ("the one who") about someone carrying a corpse. Six times the participle is used in the masculine plural⁴ and once in the feminine plural⁵, all of which are descriptive in nature indicating an ongoing action. The uneven distribution of the participles appears to correspond to the needs of the context rather than being the result of stylistics or difference in time.

As we consider the distribution of the verb in the Pentateuch (see table 11), we find that the book of Exodus is somewhat different from the others, with its almost equal concentration of infinitives, perfects, and imperfects, or about 30 percent each, whereas in Genesis, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy the imperfect makes up

¹Exod 34:7; Lev 11:25, 28, 40; 15:10; Num 14:18; and Deut 24:15.

²Exod 34:7 and Num 14:18.

³Deut 24:15. See Frank R. Blake, A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses (Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951), 29.

⁴Camels in Gen 37:25; asses in Gen 45:23; certain groups of Levites in Num 10:17, 21 and Deut 31:2, 25.

⁵About she-asses in Gen 45:23.

about 50 percent or more of the occurrences, and the infinitive only 5 to 15 percent. There is, however, no indication that these are anything but the result of contextual needs, for infinitives *per se* do not appear to occur any less frequently in Leviticus than the rest of the Pentateuch, so it is a mere coincidence that only one of these happens to be derived from the root *nāšāʾ*¹. An examination of various morphological forms of randomly selected verbal roots indicates that their distribution in the books of the Pentateuch is dependent on the subject matter rather than difference in style (see table 12).

Large portions of Exodus--especially from chapter 20 on--consist mainly of instructions about general or specific actions which in Hebrew frequently involve a combination of imperfects and perfects with *waw*-consecutive.¹ When instructions include purposive statements the use of infinitives is quite natural. The books of Genesis, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, on the other hand, consist mostly of past narratives which demand a higher proportion of imperfects with *waw*-consecutive.²

¹Gesenius talks about 'frequentative perfect consecutive,' "which is frequently employed with a certain emphasis to introduce the apodosis after sentences . . . which contain a condition, a reason, or a statement of time. Such an apodosis . . . may represent either future events, or commands and wishes, or even events which have been often repeated in the past." Gesenius, § 112.

²Gesenius states, "The imperfect with *waw* consecutive serves to express actions, events, or states,

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF VERBAL FORMS

Infinitive					
	<i>ʔmr</i>	<i>šm^c</i>	<i>qrb</i>	<i>zbḥ</i>	<i>lqh</i>
Gen	77	6		1	7
Ex	51	6	2		
Lev	51	1	8	1	
Num	85	6	7		
Deut	41	13	1	1	7

Perfect					
Gen	47	20	2		21
Ex	34	16	6	4	24
Lev	12	1	30	1	23
Num	32	8	21		24
Deut	52	22	5	3	18

Imperfect					
Gen	465	17	3	2	84
Ex	194	22	5	10	42
Lev	15	4	49	5	28
Num	124	12	25	1	33
Deut	45	39	6	7	19

Another morphological feature of interest is the distribution of 'person,' 'gender,' and 'number' in the different aspects combined with the use of waw-consecutive. The question is whether there is any apparent relationship between morphological forms and fixed expressions.

which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately before. The imperfect consecutive is used in this way most frequently as the narrative tense." Gesenius, § 111a.

Table 13 shows great flexibility in this respect in the use of *nāšā*³. Two things are noted: the high proportion of the waw-consecutive forms in Genesis and their total absence in Deuteronomy. An examination of these passages does not, however, reveal any significance relating to this fact. It appears rather to be a coincidental contextual feature, for waw-consecutive forms, in general, appear to be fairly evenly distributed throughout the Pentateuchal narratives (see table 14).

TABLE 13
MORPHOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION
(Finite Forms)

Verb form*			Gen +		Exod +		Lev +		Num +		Deut +		Total +	
P	sing	1c	1	1		1				2			1	4
E		2m	1						1				1	2
Q R		3m	1	4	4	5		1			1		5	11
F	plural	2m	1										1	
A		3c			1				3	1			4	1
I	sing	1c	1		1						2		2	2
L M		2m		1		4		2		2	3			12
P		3m	14	3	2	2	1	2	8	3	7		25	17
E		3f	3					1	1	1			4	2
R	plural	2m								4				4
F		3m	5		1	1	1	3	1	3			8	7
I s	w/nā ³	2m		5		1								6
P g	w/o nā ³	2m							3		1			4
T	w/o nā ³	2f		1										1
	pl w/o nā ³	2m						1		2				3
NIPH	perf sg	3m			1								1	
HIPH	perf sg	3m					1						1	
HITHP	impf sg	3m								1				1
		3f								1				1
	pl	3m								1				1
Total			26	12	10	13	8	9	14	25	14		58	73

* Note: The plus-sign (+) indicates forms with waw consecutive.

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF WAW-CONSECUTIVE FORMS
IN THE PENTATEUCH

	ʔmr		šm ^c		qrb		zbḥ		lqh	
	Perf	Impf	Perf	Impf	Perf	Impf	Perf	Impf	Perf	Impf
Gen	11	394	0	12	0	1	0	2	11	68
Exod	13	144	2	6	3	0	3	2	22	23
Lev	10	12	1	0	22	13	1	0	22	10
Num	18	103	4	4	20	13	0	1	14	23
Deut	26	20	9	6	1	4	0	0	10	5

Note: The numbers in the perfect may not be quite accurate as they include some waw conjunctions.

The finite forms occur altogether 131 times, thus making up 77.5 percent of the total number. They occur most frequently in the third person, 89 times, or 67.9 percent of the finite forms. Of these, 68 are in the singular (61 are masculine, and 7 feminine); 21 are plural (16 masculine and 5 common). Second person occurs 33 times, 14 of which are imperatives, or 25.2 percent. Twenty-five of these are singular, with all but 1 being masculine. All of the plural forms are masculine. First person is found 9 times, or in 6.9 percent of the finite forms, all of them in the singular.

Finally we have the non-finite forms in table 15. They occur thirty-eight times, and represent the remaining 22.5 percent. As we evaluate the morphological evidence, we find that no single morphological feature can be

associated with any particular meaning of the root. The great variety just corroborates its flexibility.

TABLE 15
MORPHOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION
(Non-finite Forms)

QAL			Gen	Ex	Lev	Num	Deut	Total
Parti- ciple	Sing	masc		1	4	1	1	7
	Plur	masc	2			2	2	6
		fem	1					1
Infin	w/prefix		4	9	1	3	1	18
	w/o prefix		2			2	2	6
Total			9	10	5	8	6	38

Syntax

Great flexibility is also found in the way *nāšā*³ links up with its direct object. In this section we examine these more closely in order to determine if there are any particular meanings related to specific syntactical constructions, or if certain constructions imply a technical usage or meaning.

Object Linkage

The verb is used transitively more than 94 percent of the time. Sometimes it has an external link with its

object, e.g., the object indicator or a preposition;¹ but frequently it is introduced without a preposition. Of the linkages the object indicator ³eṭ is the most frequent, as table 16 indicates. It is used sixty-eight times, or 40.2 percent of the time. In the Pentateuch the object has no prepositional linkage in sixty instances or 35.5 percent of the occurrences. The verb seems to have little, if any, preference for a particular preposition. Again, the context appears to be the determining factor. There are apparently no fixed constructions being used in a technical sense. Ten times, or in 5.9 percent of the occurrences, the verb has no specified direct object.

TABLE 16
SYNTACTICAL DISTRIBUTION

Obj in- trod by	Genesis		Exodus		Lev		Numbers		Deut		Total	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
¹ e	3	6.4	1	3.0			1	2.1			5	3.0
³ eṭ	17	36.2	18	54.5	6	27.3	21	44.7	6	30	68	40.2
Other												
prepos	1	2.1			1	4.5	1	2.1	1	5	4	2.4
Pron	5	10.7	6	18.2	1	4.5			1	5	13	7.7
Suffix	1	2.1	2	6.1	1	4.5	2	4.2	3	15	9	5.3
No prep	17	36.2	5	15.2	13	59.1	16	34.0	9	45	60	35.5
No obj	3	6.4	1	3.0			6	12.8			10	5.9
Total	47		33		22		47		20		169	

¹Prepositions are only used nine times: ¹e five times, ³min three times, and ^be once.

Subject-Object Linkage

Table 17 further analyzes how the verb is syntactically linked to its direct object. According to this table, divine beings are the subject seventeen times, or in about 10 percent of the cases. Man is the subject 135 times, or about 80 percent of the time, and other, or no, subjects make up the remaining 10 percent (seventeen times). Interestingly, God is never the subject of *nāšā*³ in Leviticus, even though he is the subject in the other four books of the Pentateuch. Apart from the scapegoat in Lev 16 'man' is the only subject of *nāšā*³ in Leviticus.

TABLE 17

SUBJECT-OBJECT LINKAGE

Subject:	God/Div.beings				Man					Other				Total
Objects	Gen	Ex	Num	Dt	Gen	Ex	Lev	Num	Dt	Gen	Ex	Lev	Num	
Body +		1	1		8	1	1	2	1					15
parts -			1	1	10				2					14
Persons+		1	1		8	1	1	8	2		1			23
-	1			4	2		2	1	1		2			13
Things +	2				2	14	4	7	5	6	2			42
-					1			9	3	2				15
Wrongs +		1			1	4		6				1		13
-		2	1		1	2	13	4	1					24
No obj					2	1		4		1			2	10
Total	3	5	4	5	35	23	21	41	15	9	5	1	2	169

Note: The plus (+) and minus (-) signs indicate the presence or absence of prepositions, object indicator, or independent personal pronouns introducing the object. The category "Body parts" covers all parts or functions of the subject's own body affected by the verb.

In twenty-nine instances we find 'body-parts' as the object, 'persons' in thirty-six instances, 'wrongs' in thirty-seven, and 'things' or other objects in fifty-seven, and no specific object in ten instances.

Positional Indications

Positional indicators point out the direction of the verbal action, whether it implies a movement or a localized position. Six such morphs were used with the root $nš^3$ in the Pentateuch, altogether forty-three times: five prepositions and the directional $-āh$ (see table 18). An analysis of these usages indicated considerable fluidity. Indeed, no fixed patterns were detected. Apart from the directional $-āh$ and the preposition 3el the indication was quite ambiguous and had ultimately to be determined by the immediate context or the general flow of the narrative. That was also the main indicator in the remaining 120+ passages where there were no directional morphs present with $nš^3$. Significantly, it was also noted that the use of the prepositions was most frequently used in texts indicating movement. This appears to support the contention that the root may include some movement in its semantic range, without it being its basic meaning, and it must, therefore, often be drawn out by some morphs indicating the movement.

As we survey the syntactical evidence, we find no indication of any particular structures being associated with specific meanings of the root. Again, this confirms earlier findings about the great flexibility in the general meaning and usage of the root *nāšāʾ*.

TABLE 18
POSITION INDICATORS

Context:	General	*Util	Own wrongs	Other wrongs	*Interpers	Total
<i>ʿal</i>	6		3	5	3	17
<i>ʾel</i>	3	1		1	1	6
<i>lʿ</i>	2				3	5
<i>bʿ</i>	1					1
<i>min</i>	5	2			2	9
<i>-āh</i>	1	3		1		5
Total	18	6	3	7	9	43

*Util = Utilization; *Interpers = Interpersonal relations

Synonyms and Parallels

Throughout the OT there are several synonyms for the root *nāšāʾ*. Fabry¹ mentions the main ones as *ʿāmas* "lift," *sāḥal* "carry," *lāqaḥ* "take," *nāṭal* "load," and *yāḥal* (hiph) "bring." Of these only the first three are found within the Pentateuch: *ʿāmas* and *sāḥal* occur once each as synonyms of *nāšāʾ*; *lāqaḥ* occurs several times, but very seldom does its meaning overlap that of *nāšāʾ*. Actually the synonyms can be classified into four groups

¹Heinz-Josef Fabry, "*nāšāʾ*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:627.

which agree with four different areas of usages of *nāśa*²: literal, metaphoric, idiomatic, and sequels.¹ Only two clear antonyms were noted in the Pentateuch: *nāpal* "fall,"² and *šākab* "lie down."³

Literal Usage

1. *āmas*: "Each man loaded (*wayya*⁴*mos*) his donkey."⁴
2. *sābal*: "He bowed his shoulder to bear (*lisbol*) [burdens]."⁵
3. *lāqah*: "Now Rachel had taken (*lāq*⁶*hāh*) the household idols."⁶

Besides these others also are used synonymously in a literal sense such as *rûm*, (high) "raise, lift up,"

¹Sequels are not synonyms in the real sense of the word. Rather, as used in this research, they are verbal expressions which immediately follow a statement of utilization of an object indicating the purpose of that action.

²Gen 4:6.

³Num 23:24.

⁴Gen 44:13. Cf. Gen 42:26, "So they loaded (*wayyiś*²*û*) their donkeys."

⁵Gen 49:15. Cf. a similar passage in Num 7:9, "[Sons of Kohath] . . . theirs was the service of the holy [which] they carried (*yīśśā*²*û*) on the shoulder."

⁶Gen 31:34. Cf. Num 16:15 where the verb is used in a similar context implying stealing: "I have not taken (*lo*² . . . *nāśā*²*ti*) a single donkey from them."

ṭā^can "load," yāṣā^ᶜ (hiph) "make . . . go out," nāgā^ᶜ "touch," and ^cālah (hiph) "bring up, lead up."

4. rūm (hiph): "And the water increased and lifted up (wayyis^ᶜū) the ark, so that it rose [or: was high] (wattārām) above the earth."¹

5. ṭā^can: "Do this: load (ṭa^cnū) your beasts and go to the land of Canaan."²

6. yāṣā^ᶜ (hiph): "At the end of every third year you shall bring out (tôṣi^ᶜ) all the tithe."³

7. nāga^c: "Whoever touches (hannogēa^c) their carcass."⁴

8. ^cālah (hiph): [Joseph said] "You shall carry (w^cha^clītem) my bones from here with you."⁵

Metaphoric Usage

In the metaphoric sense there are also several synonyms and word associations, e.g., nāḏab "urge,

¹Gen 7:17.

²Gen 45:17. Cf. also 45:23 where the command is being fulfilled as Joseph sends his father "ten donkeys loaded (noś^ᶜīm) with the best things of Egypt."

³Deut 14:28. Cf. Deut 14:24, "If the distance is so great for you that you are not able to bring it (ś^cēṭō) [the tithe] . . . you shall exchange it."

⁴Lev 11:24. Cf. Lev 11:25, "Whoever picks up (hannōšē^ᶜ) any of their carcasses."

⁵Exod 13:19. Cf. a similar command by Jacob in Gen 47:30, "You shall carry me (ūn^cšā^ᶜtanī) [referring to his bones] out of Egypt and bury me."

prompt,"¹ *šālah* "let go, send," *lāqah* "take, seize," *sālah* "forgive," and *kpr* (piel) "appease, make amends."

1. *nāḏab*: "And everyone whose heart stirred him (*nēšā³ô*) and everyone whose spirit moved him (*nāḏ³bāh*)."²

2. *šālah*: "You shall serve your enemies whom the Lord shall send (*yēšall³hennû*) against you."³

3. *lāqah*: "He spread out his wings and caught them (*yiqqāḥēhû*), he carried them (*yīššā³ēhû*) on his pinions."⁴

4. *sālah*: Having referred to God as the *nošē³* *āwôn* Moses pleads with him: "Pardon, I pray, the iniquity (*s³lah-nā³ la³awôn*) of this people . . . just as you have forgiven [or: carried] (*nāšā³tāh*) this people from Egypt even until now."⁵

5. *kpr* (piel): "He gave it [the sin offering] to you to bear away (*lāšē³t*) the guilt of the congregation, to make atonement (*l³kappēr*) for them before the Lord."⁶

¹Aloysius Fitzgerald, "MTNDBYM in 1QS" *CBQ*, 36 (1974):498 suggests "a generous impulse."

²Exod 35:21.

³Deut 28:48. Cf. Deut 28:49, "The Lord will bring (*yīššā³*) a nation against you."

⁴Deut 32:11.

⁵Num 14:19.

⁶Lev 10:17.

Idiomatic Usage

For certain idiomatic expressions, the following synonyms are found:

1. $nāšā^{\text{3}} ro^{\text{3}}š$ (referring to a census) = $pāqad^{\text{1}}$
 "Only the tribe of Levi you shall not number ($lo^{\text{3}} tipqod$),
 nor shall you take their census ($w^{\text{3}}et ro^{\text{3}}šām lo^{\text{3}} tiššā^{\text{3}}$)
 among the sons of Israel."²

2. $nāšā^{\text{3}} pānim/p'ne$ has a few synonyms depending on the context:

a. $hādar$: "You shall not be partial ($lo^{\text{3}} tiššā^{\text{3}} p'ne$) to the poor nor defer ($lo^{\text{3}} tehdar$) to the great."³

b. $hānan$: "A nation of fierce countenance who shall have no respect ($lo^{\text{3}} yiššā^{\text{3}} pānim$) for the old, nor show favor ($lo^{\text{3}} yāhon$) to the young."⁴

c. $māšā^{\text{3}} hēn$: "If I have found grace ($māšā^{\text{3}} ti hēn$) in your eyes."⁵

¹Gunnel André has pointed out in his dissertation Determining the Destiny (Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1980), 114 passim, that even though these expressions are very similar in meaning they are apparently not quite interchangeable. $Pāqad$ can in most cases replace $nāšā^{\text{3}} ro^{\text{3}}š$, but the reverse can only take place in certain positions. See especially p. 117 in André's book.

²Num 1:49. In some cases this expression may possibly be synonymous with the expression $nātan ro^{\text{3}}š$ "appoint a leader" in Num 14:4.

³Lev 19:15.

⁴Deut 28:50.

⁵Gen 33:10. Cf. a parallel passage in Gen 32:21: "Perhaps he will accept me ($yiššā^{\text{3}} pānay$)."

d. *rāṣāh*: "You have received me favorably (*wattirṣēni*)."¹

e. *ʔôr* (hiph): "The Lord make his face shine (*yāʔēr yhwḥ pānāyw*) on you. . . . The Lord lift up his countenance (*yīśšāʔ yhwḥ pānāyw ʔēlēkā*) on you."²

Sequels

Sequels indicate the immediate result of an action initiated by *nāšaʔ*. The following are found in the Pentateuch:

1. *nāšāʔ ʕayin* => *rāʔāh*: "And Lot lifted up his eyes (*wayyīśšāʔ* . . . *ʔet-ʕēnāyw*) and saw (*wayyarʔ*) all the valley of Jordan."³

2. *nāšāʔ qôl* => *bākāh*: "And she . . . lifted up her voice (*wattiśšāʔ ʔet-qolāh*) and wept (*wattēbk*)."⁴

3. *nāšāʔ raqlāyw* => *hālak*: "Then Jacob went on his journey (*wayīśšāʔ* . . . *raqlāyw*) and came (*wayyēlek*) to the land of the sons of the east."⁵

¹Gen 33:10. Cf. the negative command in Lev 19:15, "You shall not be partial (*loʔ tiśšāʔ*) to the poor."

²Num 6:25, 26.

³Gen 13:10.

⁴Gen 21:16. Cf. *nāṭan qôl* which apparently emphasizes more the loudness involved (see 1 Sam 12:17,18 and Jer 2:15 e.a.), whereas *nāšāʔ qôl* just points out the use of the voice.

⁵Only in Gen 29:1. A similar expression is possibly also found in 1 Sam 17:20 with *raqlāyw* elided. Compare the expression *rûm* (hiph) *ʔet-raqlô* "move one's foot" in

4. $nāšā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $yāḏ$ $\Rightarrow$ $bārak$: "Then Aaron lifted up his hands ($wayyiššā^{\text{Ṣ}}$. . . $^{\text{Ṣ}}et-yāḏāw$) toward the people and blessed them ($waybār^{\text{Ṣ}}kem$)."¹

5. $nāšā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $yāḏ$ $\Rightarrow$ [$šāba^{\text{C}}$ (implied)]: "I will bring you to the land which I swore ($nāšā^{\text{Ṣ}}tī$ $^{\text{Ṣ}}et-yāḏī$) to give to Abraham. . . ."²

6. $nāša^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $k'li$ $\Rightarrow$ $šūḏ$: "Now then, please take your gear ($šā^{\text{Ṣ}}-nā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $kēlēkā$) . . . and hunt a game for me ($wšūḏāh$ li $šāyidh$)."³

7. $nāšā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $māšāl$ $\Rightarrow$ $^{\text{Ṣ}}amar$: "And he took up his discourse ($wayyiššā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $mšālō$) and said ($wayyo^{\text{Ṣ}}mar$)."⁴

As this survey indicates the semantic range of the root $nāšā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ is quite wide, permitting it to be used in a variety of contexts, and its flexibility in meaning is then honed by its context, within the framework, however,

Gen 41:44 indicating a general incidental movement, whereas $nāšā^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $regel$ implies a purposeful move.

¹Only here in Lev 9:22. Compare with the expression $rūm$ (hiph) $yāḏ$ in Gen 41:44 where it implies a general incidental movement of the hand; Exod 17:11 indicating "holding up the hand"; Num 20:11 "lift the hand" for striking the rock, and 1 Kgs 11:26, 27 implying a rebellion.

²Exod 6:8. Actually the expression $nāša^{\text{Ṣ}}$ $yāḏ$ has become a metonym for swearing an oath. The term for swearing an oath, $šāba^{\text{C}}$, is never used as a sequel, but the context implies that meaning.

³Only in Gen 27:3.

⁴Only found in the story about Balaam in Num 23 and 24.

of its basic concept--that of a sustained upward movement for the purpose identified by the context.

Literary Context

Within the Pentateuch the verb *nāšāʾ*³ is found in both cultic and non-cultic passages--as table 19 indicates--in narratives, poetry, and legal texts, and it may be used either in a literal or metaphoric sense. Within any of these classifications or combinations there is also a wide distribution of both morphological and syntactical forms.

Table 19 also indicates that the most common usage of *nāšāʾ*³ is in narrative passages, altogether 108 occurrences, or 63.9 percent; legal use makes up for 56

TABLE 19
DISTRIBUTION ACCORDING TO LITERARY FORMS

SUBJ	Usage	Non - Cultic				Cultic		
		Narr	Poetry	Legal	Tot	Narr	Legal	Tot
Man	literal	15		1	16	13	13	26
	metaphoric	49	1	9	59	3	31	34
God	metaphoric	13	2		15	1	1	2
Inani-								
mate	metaphoric	7	1		8	3		3
Animal	literal	3			3			
	metaphoric		1		1		1	1
None	metaphoric	1			1			
Total		88	5	10	103	20	46	66

cases, or 33.1 percent, and 5 times it is used in poetry, or 3 percent. It is found 103 times in non-cultic passages, or 60.9 percent, and 66 times in cultic context, or 39.1 percent. Literal use accounts for 45 uses, or 27.2 percent, and it is used metaphorically 124 times, or 72.8 percent. However, there is no characteristic pattern discernible for the various meanings of the root *nāšāʾ*. Its shades of meaning appear to be entirely dependent on the context, without any direct relation to the literary form within which it is found.

Summary

On the basis of this survey it seems fairly safe to conclude that there is no morphological or syntactical evidence, or any other compelling indication, of the existence of more than one root *nāšāʾ* in the Hebrew Old Testament, nor has it been found to be a part of any fixed technical expression. Closest to it are the expressions *nāšāʾ yāḏ* for "swearing an oath," and *nāšāʾ rōʾš* for "taking a census," but even these appear to be rather a matter of metonymy rather than a *termini technicae*.

All the morphological, syntactical, and contextual evidence seems to point to a single, very flexible and neutral root which is fairly evenly distributed throughout all of the OT, without any significant difference noted between individual books or sections. What difference

there is relates more to the subject matter of a given book than individual stylistics or development through time. No noticeable development was detected in the OT writings related to time, authorship, or sources. Based on the statistics presented, the use of the term is also quite uniform. The heaviest--and almost equal--concentration is found in the Pentateuch and the Later Prophets.

The verb is used almost exclusively in the Qal, or more than 90 percent. It occurs both in non-cultic and cultic contexts, and within each the verb may be found in different literary forms such as narratives, legal texts, or poetry. Historical, narrative books have the highest ratio of literal meanings with man as subject, whereas prophetic, instructional writings have a higher ratio of metaphoric meanings and also a higher percentage of God as subject. Throughout, there is significant emphasis on concreteness; even the metaphoric usages appear to be based on earlier, literal actions.

CHAPTER IV

SEMANTIC SCOPE OF *nāšāʔ* IN THE PENTATEUCH

When the usage of *nāšāʔ* in the Pentateuch is examined it becomes evident that it can be classified into five categories similar to those found in cognate languages. Most common are the aspects of (1) *transport*, and (2) *support*, but idiomatic expressions indicating (3) *utilization* of tools or parts of the human body, and (4) *interpersonal relations* are quite frequent, and finally there are usages in the context of (5) *dealing with sin and wrongdoing*. The first three are the subject of this chapter, whereas the last two are examined in the following chapters.

Nāšāʔ and Movement

In forty-two instances, or 24.8 percent of the total, the verb *nāšāʔ* is involved in some kind of a movement from one place to another. The movement may be either indicated by a preposition or the directional *-āh* (eleven times), parallel expressions of movement (eleven cases), or by the general context (twenty cases). It must be noted, however, that in only seven cases is the

movement explicitly indicated by certain morphs;¹ all the other instances depend on the context for clarification, even if there is a preposition. In thirty-six instances persons are the subject, animals occur once, and other subjects such as wagons, wind, water, or kingdom are found six times.

Formal Indications

Data

Formal indications of movement are found in twenty-two cases and include morphs such as ^cal, ^ʔel, min, directional -āh, and parallel expressions of movement in the immediate context. Seventeen are in non-cultic narratives, and the remaining five in cultic texts.

1. Non-cultic setting

Gen 43:34	And <u>he took</u> (wayyiśśā ^ʔ) <u>portions to them</u> (^ʔ alēhem) <u>from his own table</u> (mē ^ʔ ēt pānāyw).
Gen 47:30	But when I lie down with my fathers, <u>you shall carry me</u> (ūn'śā ^ʔ tanī) <u>out of Egypt</u> (mimmisrayīm) and bury me in their burial place.
Gen 50:13	For his sons <u>carried</u> (wayyiś ^ʔ ū) him <u>to the land</u> (^ʔ arsāh) of Canaan.
Num 16:15	<u>I have not taken</u> (lo ^ʔ . . . nāsā ^ʔ tī) a single donkey <u>from them</u> (mēhem). ²

¹Gen 43:34; 47:30; 50:13; Exod 10:19; Lev 10:4, 5; Num 16:15.

²Moses defends himself before the Lord against

- Exod 10:19 So that the Lord shifted the wind to a very strong west wind which took up (wayyiśśā³) the locusts and drove them into the Red Sea (wayyitqā^cēhū yāmmāh sūp).
- Gen 31:17, 18 Then Jacob arose and put (wayyiśśā³) his children and his wives upon camels (^cal-hagg^mmallīm) . . . to go to the land (³arṣāh) of Canaan.
- Gen 42:26 So they loaded their donkeys (wayyiś³ū . . . ^cal-h^mmorēhem) with their grain, and departed from there.
- Gen 46:5 Then Jacob arose from Beersheba; and the sons of Israel carried (wayyiś³ū) their father Jacob and their little ones and their wives, in the wagons (bā^cqālōt).
- Exod 12:34 So the people took (wayyiśśā³) their dough before it was leavened . . . bound up in clothes on (^cal) their shoulders.
- Gen 7:17 And the water increased and lifted up (wayyiś³ū) the ark, so that it rose above (wattārām mē^cal) the earth.
- Exod 10:13 . . . and when it was morning, the east wind brought (nāśā³) the locusts.¹
- Num 23:24 Behold, a people rises (yāqūm) like a lioness, and as a lion it lifts itself (yiṭnaśśā³); It shall not

accusations by Korah and Dothan. He claims that he has never done them any wrong, not even taken a donkey from them. Later the prophet Samuel used a similar argument in his own defense (1 Sam 12:3). In that passage the verb *lāqah* is used instead of *nāśā³*.

¹Cf. vs. 14 where the expression "came up over all the land" is used concerning the result of this action.

lie down (yīškab) until it devours the prey.

Gen 45:19 Take wagons from the land of Egypt for your little ones and for your wives, and bring (ûn'sā³tem) your father and come.

Gen 45:27 When he saw the wagons that Joseph had sent to carry (lāšē³t) him, the spirit of their father Jacob revived.¹

Gen 46:5B . . . in the wagons which Pharaoh had sent to carry (lāšē³t) him.²

Num 13:23 Then they came to the Valley of Eshcol and from there cut down a branch with a single cluster of grapes; and they carried it (wayyīššā³uhû) on a pole between two men.³

Deut 14:24 If the distance is so great for you that you are not able to bring (š'ē³etô) the tithe.

2. Cultic setting

Lev 10:4, 5 Come forward, carry (š'û) your relatives away from (mē³et) the front of the sanctuary to the outside (ʔel-miḥûš) of the camp. So they . . . carried them (wayyīššā³um) still in their tunics to the outside (ʔel-miḥûš) of the camp.

¹Cf. vs. 19 where the context indicates the idea of coming from one place to another.

²Cf. vs. 5a and 45:19 above where the idea of a movement is clearly indicated.

³The idea of transport is brought out by vss. 25 and 26 which reads: "when they returned from spying out the land, at the end of forty days, they proceeded to come to Moses and Aaron . . . and they brought back word to them . . . and showed them the fruit of the land."

- Num 10:17 And the sons of Gershon and the sons of Merari, who were carrying (noś³ē) the tabernacle, set out (wⁿās^cū).
- Num 10:21 Then the Kohathites set out (wⁿāsa^c) carrying (noś³ē) the holy objects.
- Deut 12:26 Only your holy things which you may have and your votive offerings, you shall take (tiššā³) and go to the place (ūbā³tā³ el-hammāqōm) which the Lord chooses.

Comments

In the six first passages a movement is clearly indicated by indicating both the goal and the point of departure (°al + min),¹ the point of departure or separation (min),² or the point towards which the movement is directed (°aršāh³ and yammāh⁴). The next four passages also include prepositions, but the movement is not clear except from the context. Three times we find the preposition °al which can have both locational and terminative sense.⁵ Once the movement is indicated by the

¹Gen 43:34.

²Num 16:15. This is in fact the only time an animal is the object in the OT in contrast to both Ugaritic and Akkadian where an animal was occasionally the object in the context of sacrifices being brought (see chapter 2).

³Gen 50:13.

⁴Exod 10:19.

⁵See Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 216.

directional *-āh* in the next verse,¹ once by the point of departure being indicated (*miššam*),² and once the movement can only be detected by the general context.³ In one passage⁴ we find a combination of the preposition *b'* indicating the means of transport and a directional *-āh* indicating the goal of the movement. In three passages the movement is not indicated by any particular morph, but by parallel expressions in the immediate context: *rûm + mē'al* "rise above,"⁵ *alāh al* "come up upon,"⁶ and *qûm* "rise up" in contrast to *šākab* "lie down."⁷ Finally, in five instances the movement is implied by some expression in the context. Three of these are in the context of Jacob's moving to Egypt, having discovered that his son, Joseph, was still alive.⁸ All of them indicate how Jacob and his family were to use the wagons which had been "sent" from Egypt in order to "come" to Joseph. In one passage we are told about the spies taking a cluster of

¹Gen 31:17 and 18.

²Gen 42:26.

³Exod 12:34.

⁴Gen 46:5.

⁵Gen 7:17.

⁶Exod 10:13.

⁷Num 23:24.

⁸Gen 45:19, 27; 46:5β.

grapes as a sample of the fertility of the land and bringing it back to the people.¹ Finally, the people are encouraged to bring their tithe to a given place, unless the distance is too great for it to be practicable.²

One passage in the cultic setting with two occurrences of the root *has* morphs which clearly indicate movement,³ both a point of departure or separation *min* (once) and the "goal" *ʔel-miḥûṣ* (twice); two have contextual parallels: a verb of movement *nāsā*⁴ and once the movement is indicated by a parallel verb and a preposition of movement (*bôʔ* + *ʔel*).⁵

Contextual Indications

Data

The remaining twenty passages have no direct indication of a movement, but the general context leaves no doubt that the emphasis is on movement rather than some stationary action. All the texts are in a cultic setting and most deal with the transport of various items of the

¹Num 13:23. Cf. vss 25 and 26 where the idea of movement is brought out: "When they returned from spying out the land . . . they proceeded to come to Moses and Aaron . . . and showed them the fruit of the land."

²Deut 14:24.

³Lev 10:4, 5.

⁴Num 10:17, 21.

⁵Deut 12:26.

tabernacle, when "the camp is to set out."¹ Four texts issue a warning against becoming contaminated by contact with "unclean" things.²

a. Subject: the Levites

Num 1:50 But you shall appoint the Levites over the tabernacle of the testimony, and over all its furnishings and over all that belongs to it. They shall carry (yīś³û) the tabernacle and all its furnishings, and they shall take care of (y'šār⁴tuhû) it.

Num 4:15 When the camp is to set out. . . the sons of Kohath shall come and carry (lāśē³t) them.³

b. Object: (i) the ark

Exod 25:14 And you shall put poles into the rings on the sides of the ark, to carry (lāśē³t) the ark with them.⁴

(ii) the table

Exod 25:27 The rings shall be close to the rim as holders for the poles to carry (lāśē³t) the table.⁵

¹Num 1:51; 4:15, 25.

²Lev 11:25, 28, 40; 15:10.

³See also parallel passages in Num 4:25; Deut 10:8; and 31:9, 25.

⁴The same expression is found in Exod 37:5.

⁵Also used in Exod 25:28 and 37:14, 15.

(iii) the altar

Exod 27:7 The poles shall be on the two sides of the altar when it is carried (*biš³et 3otō*).¹

(iv) the altar of incense

Exod 30:4 They shall be holders for poles with which to carry (*lāšē³t*) it [altar of incense].²

(v) carcasses/corpses

Lev 11:25 Whoever picks up (*w³kol-hannošē³*) any of their carcasses shall wash his clothes and be unclean until evening.³

(vi) contaminated items

Lev 15:10 Whoever then touches any of the things which were under him [a person with a discharge] shall be unclean until evening, and he who carries (*w³hannōšē³*) them shall wash his clothes. . . .

Comments

Six times the transport of the tabernacle and its furnishings is said to be the responsibility of certain families of the Levites⁴, with one passage paralleling *nāša³* with the verb *šāraṭ*, meaning "to serve or minister in an official capacity as an official or a priest."⁵

¹See also Exod 38:7.

²Also in Exod 37:27.

³This expression is repeated in Lev 11:28, 40.

⁴Num 1:50; 4:15, 25; Deut 10:8; 31:9, 25.

⁵Num 1:50. Holladay, 384; BDB, 1058; and KBL, 1013, all give "serve," or "wait on" in a cultic context.

NASB translates it as "they shall take care of it."¹ Ten passages describe a technical aspect involved in making possible the transport of some items of the tabernacle: poles were to be made for the purpose of carrying its furnishings: the ark,² the table,³ the altar of incense,⁴ and the altar.⁵ A series of four passages are in the form of laws prohibiting any contact with ceremonially unclean objects, such as dead bodies,⁶ or items on which a person suffering from discharge has been sitting.⁷ The context implies that the main concern is not merely the act of a simple touch. It seems clear that the idea is rather one of moving the carcasses or the objects.⁸

¹The idea of caring was also found in Akkadian (see chapter 2 above), and it seems to form an integral part of the root-meaning both in Akkadian and Hebrew.

²Exod 25:14; 37:5.

³Exod 25:27, 28; 37:14, 15.

⁴Exod 30:4; 37:27.

⁵Exod 27:7; 38:7.

⁶Lev 11:25, 28, 40.

⁷Lev 15:10.

⁸So for instance Carl F. Keil and Franz Delitzsch, Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament, vols. 1-3 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949), 3:368 and A. B. Silberman, ed., Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary, hereinafter Rashi (London: Shapiro, Vallentine & Co., 1946), 2:46.

It becomes evident from this that the idea of movement may be included in the semantic range of *nāšāʾ*, but it is apparently not the primary meaning, for prepositions, morphs of movement or the context is usually needed to draw out that sense. This strengthens the earlier suggestion that the primary sense is in the area of sustained carrying. The use of different subjects and objects in different contexts, cultic or non-cultic, has apparently no significant impact on the usage or meaning of *nāšāʾ*. Its flexibility permits it to be used in various contexts and still retain its basic meaning. At the same time it adjusts the exact nature of the transport quite easily to the needs of the immediate context.

Nāšāʾ as Supporting

Data

In fourteen instances the contextual emphasis of passages with *nāšāʾ* is on the aspect of ongoing support, ability to hold, or maintain. Again, it is mostly the context that indicates this. Seven times the verb takes a preposition of position or movement: twice the preposition of location *ʿāl*,¹ four times *lʿ* indicating manner,² and

¹Num 7:9; 16:3.

²Exod 20:7; Deut 5:11. Cf. Waltke, 206. Both passages are the same and repeat the same phrase 4 times.

once a distributive *min.*¹

1. Non-cultic setting

Gen 13:6	And the land could not <u>sustain</u> (<i>nāšā³</i>) them while dwelling together.
Gen 36:7	For their property had become too great for them to live together, and the land where they sojourned could not <u>sustain</u> (<i>lāšē³t</i>) them because of their livestock.
Gen 44:1	Fill the men's sacks with food, as much as they can <u>carry</u> (<i>š³ē³t</i>), and put each man's money in the mouth of his sack.
Gen 45:23	And to his father he sent as follows: ten donkeys <u>loaded</u> (<i>noš³fm</i>) with ² the best things of Egypt, and ten female donkeys <u>loaded</u> (<i>noš³ot</i>) with grain and bread.
Exod 20:7 Deut 5:11	<u>You shall not take</u> (<i>lo³ tiššā³</i>) the name of the Lord your God in vain, for the Lord will not leave him unpunished who <u>takes</u> (<i>yiššā³</i>) his name in vain.
Exod 23:1	You shall not <u>bear</u> (<i>lo³ tiššā³</i>) a false report.
Num 16:3	You have gone far enough, for all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the Lord is in their midst; so why do you <u>exalt yourselves</u> (<i>tiṭnašš³ū</i>) above the assembly of the Lord?

¹Deut 33:3. It is, however, debated whether this is a prefixed preposition or an enclitic *mem* from the previous word (see discussion below).

²Not in Hebrew. Should be italicized since it is supplied.

- Num 24:7 And his king shall be higher than Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted (*w^ctinnaššē³*).
- Deut 33:3 Yea, he loves the peoples; All his holy ones are in your hand, and they bowed down (*tukkû*) at your feet, your word sustains them (*yiššā³ middabb^crotēkā*)¹.

2. Cultic setting

- Num 7:9 But he did not give any to the sons of Kohath, because theirs was the service of the holy *objects*, which they carried (*yiššā³û*) on the shoulder.

Comments

All the passage but the one in Num 7 are in non-cultic contexts. In four of them the context implies an eventual movement,² but the statements themselves emphasize the act of holding, supporting, carrying, sustaining, or maintaining. Eight of them have persons as subject,³ two have animals,⁴ and four have inanimate subjects--the land,⁵ the kingdom,⁶ and God's word.⁷

¹Translation mine.

²Gen 44:1; 45:23 (2x), and Num 7:9.

³Gen 44:1; Exod 20:7 (2x); 23:1; Num 7:9; 16:3; and Deut 5:11 (2x).

⁴Gen 45:23 (2x).

⁵Gen 13:6; 36:7.

⁶Num 24:7.

⁷Deut 33:3.

The first two passages, Gen 13:6 and 36:7, are similar in content. Both deal with the problem arising when two rich men occupy the same area with their livestock. The land could no longer produce enough grass and grains to "sustain them," (i.e., provide them with their sustenance).¹

In the following passages, Gen 44:1 and 45:23, the emphasis is on the load that is to be carried without any real concern for the transport *per se*. Both man and the animals are supporting the load that is placed upon them.

The passages in Exod 20:7 and Deut 5:11 are identical. They are a part of a legal code, or more specifically, the Ten Commandments. As to their exact meaning, varied opinions exist, especially when it comes to the meaning of "in vain" in this context.² It is a translation of the Hebrew term *šāw*³ which is commonly translated as "worthless," "what is empty,"³ "nothingness," "insubstantial thing" or a "lie."⁴ Keil and Delitzsch do not agree. They say:

¹This idea of "providing for" or "sustaining" was also found in Akkadian (see chapter 2).

²See Timo Veijola, "Das dritte Gebot (Namenverbot) im Lichte einer ägyptischen Parallele," ZAW 103 (1991):1-17.

³See Holladay, 361-2.

⁴John I. Durham, Exodus, Word Biblical Commentary (Waco, TX: Word Books Publishers, 1987), 287-8.

šāw² does not signify a lie (šeger), but according to its etymon šā²āh, to be waste, it denotes that which is waste and in disorder, hence that which is empty, vain, and nugatory, for which there is no occasion.¹

Klopfenstein is basically in agreement with this conclusion, except he sees the term going deeper, to include what he calls "die Ambivalenz 'Unheilvolles-Kraftloses.'" ² Šāw² is thus a term indicating something lacking in substance, whether that substance be power, truth, reliability, or fullness.

On this basis different interpretations of the third commandment have surfaced through the centuries. Ehrlich has pointed out that "wahrscheinlich steht tiššā² für tiššā² 'al š'patēkā,"³ and some have seen this commandment to be the basis for the rabbinic practice of not pronouncing the Tetragrammaton. Ehrlich claims, however, that this notion cannot be substantiated, but this was rather seen as a

Verbot, den Namen JHVHs leichtsinnig im Munde zu führen, ihn unnötiger Weise auszusprechen und namentlich bei ihm, da wo es sich um gleichgiltige Dinge handelt, zu schwören.⁴

Mowinckel, on the other hand, sees the commandment warning against the misuse of the name of Yahweh "als

¹Keil and Delitzsch, 1:118.

²Martin A. Klopfenstein, Die Lüge nach dem Alten Testament (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1964), 320.

³Ehrlich, 1:341.

⁴Ibid.

Beschwörungsformel in egoistischer und anderen Leuten schändlicher Absicht."¹ Noth agrees, but adds "Zauberhandlungen,"² whereas von Rad sees it mainly "directed against false swearing."³

W. E. Staples has argued for a different approach. Having shown that šāw³ is one of the epithets of idols in the OT⁴ he suggests the possibility of reading the commandment as: "Thou must not lift up the name of Yahweh, thy God, to an idol," implying the act of attaching his name to them.⁵ That argument, however, is not very convincing, since the aspect of loyalty to the "one, true God" has already been covered in the first commandment. More convincing is Veijola⁶ as he draws on Biblical and

¹Sigmund Mowinckel, Psalmstudien (Amsterdam: P. Schippers, 1966), 1:52, quoted in Klopfenstein, 316.

²Martin Noth, Das zweite Buch Mose. Exodus, Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Neues Göttinger Bibelwerk, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 131. Quoted in Klopfenstein, 316.

³Gerhard von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 2 vols., trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1962), 1:183-4. This is also supported by Keil and Delitzsch, 1:118.

⁴Quoting Jer 18:15.

⁵W. E. Staples, "The Third Commandment," JBL 58 (1939):329.

⁶Veijola, 5-12. He cites an Egyptian votive inscription from the nineteenth dynasty besides an almost identical biblical parallel from Ps 24:4 in which the expression lo³-nāšā³ laššāw³ napšī occurs in the context of swearing a false oath. He also points out that the use of nāšā³ probably is a metonymy for lifting of the hands

extra-biblical parallels, where šāw³ is used parallel with šāqer in the context of making oaths.

It seems, however, important to look at šāw³ in the context of šēm which has a broader sense here than merely being mentioned in oaths. A name in Hebrew usually stands for the essence or character of its bearer, or even life itself.¹ The passage should therefore be seen as a warning against presenting God's character as empty, lacking substance, and thus lying about it, giving a wrong impression of who God really is. But Durham may be right when he observes that

this commandment is couched in language deliberately chosen to permit a wide range of application, covering every dimension of the misuse of Yahweh's name.²

Whichever interpretation is adopted it appears that the meaning of nāšā³ in this context has to do with "holding up" (i.e. presenting) a false impression of God's character.³

in oaths (Exod 6:8; Ezek 20:6, 15, 23; and Ps 106:26). In Exod 23:1-7 šāw³ is used in parallel with šeqer "a lie," and even within the ten commandments themselves this parallel is found, as we compare the two "versions" in Exod 20 and Deut 5 where 'ēd šāqer of Exod 20:16 is replaced by 'ēd šāw³ in Deut 5:20.

¹See the theophany in Exod 33:18-23 and 34:5-7. Also A. S. van der Woude, "UV, šēm Name," THAT 2:939; and Stamm, "Dreißig Jahre Dekalogforschung," Theologische Rundschau, 27/4 (1961):289.

²Durham, 288.

³Stamm, "Dreißig Jahre . . . ," 290, points out an interesting parallel from the rules of the harems of the

The passage about the false report in Exod 23:1 has also been the subject of various interpretations, depending on whether to understand *nāšā*³ as "to carry" or "to accept, take". Most modern English translations seem to take the former view, whereas a few scholars favor the latter.¹ Even the ancient versions are divided on this issue. LXX has *παράδεξι* "accept, acknowledge," and the Targum Onkelos and Neophyti have *tqbyl* and *tqblwn* "accept, receive" respectively, whereas Peshitta has *tšr* "let go, start." Even though an initiation of a rumor may be involved, it seems more likely, in light of the present research and the immediate context, that the emphasis is more on the idea of keeping the rumor alive than starting it, considering the fact that *nāšā*³ tends to place the emphasis more on the ongoing action than only its initiation. The passage might then be translated as: "Do not sustain (or: keep alive) something that is only an unsubstantiated rumor."

The passage in Num 7:9 is in the context of instructions concerning the transport of the furnishings of the tabernacle. The leaders provided the Levites with

Assyrian kings (in Weidner, 279, rule 10, line 57-58): *i-na ša-al-ti-ši-na šu-[um il]i a-na ma-šik-te ta-zak-ru-u-ni* ("Entweder Gattinnen des Königs oder niedrige Frauen, die . . . sich gegenseitig schlagen), in ihrem Streit den Na[men der Gotth]eit mißbräuchlich anrufen."

¹Ehrlich, 1:356. Marginal reading in KJV.

oxen and carts for that purpose, but the Kohathites received no oxen or carts, for they were responsible for the furnishings of the holy--the table, altar of incense and the lampstand--all of which were to be carried on the shoulders by means of poles.¹ Even though the idea of transport is definitely present in the text, the emphasis is more on the contrast between different groups of Levites. Most of them received oxen and carts on which to load their items, but the Kohathites were to load and carry their particular burdens on their own shoulders.

The two passages from Num 16 and 24 have the verb *nāšā*² in the hithpael which most frequently has a reflexive or reciprocal meaning, but may occasionally have passive meanings.² The former is in a narrative, whereas the latter is in prophetic poetry. In the last passage *w'tinnaśšē*² stands for **w'titnaśšē*² where *ʔ* has been assimilated to a *]*. Apart from this, the structure is quite normal.

In Num 16 Dathan and Abiram accuse Moses and Aaron of desiring to be in charge of the people, "Why will you place yourselves (*titnaśšē*²) over the congregation of the Lord?" Even though the prepositional phrase *ʿal-q'hal* may indicate both the direction and the place of the activity,

¹Cf. Num 4:5-15.

²See Gesenius, § 54:3.

the context seems rather to imply that the accusation has to do with the unwillingness of Moses and Aaron to share their leadership role with others. It appears to be emphasizing the maintenance of a *status quo*, holding on to a leadership role rather than the aspiration of a new role.

The passage in Num 24 involves a comparison as Balaam is predicting the future glory of Israel. He claims Israel's king will be higher than the king of the enemy, and its kingdom will be/remain exalted, indicating a status being maintained rather than one to be attained.

In the last passage, Deut 33:3, there are several textual problems: *ḥobēh* "to love" is a *hapax legomenon*, *ʿammîm* for "people" is indefinite plural, even though the context suggests singular; there is a mixture of the pronouns "his" and "thy," *tukkû* occurs only twice in the OT, the subject of *yîššāʾ* is uncertain as is the function of the prefixed *l* in the last word. Similar problems are also found in the verses immediately preceding and following. Several solutions have been suggested, all of which involve more or less emendations, because it seems evident that the text is partially corrupt in these verses.

Since, however, a correct understanding of the details in this passage is not crucial to the current study, we only look at the possible meaning of *tukkû*

and the last phrase and then suggest a translation in which the verb *nāšā*² retains its basic meaning without violating the context.

According to the Massoretic annotations the form *tukkū* occurs only here and in Isa 1:5 where it is seen to be hophal imperfect of *nākāh* "to strike, hit, beat."¹ That meaning, however, does not seem to fit the context here.

Some² suggest that "they" refers to the heavenly host in vs. 2 who is ready to perform God's biddings, whereas others see it as referring to the people of God.³ Targum Onkelos, Targum Neophyti, and the Peshitta all suggest that it refers to the people who are being led by God. Cross and Freedman have argued, however, that *tukkū* might be read together with the previous words, forming **himtakkū* a *hištaqal* form of the root *mkk*⁴ with an infixed *h*, meaning "to bend, be low or humiliated."⁵

¹Holladay, 237-8.

²So Frank M. Cross and David Noel Freedman, "The Blessing of Moses," *JBL* 67 (1948):193, and I. Seeligmann, "A Psalm from Pre-Regal Times," *VT* 14 (1964):77-78.

³The Targums, Rashi, 2:170; Andrew D. H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy*, New Century Bible (London: Oliphants, 1979), 400. Most modern translations apparently follow their lead.

⁴Also found in Ps 106:43; Eccl 10:18; and Job 24:24.

⁵Cross and Freedman, 200-1. They are followed by Mayes, 400, and Duane L. Christiansen, "Two Stanzas of a Hymn in Deuteronomy 33," *Biblica* 65 (1984):387.

The last phrase causes the main problem. What is the subject of *yiššā*? Is it the people or possibly the word? The Targums saw the context referring to the guidance the people received from God on their journey and translated it, "they moved according to your words."¹ Many modern translations follow the LXX and the Peshitta in taking *yiššā* as "receiving," either with the people (collective) or the distributive "Everyone . . ." as subject.³ They see this passage referring to the people receiving the Decalogue as the following verse indicates.

Cross and Freedman argue for a minor emendation in order to make the translation "smoother." They do not see any need, however, to change the consonantal text. It is only necessary to join the prefixed *ḏ* in *middabb'rotēkā* to *yiššā*, reading *yiššā'am dibrotēkā*. The *ḏ* may be taken as enclitic, a common feature in Old Hebrew poetry.⁴ This provides the meaning, "they carry out your words (or: decisions)."⁵ Mayes follows their suggestion but sees the final *ḏ* as a masculine, plural pronominal suffix, thus

¹See Targum Neophyti.

²Rashi, 2:170; NASB.

³Keil and Delitzsch, 3:498.

⁴See Horace D. Hummel, "Enclitic *Mem* in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew," JBL 76 (1957):85-107, especially pp. 92-95 and 103-5.

⁵Cross and Freedman, 193.

translating, "your words lift them up"¹ or "your words uphold (or: sustain) them," which would agree with the context and also the overall meaning of *nāšā*² discussed above. Selecting this option makes "words" the subject rather than the object of the verb.²

Even though the meaning "support" is not as common as that of "transport" in the Pentateuch, that idea is usually basic to the one of "transport." Transport presupposes support. The distinction between these shades of meaning is not based on morphology or syntax alone, but

¹Mayes, 400.

²The text has been enigmatic for centuries; even the ancient versions struggle with it. For the relevant portion of the passage, LXX has: "and they received from his word [a] law which Moses commanded us." TgO has "they lifted up the stakes (=moved) according to your word." TgN supports that meaning by "they set out and encamped according to his word." Peshitta has "they followed closely after his feet and received of his word." All of them seem to agree that the sense is that the people was guided by God's word. A suggestive, literal translation of vss. 2 through 4 would run as follows: "The Lord has come from Sinai, He has dawned on them [the people] from Seir, He shone forth from the mount of Paran [these locations referring to God's glory being visible throughout the wilderness wandering], and He came from [or: in association with] a myriad of holy ones; from His right hand (came) fiery law (?) [possibly referring to the way in which the law was given. The meaning of *ʿēšdāt* is unknown. The marginal annotation in the MT suggests a Qêre of *ʿēš dāt* "a fire (of) law"] for them. Yea, the lover of peoples [or: the tribes], all his holy ones are in your hand [both "his" and "your" refer to God], and they bowed down [or: were humbled] at your feet [at Sinai], your words sustain them [or: (as they) receive of your words]. Moses commanded us the Law, the possession of the assembly of Judah." Both of the options in the last phrase are well acceptable, and their message is basically the same. Only the emphasis is different.

is drawn out by the context. It is found both in cultic and non-cultic settings with persons, animals, or inanimate subjects, but that fact does not appear to have any significant impact on the meaning.

Nāšā³ as Utilizing

In fifty-one texts the emphasis is neither on the idea of transport nor that of support, but rather that of the utilization or employment of a given object. Most frequently this meaning is found in the context of body parts or functions (thirty-nine times), but it also involves weapons once, words, eight times; and man, three times.

Weapons as Objects

Data

In one passage in the Pentateuch we find nāšā³ being used with weapons.

Gen 27:3	Now then, <u>please take</u> (šā ³ -nā ³) your gear, your quiver and your bow, and go out to the field and hunt a game for me.
----------	---

Comments

The indication of nāšā³ in this passage is not that of transporting the weapons to the field, nor the thought of them being a load that needs to be carried, but rather their utilization for the purpose indicated by the sequel of hunting a game.

Body Parts and Functions

Forty-five times in the Pentateuch there are expressions combining *nāšāʾ*¹ and body parts or functions.¹ Practically all of them are metaphoric (i.e., they do not necessarily involve a literal, visual, and/or measureable movement), or that movement is not the issue in question. They are really idioms which originally may have described a literal action, but later became a fixed expression for the effect rather than the act itself. In Hebrew the following body parts or functions are involved (listed in the order of descending frequency): the eyes, head, voice, heart, hand(s), feet, and soul. All of these appear as the object of *nāšāʾ* except the heart which functions as subject in the Pentateuchal passages.

Eyes as Object

Data. *Nāšāʾ* is used with the eyes eighteen times in the Pentateuch, compared with thirty-three times in the rest of the OT. Generally speaking, both translators and commentators take this expression to indicate a literal upward movement of the eyes. A closer look at its actual usage, however, indicates that this is not necessarily the case.

¹Nine of these--Gen 19:21; 32:21; 40:13, 19, 20; Lev 19:15; Num 14:30; Deut 28:50; and 32:40--are associated with interpersonal relations and therefore discussed in chapter 5.

- Gen 13:10 And Lot lifted up his eyes and saw (wayyiššā¹ . . . ēt-^cēnāyw wayyar²) the valley of Jordan.¹
- Gen 13:14 Now, lift up your eyes and look (šā³-nā³ ^cēnēkā ūr³ēh) from the place where you are northward and southward and eastward and westward.²
- Gen 18:2 And when he [Abraham] lifted up his eyes and looked, behold (wayyiššā³ ^cēnāyw wayyar³ w^hinneh), three men were standing opposite him.³
- Exod 14:10 And as Pharaoh drew near, the sons of Israel looked, and behold (wayyiššā³ ū . . . ³et-^cēnēhem w^hinneh) the Egyptians were marching after them.
- Deut 4:19 And beware, lest you lift up your eyes and see (tiššā³ ^cēnēkā . . . w^rā³fi^{tā}) the . . . host of heaven and . . . worship them.
- Gen 39:7 His master's wife looked with desire⁴ (wattiššā³ . . . ³et-^cēnēhā) at Joseph, and she said, "Lie with me".

Comments. C. S. Reif has pointed out that the expression nāšā³ ^cayin has received very little serious

¹A similar expression is also found in Gen 22:4; 24:64; Num 24:2; Gen 33:5; and 43:29. In the last 2 the subject is not mentioned in the phrase itself but in the previous verse.

²A similar expression is also found in Gen 31:12 and Deut 3:27.

³Similar expressions with a double sequel are also found in Gen 22:13; 24:63; 31:10; 33:1; and 37:25.

⁴The expression "with desire" is not in the Hebrew. Being a supplied interpretation, based on what is implied by the context, it should be in italics.

attention through the centuries.¹ Evidently no one seems to have regarded this expression "sufficiently controversial or problematic to warrant lengthy comment."² Even modern translations have improved little on the traditional translation of "to lift the eyes."³ Most "modernizing" has consisted in replacing "lift the eyes" with "raise the eyes."⁴

However, the most recent dictionaries reveal the awareness "that 'lifting the eyes' in Hebrew is not necessarily to be equated with the English idiom 'look up.'"⁵ In fact, the employment of this expression "in no way presupposes that the object of such vision is on a higher level than the observer."⁶ Frequently the opposite is the case: Moses on Mount Pisgah overlooking the Promised Land, likewise Abraham and Lot in their time, Rebekkah noticing Isaac from upon the camel,⁷ and Joseph

¹C. S. Reif, "A Root to Look Up? A Study of the Hebrew *nāśāʾ* ^ʿ*ayin*," *VTS* 36 (1985):230-44, especially pp. 232-36.

²*Ibid.*, 234.

³*Ibid.* See especially Reif's discussion of the trend in various contemporary versions, pp. 231-2.

⁴*Ibid.*, 235.

⁵*Ibid.*, 237.

⁶*Ibid.*, 240.

⁷Gen 24:64.

looking at his brothers.¹ This is also confirmed as we look at texts outside the Pentateuch. They show that the expression *nāšaʾ ayin* is generally followed by either a sequel or a directional morph which would be unnecessary if the idea of lifting was inherent in the verb itself. There are prepositions such as *ʾel*,² *ʿal*³ or *l*;⁴ expressions which specify an upward movement like *mārôm*;⁵ or others which indicate a round about movement, as does *sābīb*.⁶ The last two expressions in particular give the impression that the verb itself is directionally neutral and needs to be further defined by other morphs or the context to indicate even an upward move.

Ehrlich appears to be one of the first commentators to draw attention to the fact that when *nāšaʾ* is used with parts of the body it does not mean "to lift" but rather it is clearly being used in the idiomatic sense of

¹Deut 3:27; Gen 13:10, 14; and Gen 43:29 respectively.

²Ezek 18:6, 12, 15; 33:25; Ps 121:1; 123:1; Ezek 23:27.

³Jer 3:2.

⁴Isa 51:6.

⁵2 Kgs 19:20 and its parallel passage in Isa 37:23 and Isa 40:26.

⁶Isa 49:18 has *šʿî-sābīb ʿēnyik ūrʿî* which NASB translates as "Lift your eyes and look around." A more accurate translation would be "Look around and see."

activating them.¹ He has been followed by E. A. Speiser who claims that the expression is not used "to signify degree or volume, but with the shading of 'to pick up,' to focus attention on the activity involved."² C. S. Reif then concludes correctly that "the idiom *nāšā' ayin* carries the basic sense of 'activating the eye' i.e., deciding to employ one's visual faculty."³

As to the double sequels, it appears that *w'hinneḥ* adds a moment of surprise to the act, pointing out something that came unexpectedly to the attention of the viewer.⁴ This can be seen in all the occurrences of *hinneh*: Abraham noticing the presence of three strangers near his tent,⁵ or seeing the ram in the thicket at the time of the sacrifice of Isaac,⁶ Isaac catching sight of the approaching camels bringing his future bride,⁷ Jacob noticing the speckled traits of the rams mating,⁸ and

¹Ehrlich, 1:52.

²Speiser, *Genesis*, Anchor Bible, vol. 1, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1964), 156.

³Reif, 244.

⁴See HAL₃, 242; and Paul P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1947), § 105d.

⁵Gen 18:2.

⁶Gen 22:13.

⁷Gen 24:63.

⁸Gen 31:10. Actually the law of recessive traits

suddenly seeing Esau approaching.¹ It is also used of Joseph's brothers as they noticed the arrival of the Ishmaelite traders² and the Israelites as they were surprised by the sudden arrival of the Egyptian army by the Red Sea.³

The passage in Gen 39:7 is different from the others as it is the only one in the Pentateuch in which *nāšāʾ* ^{ʿayin} has no sequel. Comparing it to similar constructions outside the Pentateuch, we notice that without a sequel the expression has more the sense of a mental attitude than that of actually seeing.⁴ Most frequently it is used about diverting the attention towards a particular object, usually idols or enemy nations, with a desire or an expectation.

The use of *nāšāʾ* in these expressions thus implies a purposeful, conscious act of looking, in contrast to the

was being revealed to Jacob in the dream. On the surface all the animals were white, but some had recessive genes for speckledness. It was revealed to him that these were the ones that mated.

¹Gen 33:1.

²Gen 37:25.

³Exod 14:10.

⁴Cf. passages such as 2 Kgs 19:22 (=Isa 37:23) where it implies haughtiness; Ezek 18:6,12,15, and 33:25 where the eyes are turned toward idols; and Ezek 23:27 where the object is lewdness and harlotry.

incidental happening when the simple $rā^3āh$ is employed.¹ The effect of $nāšā^3$ in this context is somewhat ingressive in nature,² and is to a certain extent similar to the English expression "turn the eyes [or: the attention] towards something."

Head as Object

Data

In this category we find twelve passages in the Pentateuch. Three are in the context of interpersonal relations,³ with the remaining nine in the context of taking a census or mustering. Eight are in the book of Numbers alone.

Exod 30:12 When you take a census ($tiššā^3$ $ʔet-ro^3š$) of the sons of Israel to number them ($lipqudêhem$) then each one of them shall give a ransom for himself to the Lord.⁴

¹See Franz J. Stendebach, "יָשָׁה, $ʕajin$ ", TWAT (1989), 6:39.

²Cf. the use of ingressive aorist in Greek. E.g., Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament, trans. by Robert Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), 171, §331; and A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 834.

³Gen 40:13, 19, 20. Besides, there are five texts with face as object--Gen 32:21; Lev 19:15; Num 6:25; Deut 10:17; and 28:50. All are discussed in chapter 5 since their emphasis is on interpersonal relations.

⁴For a similar statement, see also Num 1:2; 4:2, 22; and 26:2.

- Num 1:49 Only the tribe of Levi you shall not number (lo³ tipqod), nor shall you take their census (w³et-ro³šām lo³ tiššā³) among the sons of Israel.
- Num 31:26 Take a count (šā³ ʾet ro³š) of the booty that was captured, both of man and of animal.
- Num 31:49 Your servants have taken a census (nāš³ ʾet-ro³š) of the men of war who are in our charge, and no man of us is missing.
- Num 3:40 Number every first-born male (p³qod kol-b³kor zākār) of the sons of Israel from a month old upward, and make a list of their names (w³šā³ ʾet mispar š³motām).

Comments

All these passages, except Num 31:49, are in the form of non-cultic instructions, and all of them convey the idea of some kind of counting which is unique to the Pentateuch. In other Biblical passages this expression is never used in that sense, but rather conveys the idea of rebellion,¹ self-assurance,² or restoration of an individual.³ The fact that ro³š is always used in the singular in these Pentateuchal passages, even though the context is clearly plural, is a strong indication that it is used idiomatically rather than literally. The

¹Judg 8:28; and Zech 2:4.

²Job 10:15.

³See chapter 5.

expression is apparently similar to the English "take a head-count."

The last passage is in a similar context to the other passages, but instead of the expression *nāšāʾ roʾš* this passage uses *nāšāʾ ʾēṭ mispar š'moṭām*. Structurally, it does not differ from the other census passages. It is apparently only a matter of approach or emphasis. The context seems to call for an action for the purpose of establishing or verifying the list of names of those who were counted for a particular purpose. Rashi has argued that

they brought their records of pedigree and witnesses to confirm the prevalent presumption regarding their parentage, so that each might establish his pedigree with regard to that particular tribe.¹

All of these passages are in some way connected with the act of taking a census, mostly for the purpose of assigning a position in the community. In five of these passages *nāšāʾ roʾš* is used parallel with *pāqad*,² which is usually translated as "call up (for duty)," "muster" or "appoint" in these contexts.³ Gunnel André has discussed quite extensively the relationship between *pāqad* and *nāšāʾ roʾš* and comes to the conclusion that there is

¹Rashi, on Num 3:18.

²Exod 30:12; cf. vss. 13 and 14; Num 1:2, 49; cf. vss. 3 and 49B; 4:2, 22; cf. vss. 34 and 38.

³See Holladay, 296, and KBL, 773.

1. A close relationship between *nāšāʾ ʾēṭ roʾš* and *pāqad*, but they are not interchangeable. They can be coordinated in an order/prohibition and in that position *nāšāʾ ʾēṭ roʾš* appears first. . . .
2. They have the same subjects and objects. . . .
3. Both verbs imply an action to be done with a large crowd of people according to certain principles of assortment.
4. The results of both verbs is [sic] a large number of *pʿquḏim*.¹

There is, however, some question about his first point. In Num 1:48 and 3:40 *pāqad* appears in the first position and *nāšāʾ ʾēṭ roʾš* and *nāšāʾ ʾēṭ mispar*, respectively, in the second position. André states concerning the first passage that "in the only example of prohibition the order is reversed."² He gives no explanation of the second. It seems, therefore, more in line with the evidence to accept these expressions as practically synonymous.

Exactly what was involved in this process is disputed among scholars. Most translations and commentators take the approach that it refers simply to the taking of a census. André comes to the conclusion, based on his study of *pāqad*, that it implied "determin[ing] the destiny of the congregation according to its fitness to perform a

¹André, 117.

²Ibid.

certain task"¹ which frequently was related to military service. This is definitely the case in Num 1:2, 49, 50 where Moses is commanded to "take head-count" of all who were of serviceable age. It included only males over twenty years of age, and the Levites were not included. Later, however,² the "head-count" involved the Levites as they were being assigned their duties related to the sanctuary.

The context of *nāšā* ³ē_u *ro* ³š in these passages seems to demand a process of selective "head-count" for the purpose of appointing to or assigning some specific duties, either military or cultic. The only exception--Num 31:26, 49--is more general in its scope, as it involves captives and cattle alike, without the assignment of any duties. This may indicate that even though the expression usually and basically implied assignment to duties it was not exclusively a *terminus technicus* for census-taking. Rather, it was a general term which at times was used as metonymy for any kind of counting or checking, in line with the evidence also found in Akkadian.³

¹Ibid., 240-1.

²See Num 4:22, 29.

³See above in chapter 2.

Voice as Object

Data

Four times in the Pentateuch *nāšāʾ* is used with *qôl* "the voice" as object.¹

Gen 21:16	And she sat opposite him, and <u>lifted up her voice and wept</u> (<i>wattiššāʾ ʾet-qôlāh wattēbk</i>). ²
Num 14:1	Then all the congregation <u>lifted up their voices and cried</u> (<i>wattiššāʾ . . . wayittʾnū ʾet-qôlām</i>) and the people wept (<i>wayyibkū</i>) that night.

Comments

All of the Pentateuchal passages involving the expression *nāšāʾ qôl* are in non-cultic narratives and the expression is always followed by the sequel *bākāh* "to weep."³ In the last passage quoted, *nāṭan* is added, apparently to emphasize the intensity of the action.⁴ In all of these passages the subject is "persons," which is

¹This compares to 15 times outside the Pentateuch.

²A similar expression is found in Gen 27:38 and 29:11.

³In 10 similar expressions outside the Pentateuch *nāšāʾ qôl* leads to "weeping" (Judg 2:4; 21:2; 1 Sam 11:4; 24:16; 30:4; 2 Sam 3:32; 13:36, Job 2:12 and Ruth 1:9, 14), 4 times to "shouting" (Judg 9:7; Isa 42:2, 11; 52:8), and once to an expression of joy (Isa 24:14).

⁴For the expression *nāṭan qôl* see Gen 45:2 which is the only place where it is followed by a sequel, the prepositional phrase *biḅkī*. *Nāṭan qôl* is found 14 times outside of the Pentateuch, always in a "neutral" sense of making some nondescript sound, frequently a great impressive one such as thunder (1 Sam 12:17, 18) or roaring (Jer 2:15; 22:20; 48:34).

most frequent, but outside of the Pentateuch the expression is also used of the sound of water.¹ It appears that the expression *nāšāʾ qôl* is an idiomatic expression for the sustained utilization or employment of the sound-mechanism for the purpose expressed by the sequel or context, and is not necessarily an indication of loudness, as most translations seem to imply.

Hand(s) as Object

Data

Nāšāʾ occurs four times together with *yāḏ* in the Pentateuch, once in a cultic context with man as subject, and three times in a non-cultic setting with God as subject.

Lev 9:22	Then Aaron <u>lifted up his hands</u> (<i>wayyiššāʾ . . . ʾet-yāḏāw</i>) toward the people and blessed them.
Exod 6:8	And I will bring you to the land which <u>I swore</u> (<i>nāšāʾtī ʾet-yāḏī</i>) to give to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. ²
Deut 32:40	Indeed, <u>I lift up my hand</u> (<i>ʾeššāʾ . . . yāḏī</i>) to heaven and say, "As I live forever."

Comments

The expression *nāšāʾ yāḏ* is used in various contexts in the OT. Within the Pentateuchal corpus,

¹Ps 93:3.

²The same expression is also found in Num 14:30.

however, it is only used in the context of blessing (once) and swearing an oath, the latter of which is exclusively used with God as the subject.¹ A parallel expression for man is *rûm* (hiph) and *yāḏ*.² A. D. Crown concurs that the raising of the hand always accompanied the taking of an oath.³ But he is wrong when he claims that *nāšāʾ* by itself can also mean to swear.⁴ He further believes that this upward movement of the hand may have signified a punishment (e.g., cutting of the throat) in case the oath was broken. This, however, remains a conjecture, since no textual evidence confirms it. More likely is the suggestion by Giesen that the gesture of raising the hand "dürfte affirmativer Art sein."⁵

¹Freedman and Willoughby--TWAT (1986), 5:640-- give a somewhat misleading impression when they state--quoting a study by Georg Giesen Die Wurzel ʾlʾw "schwören". Eine semasiologische Studie zum Eid im Alten Testament, Bonner Biblische Beiträge, Band 56 (Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1981), 43--that "Interessanterweise ist in allem Belegen JHVH Subjekt." Giesen makes it clear, however, that this is only in the context where *nāšāʾ* *yāḏ* is used as a "synonym" for *šābaʿ* "to swear." In other contexts man may also be the subject.

²E.g. Gen 14:22.

³Alan D. Crown, "Aposiopesis in the Old Testament", Abr-Nahrain 4 (1963-64, ed. 1965):107.

⁴He quotes BDB, 670, but has evidently misread the information given there. BDB does not claim that *nāšāʾ* by itself means "to swear," but rather in the context of *nāšāʾ* *yāḏ*.

⁵Giesen, 43. See also Marvin H. Pope, "Oaths", IDB (1962), 3:576.

The term for swearing an oath, *šāḥa^c*, is never used as a sequel for *nāšā^ḡ yāḏ* even though the idea of oath-taking is quite clear from the immediate context. In these passages it is expressed by the use of the verb *nāṭan*. God says that he has "raised his hand (towards heaven)" to give the people the land, etc. When this expression is used of God, in twelve out of fourteen occurrences outside of the Pentateuch it is in the context of God giving a promise.¹ The other two simply imply God's lifting his hand for action on behalf of his people.² When used of man, this expression is never associated with oath. Rather it implies a durative action involving blessing,³ prayer or pleading⁴, praise or delight⁵, or rebellion.⁶

¹Ezek 20:5 (2x), 6, 15, 23, 28, 42; 36:7; 44:12; 47:14; Ps 106:26; Neh 9:15.

²Isa 49:22; Ps 10:12.

³Lev 9:22. This is in fact the only Biblical occurrence of *nāšā^ḡ yāḏ* in the context of blessing.

⁴Ps 28:2; Lam 2:19.

⁵Pss 63:4; 119:48; 134:2.

⁶2 Sam 18:28; 20:21.

The expression *nāšā³ raglāyw* is found only once in the Pentateuch, and at the same time, in the OT.¹

Comments

¹A similar expression is found in 1 Sam 17:20 but *raglāyw* is missing, possibly inadvertently. It may, however, also indicate an idiomatic use of the expression which may lead to the omission of a morph that has "lost" its real meaning.

²E.g., Otto Procksch, Die Genesis (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913), 334.

Soul as Object

Data

The soul as a mindset is the object of *nāšā*¹ in one passage in the Pentateuch. It occurs within the context of laws regulating the way an employer is to treat his employees.

Deut 24:15 You shall give him his wages on his day before the sun sets, for he is poor and sets his heart on it (*w¹ēlāyw hū¹ nošē¹et-napšō*).

Comments

This expression is found seven times in the OT outside of the Pentateuch.¹ In the Psalms it is usually translated literally, "I lift my soul." Most commentators and translators make no comments as to its meaning there, but the context implies the idea of "turning one's mind towards" or "keeping one's mind on something" (similar to the last example of *nāšā*¹ ^cayin above), thus employing the mind, directing it towards something desirable. Outside of the Psalms, it is translated "desire" or "set one's mind to."²

¹According to Avraham Even-Shoshan, A New Concordance of the Old Testament (Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sefer" Publishing House, 1985), 781, the following: 2 Sam 14:14; Pss 24:4; 25:1; 86:4; 143:8; Prov 19:18; Hos 4:8.

²Except in 2 Sam 14:14 where it refers to God's taking someone's life.

In the present passage *nāšā*³ is followed by the preposition ³*el*, and the idea seems to be "keeping the mind fixed upon" the wages for the day's work. The context seems to imply that it is more than a fleeting thought, it is what the individual lives for at the moment.¹

Māšāl as Object

Data

The expression *nāšā*³ *māšāl* occurs seven times in the Pentateuch, all in the Balaam corpus. In fact, this expression is not found anywhere in the OT outside of this passage.²

Num 23:7, 18 And he took up his discourse and
 24:3, 15, said (*wayyiššā*³ *m'šālō wayyo*³*mar*)
 20, 21, 23

Comments

All these passages are identical. They form intermittent introductions in Balaam's prophetic proclamation. Structurally, they are also identical with those passages where *nāšā*³ is used with body parts: the verb *nāšā*³ in the imperfect, the object without an object indicator, and a sequel.

¹LXX translates this expression *ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχει τὴν ἐλπίδα* "he has his hope bound up in it."

²For similar usage in Akkadian--about the recital of the *Enuma Eliš*--see chapter 2 above.

Māšāl is one of those Hebrew words which defy translation. It is usually translated "saying," or "proverb."¹ But it has a wider meaning, as Eißfeldt has pointed out; it involves

auf der einer Seite eine Entwicklung vom einfachen, prosaischen Volksspruchwort zum Spottvers einerseits und zum poetisch geformten Weisheitsspruch anderseits sieht und auf der anderen Seite Gleichniserzählung, Orakelrede und Allegorie in Zusammenhang bringt.²

In this context it appears that the expression means that Balaam employed or utilized "proverbs" as he spoke, or "he expressed his oracle (instruction) by saying." The expression does not necessarily imply a loud expression, but rather the fact of utilizing a certain type of expression in his communication.

Heart as Subject

Data

The expression combining *nāšāʾ* and *lēb* is structurally different from the other expressions involving parts of the body. In these passages "heart" functions as subject of the sentences, whereas in all the others the various body parts have been the objects.

Exod 35:21 And everyone whose heart stirred
him (ʾšer-nʾšāʾō libbô) and

¹Holladay, 219-20.

²Otto Eißfeldt, "Der Maschal im Alten Testament," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beihefte 24 (1913), 42; quoted in Karl-Martin Beyse, "לִשְׁמַל *māšal* I," TWAT 5:72.

everyone whose heart moved him
(w^ʿkol ʔ^ašer nāḏ^ʿbāh rūḥō) came.

Exod 36:2 Then Moses called . . . everyone whose heart stirred him (kol ʔ^ašer n^ʿšā^ʔō libbō), to come to work to perform it.

Exod 35:26 And all the women whose heart stirred (ʔ^ašer nāšā^ʔ libban) with a skill.

Comments

The context indicates that the meaning of all of them is quite similar, "Every man/woman whose heart stirred him/her" to perform a particular task came forward and did his/her share in connection with the construction of the tabernacle. In light of the context and other parallel passages it appears that these individuals were endowed with a special skill which they felt motivated to employ for the purpose of setting up the tabernacle and its equipment.¹

This is in line with other passages where nāšā^ʔ is used in expressions involving parts of the body as objects. In these, it forms a part of an idiomatic expression implying the utilization of that part or object for some stated purpose, rather than being just a description of an actual movement. The action may involve

¹See e.g., Exod 35:22, 25, 29; 36:4. The Syriac version, Peshitta, translates this expression with ʔ^ʿthšb blbh meaning "purpose/plan/have in mind in his/her heart," possibly implying creativity [?].

the movement of a particular body part, but it is not synonymous with it; rather it is the result of the employment of that organ.

Summary

Based on the general usage of *nāśā*² in the Pentateuch the basic idea that emerges is one of sustained carrying with the aspects of transport and/or support being indicated by prepositions, morphs of movement, parallel expressions and/or the immediate context. Its meaning may also be "carried out" by various body parts or by means of tools being utilized for a specific purpose related to their functionality. In more than 40 percent of occurrences within the Pentateuch the emphasis is on the aspect of lifting, whereas in the remaining 60 percent the main emphasis is on the carrying aspect, even though lifting may be involved.

These shades of meaning are not discernible in any form of the root itself, but are indicated by certain morphs, parallelisms, or, most importantly, the context. The Pentateuchal usage seems to support the contention that *nāśā*² does not primarily describe a momentary movement, but rather a prolonged support. Even when a movement is involved, it either presupposes support (as in the idea of transport) or implies duration (as in the context of utilization). With body parts or tools the

*nāšā*³ expression is followed by a sequel, which expresses the purpose or result of the action rather than being a synonym.

With this background we now turn the attention to the more metaphoric use of the root and investigate how it is used in the context of wrongdoings.

CHAPTER V

NŠ² AND WRONGDOING IN THE PENTATEUCH

The remaining sixty-one occurrences of the root *nāšā²* in the Pentateuch are in the context of interpersonal relations and/or sin and wrongdoing within which sphere the concept of forgiveness is found. The attention in this chapter is directed towards the thirty-nine passages which use *nāšā²* in the context of sin and wrongdoing. The remaining twenty-two passages, involving interpersonal relations, are the subject of chapter 6.

Nāšā² and Wrongdoing

When *nāšā²* is used with terms for sin and/or wrongdoing the main concern is not the transport or removal of the wrong *per se*, but rather the consequences resulting from who is carrying the wrongs. On the one hand, there are those who *nāšā²* their own wrongdoings, and then there are those who *nāšā²* the wrongs of others. In only eight out of thirty-nine instances is *nāšā²* followed by the preposition ^cāl which three times indicates cause,¹

¹Lev 22:9; 19:17; Num 18:32.

four times it implies movement,¹ and once the positional effect is reinforced by ʔel and a directional -āh.²

Nāśāʔ and Own Wrongdoings

There are nineteen passages in the category of nāśāʔ in the context of own wrongdoings. Only three of these have a preposition, ʕāl, which indicates cause in these contexts.³ All of them have human beings as subject and ʕāwôn, or hētʔ as objects: ʕāwôn 12 times, and hētʔ 7 times. Of these, two passages deal with wrongdoing in general (1), six are related to cultic eating (2), one is associated with cultic clothing (3), four deal with sexual relations (4), four with attitudes and actions towards God or holy things (5), and two indicate attitudes and actions toward a fellow human being (6).

Data

1. Wrongdoing in general

Lev 5:1	Now if a person sins . . . when he is a witness . . . <u>he will bear his guilt</u> (wʕnāśāʔ ʕāwônô).
Lev 5:17	Now if a person sins . . . though he was unaware, still he is guilty, <u>and he shall bear his punishment</u> (wʕnāśāʔ ʕāwônô).

¹Exod 28:12, 29, 30, 38.

²Lev 16:22. Cf. also vs. 21.

³Lev 17:17; 22:9; Num 18:32. See Waltke, 218.

2. Cultic eating

- Lev 7:18 The person who eats of it [the Peace offering on the third day] shall bear his own iniquity (^cwōnāh tiśśā³).
- Lev 19:8 And everyone who eats it [same as in 7:18] will bear his iniquity (^cwōnō yiśśā³) for he has profaned the holy thing of the Lord; and that person shall be cut off from his people.
- Lev 22:16 (And they shall not profane the holy gifts of the sons of Israel which they offer to the Lord,) and so cause them to bear punishment for guilt (w^hiśśī³ū³ ōtām ^cwōn³ aśmāh) by eating their holy gifts.
- Lev 22:9 They [the priests] shall therefore keep my charge, so that they may not bear sin because of it¹ (w^hiś³ū³ ālāyw hēt³), and die thereby because they profane it.
- Num 18:32 And you shall bear no sin by reason of it (w^hlo³-tiś³ū³ ālāyw hēt³), when you have offered the best of it [the harvest].
- Lev 17:16 But if he does not wash them [his clothes after eating anything found dead] or bathe his body, then he shall bear his guilt (w^hnāśā³ ^cwōnō).

3. Cultic clothing

- Exod 28:43 They [the linen breeches] shall be on Aaron and on his sons when they enter the tent of meeting, . . . so they do not incur guilt (w^hlo³-yiś³ū³ āwōn) and die.

¹Referring to touching unclean things or eating sacred offerings without bathing.

4. Sexual relations

- Lev 20:17 If there is a man who takes his sister . . . so that he sees her nakedness . . . it is a disgrace; and they shall be cut off in the sight of the sons of their people. He has uncovered his sister's nakedness; he shall bear his guilt (^cwônô yiśśā^ʔ).
- Lev 20:19 You shall not uncover the nakedness of your mother's sister . . . they shall bear their guilt (^cwônām yiśśā^ʔû).
- Lev 20:20 If there is a man who lies with his uncle's wife . . . they shall bear their sin (het^ʔām yiśśā^ʔû) They will die childless.
- Num 5:31 Moreover, the man [who is jealous because his wife was unfaithful] shall be free from guilt but that woman shall bear her guilt (tiśśā^ʔet^ʔ ^cwônāh).

5. Attitudes and actions towards God and holy things

- Lev 24:15 If anyone curses his God, then he shall bear his sin (w^cnāśā^ʔ het^ʔô).
- Num 14:34 For every day you shall bear your guilt (tiś^ʔû et^ʔ-^cwônotēkem) a year.
- Num 18:22 And the sons of Israel shall not come near the tent of meeting again, lest they bear sin (lāsē^ʔt hēt^ʔ) and die.
- Num 9:13 The man who . . . neglects to observe the Passover, that person shall be cut off from his people. . . . That man shall bear his sin (het^ʔô yiśśā^ʔ).

6. Attitude and actions towards others

- Lev 19:17 You shall not hate your fellow country-man in your heart; you may

surely reprove your neighbor, but
shall not incur guilt because of
him (w¹⁰-tⁱśśā³ c^ālāyw hēt³).

Gen 4:13

And Cain said to the Lord, My
punishment is too great for me to
bear (gādōl c^āwōnī minn⁴śō³).

Comments

All but two of these passages, Num 14:34 and Gen 4:13 which are in narrative texts, are in a cultic setting--regulations as to what will happen if individuals should do or fail to perform certain actions. These vary from defiance of God and holy things,¹ failure to observe cultic rituals² to obstinacy,³ immoral acts and hate of one's fellow man,⁴ or plain ignorance.⁵ All of them lead to the same result: whoever commits the acts mentioned, either knowingly or inadvertently, has to nāśā³ his or her own wrongdoing. This wrongdoing may be expressed by either c^āwōn or hēt³, which are used quite interchangeably in these contexts.⁶

¹Gen 4:13; Lev 24:15 and Num 18:22.

²Exod 28:43; Lev 7:18; 9:13; 17:16; 19:8; 22:9, 16; and Num 18:32.

³Lev 5:1; Num 5:31; and 14:34.

⁴Lev 19:17 and 20:17, 19, 20.

⁵Lev 5:17.

⁶For an extensive discussion of the difference between these terms and their use, see R. Knierim, *passim*. In this context, however, we find illicit sexual relations classified as c^āwōn in Lev 20:17-19 but as hēt³ in vs. 20.

Besides, there is no clear distinction to be found between action and its consequences. The difference is more a matter of interpretation than one of direct translation. Von Rad¹ has also pointed out that "there is absolutely nothing in the thought of the OT which by and large corresponds to the separation which we make between sin and penalty," and again, that there is no difference between the guilt of the deed and its penalty. The concept includes both the act and its consequences. This concept he calls "Tatsphäre" or "a synthetic view of life."²

The same ambivalence is also found in relation to touching unclean things in Lev 22:9 (*hēt*³) and 17:16 (*āwōn*). Whatever shade of meaning may be involved does not appear to affect the *nāsā*³ action. Translations attempt to relate the action to modern equivalents or counterparts and thus the expression *nāsā*³ *āwōn*, or *hēt*³ may be translated as bearing one's iniquity/sin/guilt/punishment or responsibility. This apparent inconsistency is found both within a given translation and also between different translations. In the texts under discussion *nāsā*³ *āwōn* is translated "bear guilt" in Lev 5:1; 17:16; 20:17-19; Num 5:31 and 14:34 "bear iniquity" in Lev 7:18 and 19:8 and "bear punishment" in Gen 4:13, Lev 5:17; and 22:16. At the same time *nāsā*³ *hēt*³ is translated as "bear sin" in Lev 20:20; 22:9; 24:15; Num 9:13; and 18:32; but "incur guilt" in Lev 19:17. As an example of how different translations may vary, *nāsā*³ *āwōn* in Num 14:34 is translated as "bear your iniquities" (KJV, RSV), "bear your guilt" (NASB), "pay the penalty of your iniquity" (NEB) and "suffer for your sins" (NIV). On this point see also Knierim, 219-221.

¹von Rad Old Testament Theology, 1:266.

²Ibid., 265.

The composite picture emerging from these texts is that of one who has committed some wrong acts against God, his instructions or a fellow man, and as a consequence must bear/carry the effects of his/her actions involving the "Eingeständnis eigener Schuld und Einsicht in die Strafe."¹ *Nāšā* ^ʿ*āwôn/hēt* in these contexts indicates the individual's responsibility for his actions, and according to the judicial principle of action-consequence relationship in Israel, the sinner must stand up to his own actions.²

The exact consequences are not always explicitly expressed, as can be seen in table 20. In the first group of texts (1) dealing with failure to testify or doing what is expressly forbidden, there are no stated consequences; only a general statement to the effect that the wrongdoer will be held accountable for his actions. Unacceptable cultic eating (2) usually led to death: "he shall die,"³ "be cut off,"⁴ non-acceptance and death,⁵ or, no explicit

¹Freedman and Willoughby, "*nāšā*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:633.

²*Ibid.*, 634.

³Num 18:32.

⁴Lev 19:8; 22:9; 17:16.

⁵Lev 7:18. Cf. 19:8 which deals with the same offering.

TABLE 20
Nāsā³ OWN WRONGDOINGS

^c āwōn	Subject	Wrongdoing	Effect (implied)
Gen 4:13	Cain	murder	death cf. 4:15
Exod 28:43	Aaron/sons	improper clothing in tabernacle	death
Lev 5:1	()	wrong witnessing	
Lev 5:17	()	general failure	
Lev 7:18	()	wrong eating of offering	(death cf. 7:20, 21)
Lev 19:8	()	wrongful eating of sacrifices	cut off from the people
Lev 22:16	()	wrongful eating	(death cf.22:9)
Lev 17:16	()	of sacrifices	(cut off cf. 17:14)
Lev 20:17	Man	incest	cut off
Lev 20:19	Man	incest	(cut off cf.18:29)
Num 14:34	People	rebellion	death cf.14:35
Num 5:31	Wife	unfaithfulness	(death cf. Deut 22:22)
<hr/> ^h ēt ³ <hr/>			
Lev 22:9	Priests	eating sacrifice without washing	death
Lev 20:20	Man	incest	death w/o child
Lev 24:15	()	cursing God	death
Lev 19:17	()	hating fellow countryman	
Num 18:22	()	approach tent of meeting	death
Num 9:13	()	neglect passover	death
Num 18:32	Levites	wrongful eating harvest	death

consequences when eating sacred offerings by mistake.¹ A Levite not wearing breeches as he served in the Tabernacle must die.² Any kind of illicit sexual relations usually led to death to both persons involved.³ If a man had sexual relations with his uncle's wife, the law demanded that both the man and the woman be put to death without the relationship bearing fruit--i.e., without a child born as a result; they would "die childless."⁴ In the case of an unfaithful wife, the context indicates some devastating disease and a curse⁵ (cf. vs. 27), and other laws dealing with similar cases indicate that these might ultimately be fatal.⁶ Open or indirect obstinacy and rebellion against God and his holy requirements were all punishable by

¹Lev 22:16. Cf. however 22:9.

²Exod 28:43.

³Lev 20:17, 20.

⁴Lev 20:19. The same is said about sexual relations between in-laws in vs. 21. It is not clear if the expression only implies inability to bear children or if it is another way of saying that their effort to have children together will be fruitless for they shall both die. In light of the general context the latter seems more likely. Norman H. Snaith, ed. Leviticus and Numbers, Century Bible (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967), 140, points out that the root ^c*rfrim* actually means "stripped," and probably implies that the "couple" would be "stripped of posterity" to keep the family name in remembrance. This would then also mean that they would have no place in genealogies or in continuing Israel.

⁵Num 5:31.

⁶Cf. Deut 22:22 where both the man and the woman are to die if they are caught.

death, either immediate¹ or ultimate.² Finally, hate and murder both ultimately resulted in death.³

According to these passages the ultimate consequence of wrongdoing is death. It is an unavoidable burden which the wrongdoer must carry. "Die Schuld liegt wie⁴ eine Last auf dem Menschen . . . die man tragen und auf sich nehmen . . . muß."⁵

Knierim appropriately likens the ⁶āwôn to a lebendig wirksame Last, auf jedem Fall zu tragen, und zwar so lange, bis er seiner Qualität gemäß dem Täter zum entsprechenden Schicksal geworden und damit zum Ziel, zur Erfüllung gelangt ist. Ist der Täter tot, so ist auch der ⁶āwôn aus der Welt geschafft. Er geht nicht verloren und wird nicht vergessen. Und hat er einmal begonnen, so muß er auch getragen werden. Naheliegend ist, daß ihn der Täter selbst zu tragen hat, und ebenso, daß er ihn nicht tragen vermag (Kain).⁶

Such severe consequences, and the fact that it is difficult to live without ever taking a faulty step lead inevitably to the question, whether the wrongdoer is entirely left to his fate, without any hope of respite.

¹Lev 24:15; Num 9:13; and 18:22.

²Num 14:34.

³Lev 19:17 and Gen 4:13.

⁴Knierim, 221, note 89, suggests to "emend" this by reading "als" instead of "wie" in order to emphasize the concretization of the acts and their consequences.

⁵Otto Procksch, Theologie des Alten Testaments (Güterloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950), 637.

⁶Knierim, 221.

Nāšā³ and Wrongdoings of Others

There are indications, however, that these severe burdens need not be borne by the wrongdoer alone. In eighteen passages in the Pentateuch someone other than the wrongdoer is either asked or said to *nāšā³* the wrongs. In thirteen of these man is the subject; in four, God or a divine being; and an animal, in one. While the distinction between bearing/carrying and transport/movement is somewhat blurred, it is of interest to note that in five out of eight cases where movement appears to be emphasized¹ we find the preposition ^ʿ*al*. The preposition, however, is not indicating a movement but rather a position. The movement itself is found in the context. It is of interest to note that in the case of the goat for Azazel an unambiguous preposition of movement, ³*el*, is used and reinforced by a directional *-āh*.² In one text a movement is implied without any morph to indicate it.³ The remaining twelve passages have no preposition of indication, but the context of all but three of them implies the idea of "bearing," or "sustaining."

The wrongs may be indicated by either ^ʿ*āwōn*, *z'nūt*, *šemōt*/ *mišpat*, *ḥēt³* or *peša^c*, which appear to be

¹Exod 28:12, 29, 30, 38; Lev 16:22.

²Lev 16:22, 21.

³Lev 10:17.

used mostly synonymously, without any clear distinction between them in these contexts.

Man as Subject

There are eleven passages with a total of thirteen occurrences of *nāšāʾ* in which man is the subject. Six passages, with seven occurrences--all of which convey the idea of "bearing" or "carrying"--deal with the duties and functions of the priests and Levites in the sanctuary (1), one is also related to a priestly function in the sanctuary, but emphasizes more the aspect of "transporting" or "removing" by eating (2), one deals with a transfer of responsibility when a vow is cancelled (3), and finally, three passages, with four occurrences of *nāšāʾ*, are in the context of general wrongdoing against an individual, a group of people, or God (4). Two of them, with three occurrences, imply "transport" or "moving," whereas one has the idea of "bearing" or "suffering." All the passages are in a cultic context except those in group (4) which are narrative.

Data

1. General functions of priests

Num 18:1	You and your sons and your father's household with you <u>shall bear the guilt</u> (<i>tīšʾā ʾet-^cwōn hammiqdāš</i>) in connection with ¹ the sanctuary;
----------	--

¹The Hebrew does not have the expression "in

and you and your sons with you
shall bear the guilt (*tiš^u ʔet-^cwôn kʰunnat^kem*) in connection
 with your priesthood.

Num 18:23 Only the Levites shall perform the
 service of the tent of meeting, and
they shall bear their iniquity
 (*yis^u ʔet-^cwonām*).

Exod 28:12 And you shall put the two stones on
 the shoulder pieces of the ephod,
 as stones of memorial for the sons
 of Israel, and Aaron shall bear
their names (*wʾnāsā^u . . . ʔet-^cšmōt*
lipnē yhwē) before the Lord
 on his shoulders for a memorial.

Exod 28:29 And Aaron shall bear the names
 (*wʾnāsā^u . . . ʔet-^cšmōt*) of the
 sons of Israel in the breastplate
 of judgment over his heart when he
 enters the holy place, for a
 memorial before the Lord continu-
 ally.

Exod 28:30 And you shall put in the breast-
 plate of judgment the Urim and
 Thummim, and they shall be over
 Aaron's heart when he goes before
 the Lord; and Aaron shall carry the
judgment (*wʾnāsā^u . . . ʔet-^cmišpat*)
 of the sons of Israel over his
 heart before the Lord continually.

Exod 28:38 And it [the plate of gold] shall be
 on Aaron's forehead, and Aaron
shall take away the iniquity
 (*wʾnāsā^u . . . ʔet-^cwôn*) of the
 holy things which the sons of
 Israel consecrate, with regard to
 all their holy gifts; and it shall
 always be on their forehead, that

connection with" which appears twice in this passage, thus
 actually it should be in italics. This translation is
 probably chosen to avoid associating the holy place with
 guilt and wickedness. The Hebrew text has only "^cāwôn of
 the sanctuary" and "^cāwôn of your priesthood."

they may be accepted before the Lord.

2. Transport by eating

Lev 10:17 Why did you not eat the sin offering in the holy place? For it is most holy, and he gave it to you to bear away the guilt (*lāsē^ṭ ʔet-^cwōn*) of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord.

3. Cancelled vow

Num 30:15 But if her husband annuls them [vows made by his wife] after he has heard them, then he shall bear her guilt (*wʿnāsā^ṭ ʔet-^cwōnāh*).

4. General wrongdoing

Gen 50:17 Thus you shall say to Joseph, Please forgive, I beg you, the transgression (*śā^ṭ nā^ṭ peša^c*) of your brothers and their sin, for they did you wrong. And now, please forgive the transgression (*śā^ṭ nā^ṭ lʿpeša^c*) of the servants of the God of your father. And Joseph wept when they spoke to him.

Exod 10:17 Now therefore, please forgive my sin (*śā^ṭ nā^ṭ ḥaṭṭā^ṭṭī*) only this once, and make supplication to the Lord your God, that He would only remove this death from me.

Num 14:33 And your sons shall be shepherds for forty years in the wilderness, and they shall suffer for your unfaithfulness (*wʿnāsā^ṭ ʔet-zʿnūṭēkem*), until your corpses lie in the wilderness.

Comments

In the first two passages, Num 18:1 and 23, the fundamental duties of Aaron and his sons are being pointed

out by the Lord, on the one hand, and those of the Levites in general, on the other. Aaron and his sons were told that it was their duty to *nāšā'* the *ḥāwôn* of the sanctuary and the priesthood.

Knierim sees this text indicating that the priests and Levites were to bear the *ḥāwôn* of every conscious and unconscious act done by the people against the sanctuary or the priesthood.¹ Contextually, these verses come as a direct response to the problem expressed in 17:13 following the experience of Korah's challenge of Moses' and Aaron's leadership roles. In his understanding all were equally holy to serve before the Lord (cf. 16:1-3). When the people saw God's conclusive answer, they became frightened and asked in effect, "What is the point in having the tabernacle of God in our midst if no one can approach it, lest he die?" In order to prevent the people from treating God as their equal, God indicated to them that they must keep their distance, but that he (God) had already made provision to maintain a close relationship anyway. The Levites had been appointed to guard against possible trespassers among the people (18:3, 4). In the same way, the priests had been appointed to guard against possible trespassers among the Levites who were not to perform certain priestly tasks. The priests were

¹Knierim, 242.

responsible for enforcing this rule. They were thus to act as spiritual "lightning conductors" for God's anger so the people might be spared.¹

Philip J. Budd takes a somewhat broader view when he sees the priests paying "the penalty for all ritual errors" thus indicating that "the priests are fully responsible for the sanctuary, and for every aspect of priestly ministry."² Or, in the words of J. de Vaulx,

Les prêtres, responsables du culte, serviteurs de l'autel et du Saint de Saints (v. 3, 7) et les lévites, serviteurs du sanctuaire (v. 3, 4, 5, 6), sont en même temps protecteurs de la communauté (v. 27) puisque par leur intermédiaire, strictement hiérarchisé, s'établissent des relations acceptables entre les Fils d'Israël et le Dieu très Saint, auprès duquel tous sont des étrangers hormis ceux qu'il a choisis. Telle est finalement la raison d'être du Sacerdoce et du lévitisme.³

Still others see this passage expressing the concept that the priests and the Levites were to bear, or

¹Gordon J. Wenham, Numbers (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1981), 143. The same idea is also expressed by Jacob Milgrom in his Studies in Levitical Terminology, vol. 1 (London: University of California Press, 1970), 31, and "The Literary Structure of Numbers 8:5-22 and the Levitic Kippûr" in, Perspectives on Language and Text, ed. Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 211-228; see also George B. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956), 219; and Norman H. Snaith, ed. Leviticus and Numbers, CBC (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1967), 205. In this context Whybray, 44-45, is willing to concede the idea of substitution, even though he argues against it in general.

²Philip J. Budd, Numbers, WBC (Waco: Word Books Publishers, 1984), 5:205.

³J. de Vaulx, Les Nombres (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs, 1972), 204.

take upon themselves, and expunge the guilt brought upon the sanctuary by the sins of the people and their holy gifts (cf. Exod 28:38), "contaminated" by the sinfulness of the givers.¹

This interpretation seems to be confirmed by the next four passages from Exod 28, which are concerned with different parts of Aaron's garments and their function in the sanctuary ritual. In vs. 12 there are two stones "engraved according to the names of the sons of Israel" and were placed on Aaron's shoulders. Vs. 29 mentions the breastplate, on which stones were placed, one for each of the tribes with engravings according to their names. The purpose of these was that Aaron might "bear their names" on his shoulders and on his heart as he entered the presence of the Lord. In this way he would be their representative/substitute within the holy area of the sanctuary.²

On the surface, these texts do not deal with any kind of wrongdoing, but the whole context of chap. 28 in general and vss. 30 and 38 in particular clearly indicate that this *nāšā*³ process is related to the people's

¹So Keil and Delitzsch, 3:115-16. The context, however, seems to imply that primarily they were responsible for the actions of those "employed" in the sanctuary precinct.

²See Keil and Delitzsch, 2:195; and R. Alan Cole, Exodus (Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press, 1977), 200.

wrongdoing. Vs. 30 speaks of the Urim and Thummim¹ in the breastplate, and vs. 38 is concerned with the goldplate on Aaron's forehead. The function of the former is for Aaron to "bear the judgments" of the people over his heart,² and that of the latter so that he might "bear their iniquity" in before the Lord. In light of von Rad's synthetic-view-of-life approach³ these two phrases are parallel if not completely synonymous. Judgment is the result of the iniquities and the iniquities are the cause of the judgment. The strategic placement of the stones

¹On the puzzling nature of the Urim and Thummim see Edward Robertson, "The Urim and Thummim; What Were They?" VT 14 (1964), 67-74, and Edward Lipinski, "Urim and Thummim" VT 20 (1970), 495-6. Further, on the issue of Urim and Thummim, Keil and Delitzsch conclude, however, quite correctly that "we can draw no other conclusion, than that the Urim and Thummim are to be regarded as a certain medium, . . . through which, whenever the congregation required divine illumination to guide its actions, that illumination was guaranteed." 2:199. Robertson (69, 70) lists a dozen different interpretations of Urim and Thummim before adding his own suggestion that probably they represented the Hebrew alphabet "which could be used as elements of writing." He comments further that as these two names begin with the first and the last letters in the Hebrew alphabet, they possibly indicate God's universality, similar to the expression Alpha and Omega in the book of Revelation. He finds support for this in the DSS where there are several occurrences of a word apparently coined by fusing the two into ³wrtwm believed to mean "fulness" (p. 72) parallel to the expression "alpha and omega" in the New Testament. Based on Mesopotamian parallels Lipinski (496) prefers to see them as some magic stones which somehow "gave a (yes) or (no) answer."

²Compare the function of the stones in vs. 29.

³von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 1:265.

and goldplate was apparently an outward, visible indication of Aaron's identifying himself in heart and mind with the people and their wrongdoings as he prepared to enter the presence of the Lord on their behalf. By means of these pieces of his vestments he symbolically carried (*nāšā*¹) their wrongdoings and judgments on his body. He was not just a detached representative of the people; he identified himself completely with them before he entered the presence of the Lord.¹

With regard to the goldplate on the forehead, the inscription on it designated the high priest as the Lord's possession, consecrated to the Lord (vs. 36). Aaron was told to wear it in order to *nāšā*² the *ʿāwôn* of the people into the sanctuary, as they were being brought to the tabernacle with the gifts which the people had set apart for that purpose.² By accepting these gifts Aaron also

¹So Willem H. Gispen, *Exodus*, trans. Ed. van der Maas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), 272, and Cole, 200. Ehrlich, 1:376-7, on the other hand, sees these texts more in line with Num 18:1 which places on the priest "die Verantwortlichkeit . . . für irgend welche Verfehlung hinsichtlichlicher Heiligtümer JHVHs." The context, however, seems rather to refer to the priest's taking the guilt and wrongs of the people upon himself than wrongs being committed to the sanctuary. Cf. also the NT image of Christ, of whom the Levites in general and the highpriest in particular were a type, who is presented as "bearing our sins in his body on the cross" (1 Pet 2:21-24).

²Exod 28:38.

accepted what they stood for,¹ and symbolically he carried the wrongdoings of the people on his body in before the Lord.² Rodriguez has pointed out that the headpiece was connected with the priest's bearing the sins of the people and the people's acceptance before the Lord. These are closely interrelated.

The *šys* becomes a symbol of that acceptance, and of that which enables Aaron to bear sin; i.e. holiness. It is because he has been separated for the Lord that he can bear the sin of the sacrifices.³

The diadem, or headpiece, thus signified the mediating aspect of the high-priestly office as well as its substitutionary character.⁴

¹Cf. Num 18:1 above, where Aaron and his sons are made responsible for the *šawōn* of the sanctuary and the priesthood; also vs. 23 where it is stated that the function of the Levites--of whom Aaron was the epitome--was to bear the iniquity of the people.

²See vss. 30 and 38.

³Angel M. Rodriguez, Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, vol. 3 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979), 134.

⁴Gispen, 272. The fact that one who was both identified with the people and also set apart to serve before the Lord was carrying the gifts of the people as their substitute into his presence made them, i.e. the people--the pronoun is masculine singular referring back to "sons of Israel," whereas "gifts" is feminine plural--acceptable in the Lord's sight. This concept is also in line with Isa 53 where the "servant" is set apart to take upon himself the wrongs of all, carry (*nāšā*)³ them through piercing afflictions and death, thereby obtaining for the people acceptance or justification.

This interpretation appears to be further confirmed by the process of the priest's eating a portion of the sin-offering. In Lev 10:17 Moses rebukes Eleazar and Ithamar, sons of Aaron, for not correctly performing their priestly duties. They had failed to eat of the sin offering, as required by the law of the sin offering in Lev 6:26, and had burned it instead. Ehrlich suggests that

wenn nicht Gott, sondern der Priester Subject ist, heisst immer, ohne Ausnahme, für das Vergehen eines andern gegen die Heiligtümer verantwortlich sein.¹

It seems, however, that the text implies an even deeper sense than simply a responsibility for the wrongs committed by the people. In Near Eastern cultures eating had the symbolic overtones of acceptance and/or relationship or even identification with someone.² The same appears to be the case here. The "goat of sin"

¹Ehrlich, 2:37. He sees this process of eating merely as God's payment to the priests for their responsibility. "JHWH gibt den Priestern ihre Deputate vom Opfertier als Lohn, gegen sie die genannte Verantwortlichkeit und die Dienste am Heiligtum übernehmen."

²See Johannes Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture, 2 vols. (London: Oxford University Press, 1926-40), 305. In the Bible it is perhaps most explicit in the eucharistic eating and drinking of the bread and wine, an act signifying the participants' sharing or identifying with Jesus, the true bread and wine, in his life and death (cf. John 6 and 1 Cor 10:16,17). See also Geoffrey Wainwright, Eucharist and Eschatology (London: Epworth Press, 1971), especially pp. 18-19, and Harold H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning (London: SPCK, 1967), 123-25.

(š^cir haḥaṭṭā³ṭ) carried the sins of the confessor.¹

When the priest ate of that offering he symbolically made it a part of himself, in the same way as food becomes a part of its "eater" (along with all its "liabilities" like disease et al.), and took upon himself its function to nāśā³ the wrongs of the people into the sanctuary for the purpose of making an atonement for (l'kappēr ^cal) the congregation. In that way he became a substitute for the sinners and literally carried their wrongdoings in his own body.²

When the priest ministered the blood and ate the flesh, he not only took the sin upon him but identified himself so completely with the sinner that the sins he took upon himself became his sins, and he became responsible for them.³ (Emphasis his).

¹Implied in the text which states that "God has given it to you (the priests) to bear the iniquity of the congregation."

²N. Kiuchi, The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature, JSOT Supplement Series, 56 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 152-3, argues the case that during the "Azazel" ritual Aaron was not simply a representative of the people, but rather a substitute. A similar idea of a prophet's shared guilt as he is identified with a wrongdoer is found in Ezek 14:10. There is no transfer of guilt presented here, but rather the fact that the prophet becomes identified with those to whom he is responsible to impart his message. See also Gerhard F. Hasel, "Studies in Biblical Atonement I: Continual Sacrifice, Defilement/Cleansing and Sanctuary," in The Sanctuary and the Atonement, ed. Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshar (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1981), 103-6.

³Milian L. Andreasen, The Sanctuary Service (Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1947), 138.

The *nāšā*³ *ʿāwôn* can thus be seen to express a significant component of the *kpr* process without necessarily being synonymous with it.¹

All of these passages have been directly related to the cultus, or more specifically with the function of the priests. One additional passage, Num 30:15, is to a degree indirectly related to the cultus. It is in the context of the sanctity of vows in general. The basic principle expressed is that vows were to be kept (vs. 2), whether they were made by men or women. Both were equally responsible for their vows. If, however, a married woman made a vow and her husband heard about it, he had the option either to confirm it or annul it (vs. 13). In case he decided to annul the vow, it had to be done within a given time, and the Lord would forgive (*sālah*) the wife (vs. 12). If he waited too long with the annulment he would have to *nāšā*³ her wrongdoing (*ʿwônāh*), not because the vow was wrong, but because the annulment was out of place.

This is the only text in the Pentateuch which explicitly states the possibility of one person *nāšā*³-ing the *ʿāwôn* of another, resulting in the forgiveness of the

¹For further discussion of their relationship, see Kiuchi, 98-99. He suggests that *nāšā*³ *ʿāwôn* is a "semantic component" in the "cultic *kipper*." This concept is supported, though not explicitly, by similar passages in Lev 5:1, 17; Num 8:19; and 18:22ff.

latter. The concept, however, is not unique. It is found in three other passages in the Pentateuch, twice in Gen 50:17 and once in Exod 10:17. These are all in the form of a request, where a wrongdoer pleads with the wronged to *nāšā*³ the wrongs (*peša*^c/*ḥaṭṭā*³*t*) of the wrongdoer so the latter might escape the consequences of his actions. In Gen 50:17 the brothers of Joseph are afraid that he might seek revenge on them upon their father's death. At their father's advice they dispatched a messenger to Joseph to plead with him to *nāšā*³ their transgression. The first part of the verse records the instructions they gave to the messenger, whereas the latter part tells about its actual delivery.

What the brothers in fact requested was that Joseph "remove" the wrongdoing they had done to him from the sphere of their relationship, so it would no longer pose a threat to their coexistence. Neither the wrong, nor its physical effects could be abrogated. Joseph was in Egypt and had lost about two decades of fellowship with his father and family. That fact could not be changed. The expected natural human response by Joseph was revenge of some kind, which the brothers hoped could somehow be alleviated. In return, they were ready to submit to Joseph's superiority: "We are servants to you" (vs. 18), they submitted.

Joseph, however, quelled their fears by comforting them, speaking kindly to them and promising to provide for their needs (vs. 21).¹ This response to their request indicates that an integral part of the meaning of *nāšā*² was apparently the concept of caring concern, a concept which was also found in Akkadian texts.²

In Exod 10:14-17 Pharaoh was suffering from the eighth plague, that of the locusts. Viewing the total devastation it was bringing upon the land of Egypt, Pharaoh called for Moses and Aaron. Upon their arrival he acknowledged his "sin" against God and them as he pleaded for forgiveness (*šā*² *nā*² *ḥaṭṭā*² *ti*) so that "this death"--the plague--might be removed (*w'yāsēr*) from him. As Moses prayed to the Lord, the Lord responded by employing the wind to *nāšā*² the plague from the land (vs. 19). The removal (*nāšā*²) of the plague came in response to Pharaoh's request to Moses to *nāša*² his (i.e., Pharaoh's) sin and remove (*sūr*) the plague (vs. 17).

This passage reveals several things about the relationship of *nāšā*² to the wrongdoings of others:

¹Hebrew uses here a pilpel of the verb *kwl*, the basic meaning of which is to "measure". A derived meaning is "to provide for." In Neh 9:21 it refers to God's general providing care for his people during their wilderness wandering. See also A. Baumann, "]] *kwl*," *TWAT* (1984), 4:91-95, an act which in the Pentateuch is referred to as *nāšā*² (see Exod 19:4; Deut 1:31; and 32:10-12).

²See chapter 2 above.

1. Pharaoh acknowledged his wrong and clearly perceived a connection between his sin/wrongdoings and the plague, which he saw as the direct consequence of his "sin."

2. Wrongdoing is concretized; it is considered as a burden which must be carried to its ultimate consequences; it would ultimately bring death to Pharaoh, the wrongdoer.

3. Pharaoh believed the burden of his wrongdoing could be transferred.

4. Pharaoh hoped that he might escape the consequences of his actions if Moses and Aaron would *nāšā*³ his wrongdoing.

5. The process of *nāšā*³ involved a removal (*sûr*) of the consequences.

6. Moses' and Aaron's *nāšā*³-ing of Pharaoh's wrongdoing involved making a supplication to God.

7. God is presented as the ultimate remover of the consequences for wrongdoing.

No "payment" or repentance is required from the wrongdoer. The whole process is based entirely on the goodwill of the wronged towards the wrongdoer. The result is that the guilty is freed from the consequences of his actions and the wronged, or a substitute, takes on himself the burden of wrongs.

The last of the texts in this category, Num 14:33, is somewhat different in that it does not involve any kind of removal or carrying of the wrongs of others on their behalf, but rather it involves a communal sharing of the consequences of wrong actions.

Num 14 relates the reaction of the people when the spies reported on their investigation of the Promised land.

All the sons of Israel grumbled against Moses and Aaron and the whole congregation said to them, "Would that we had died in the land of Egypt! Or would that we had died in this wilderness. And why is the Lord bringing us into this land, to fall by the sword? . . . would it not be better for us to return to Egypt?" (vss. 2,3).

When Joshua and Caleb suggested that they follow God's leadership, the whole congregation called for stoning them with stones (vs. 10). By their attitude and ensuing determination to act accordingly, the people, in effect, rejected the whole covenant relationship.¹ Because of their distrust and rejection of God as their leader,² they would have to bear the consequences of their actions. In spite of the fact that they had been forgiven (vs. 20)³ they would not be permitted to enter the Promised Land.

¹Cf. Deut 31:20 where the expression "spurning [YHWH]" is specifically equated with breaking the covenant.

²Cf. 14:4 where the people suggest the appointment of another leader to lead them back to Egypt.

³For a discussion of God's part in this process, see below.

Actually, there are five groups of people involved in this incident, each of which is variously affected by the wrongdoing. First, there are the ten spies; second, the remaining two spies, Joshua and Caleb; third, those who were over twenty years of age when they left Egypt; fourth, those under twenty at the time of the Exodus; and finally, the priests and the Levites.¹

When it came to the consequences of their action the groups are reduced to three: (1) the ten spies who caused the grumbling, (2) the grumbling crowd, and (3) the "faithful" spies, Joshua and Caleb, together with the descendants of the grumblers and the priests and Levites. By their own free choice the first two groups, in effect, cut themselves off from the covenant and what it stood for. The first to receive the ultimate consequences were the instigators of the grumbling, the ten spies. Shortly after, they died in a plague (14:36, 37). The grumblers did not, right away, feel the impact as severely, but in the end they all lost their inheritance (14:23). The remaining group, through no fault of their own other than being a part of the corporate body of Israel, felt the

¹This last group is not specified, but its presence may be implied from the total context of the exodus/eisodus experience. The punishment specified later in the chapter was, however, meant only for those among "the numbered men over twenty" and the Levites were not among those numbered (2:33). Besides, Eleazar, the son of Aaron, was among those who entered the Promised Land, and apparently died later than Joshua (Josh 24:33).

immediate consequence of the wrongdoing as the fulfillment of the promise was delayed, even though in the end they received the full promise. Their "sharing" in this immediate consequence is here expressed by *nāšā*³. They would have to remain in the wilderness along with the wrongdoers until the whole transgressing generation had died. The younger generation did not thereby become "co-guilty;" neither was the older one released from their guilt. Rather, the younger generation became co-sharers in the consequences, participants in the plight.

Animals as Subject

In the Pentateuch animals are the subject of *nāšā*³ five times.¹ Only one of these is directly and explicitly associated with the process of the sin-removal in the sanctuary ritual. Even though animals were an integral part of the sanctuary services, this usage is a kind of a *hapax legomenon* in the Old Testament. Nowhere else is an animal explicitly associated with this process by the means of *nāšā*³.

Data

Lev 16:22	And the goat <u>shall bear on itself</u> <u>all of their iniquities</u> (<i>wⁿnāšā</i> ³ . . . ^c <i>ālāyw</i> ³ <i>eṭ-kol-</i> ^c <i>wōnotām</i>) to
-----------	--

¹Gen 37:25; 45:23 (2x); Num 23:24; and Lev 16:22. Outside the Pentateuch animals are seen as bearing burdens in 1 Kgs 10:2 and 2 Chr 9:1, or taking other animals for food in 1 Sam 17:34.

a solitary land; and he shall
release the goat in the wilder-
ness.

Comments

Through the centuries the whole pericope involving the two goats on the Day of Atonement has puzzled scholars and theologians alike. The problem is primarily related to the meaning and function of the "goat for Azazel."¹ J. A. Gladson cogently dealt with these issues in a thesis a couple of decades ago.² Having brought together "a menagerie of conflicting data and opinion"³ through the centuries, he summarizes the possible meanings of Azazel under three main headings:

1. Azazel means "entire removal"⁴; the word being a reduplication of the stem ^ʔzl "to go."

2. Azazel is the name of the place where the goat was cast to its death, according to post-Biblical tradition and ritual.

¹For a recent discussion of the issue and extensive bibliography on the subject of Azazel, see David P. Wright, The Disposal of Impurity, SBL Dissertation Series, 101 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 21-30. See also Hayim Tawil, "Azazel, The Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study." ZAW 92/1 (1980), 43-59.

²Jerry A. Gladson, "The Enigma of 'Azazel' in Leviticus 16" (M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1973).

³Ibid., 124.

⁴So for instance, BDB, 736.

3. Azazel is descriptive of a demonic personal being. Paul Heinisch summarizes that position quite well when he says:

But since Azazel was given a goat he must have been regarded as a personal being; and since the sins of the people were consigned to him, a demon. He stands opposed to Yahweh as Satan does in Job 1 and 2 and the serpent in Gen 3. Because the people thought that demons dwelt in desert places, the scapegoat was driven out into the wilderness.¹

Some scholars, among them Freedman and Willoughby,² see still another option. The two goats are really just two aspects of the forgiveness process, one representing the sacrificial death necessary as a precondition to forgiveness, the other the "carrying" aspect, whereby God carries and removes the sins from the camp, and thus forgives them.

Admittedly, the significance of Azazel remains an enigma in Biblical scholarship. Perhaps Wenham has evaluated the whole problem accurately when he says,

Whatever we understand by Azazel, there is little doubt about the total meaning of the ceremony . . . it all comes back to the same basic idea: that sin is exterminated from Israel.³

¹Paul Heinisch, Theology of the Old Testament, trans. William Heidt (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1950), 137.

²See Freedman and Willoughby, 637.

³Gordon J. Wenham, The Book of Leviticus, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979), 235.

Another question which arises in this context is: "Which sins are dealt with in this ritual on the Day of Atonement?" Is it the sinners' unconfessed sins,¹ the brazen wanton sins of the high-handed sinner,² or the totality of the sins of the children of Israel which throughout the year had contaminated the sanctuary and the sancta?³ Rodriguez argues correctly that the most straightforward reading of the text indicates the last suggestion as the most natural.⁴ As the last act of the special Day of Atonement ritual, the High Priest--having made an atonement for the various objects of the sanctuary --placed his hands on the head of the Azazel goat.⁵

¹So Andreasen, 205-07, who sees Azazel representing the devil who will have to bear the sins for which he is ultimately responsible along with the unconfessed sins of the people.

²So Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 1040.

³Ibid., 117.

⁴See ibid., 114-20, for further discussion of this issue.

⁵Kiuchi, 149-53, has pointed out that usually the preposition 'al and the third masculine singular pronominal suffixes in connection with the Azazel goat in vss. 10 and 21-22 have been seen as referring to the goat, indicating expiation in 'proximity to' (Levine), expiation 'for' (Keil), atonement 'over' (traditional Jewish scholars and some modern scholars) the Azazel goat; or it might be a scribal error. Kiuchi suggests rather that these be read as referring to the Azazel goat atoning for Aaron in analogy with other usages of this expression in the same chapter. Aaron is not simply envisaged as the representative of the people. He has taken upon himself the guilt of the people and the sancta and thus becomes

Thereby he transferred the sins of the people, which had been "accumulated" in the sanctuary throughout the year, and for which they had already received forgiveness during the year, to the head of the goat which was then led out into the wilderness, removing the sins of the people from the camp, thus eliminating them as far as they were concerned.

In spite of various problems related to the identity and function of the goat for Azazel, it is clear from this passage that (1) forgiveness is nowhere mentioned in connection with the Day of Atonement ritual; (2) the goat for Azazel was not killed, neither was its death a part of the sanctuary symbolism, and (3) the goat was not presented as an offering sacrificed to Azazel. Actually, it is never designated as a sacrifice; neither was it a gift or an appeasement, nor a substitute sent to Azazel to suffer in Israel's place.¹ It did not serve as

guilty in a substitutionary capacity. Now he lays his hands on the head of the Azazel goat, placing his guilt on it, which the latter then carries off into the wilderness.

¹The implication that the goat may have wasted away in the wilderness is not the issue here (cf. Whybray, 49 and note 74). Wright points out that wilderness is not necessarily a wasteland. Rather it is arid land with little vegetation except grass for pasturage of various wild animals. Most important about the wilderness is the fact that it is not inhabited by humans (p. 29). The explicit emphasis is, therefore, not on the destruction of this goat but rather on the ultimate removal/elimination of all wrongdoings of the people away from the camp. This idea of removal seems to be strongly emphasized by the fact that besides the preposition ^{al}, indicating the

an active participant in the atonement process, but rather it served only as a vehicle of transport (*nāšā*³) for the sins of Israel, which separated them from God, to remove them from the populated areas to a place where they could not threaten human populations.¹ Through this process the people were again brought into relationship with their God.

Divine Beings as Subject

In this category there are four passages. Two of them are in the form of liturgical declarations, or possibly confessions of faith² about the character of YHWH (1), one is an intercessory plea (2) and one is in the form of a warning (3).

Data

1. Confessions of faith

Exod 34:6, 7 The Lord, the Lord God, compassionate and gracious, slow to anger, and abounding in loving-kindness

carrying aspect, both the directional *-āh* and the preposition ³*el* are used to indicate the movement.

¹See D. Wright, 29-30, and Rodriguez, chap. 3. See also Freedman and Willoughby, "*nāšā*³," *TWAT* (1986), 5:637, and Whybray, 49. Whybray adds correctly that "the ritual of the scapegoat reflects a concept of sin as something menacingly close to the sinner which terrifies or threatens to destroy him by weighing upon him, a state which can only be relieved by its being taken away and removed to a distance."

²So for instance Robert C. Dentan, "The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f", *VT* 13 (1963):37.

and truth; who keeps lovingkindness for thousands, who forgives iniquity, transgression and sin (*nošē^c āwōn wāpeša^c w^hḥaṭṭā^ṣāh*); yet He will by no means leave the guilty unpunished, visiting the iniquity of fathers on the children and on the grandchildren to the third and fourth generation.

Num 14:18 The Lord is slow to anger and abundant in lovingkindness, forgiving iniquity and transgression (*nošē^ṣ āwōn wāpeša^c*); but He will by no means clear the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the children to the third and the fourth generations.

2. Intercessory plea

Exod 32:31, 32 Alas, this people has committed a great sin, and they have made a god of gold for themselves. But now, if Thou wilt, forgive their sin (*ṣim-tiššā^ṣ ḥaṭṭā^ṣtām*)--and if not, please blot me out from Thy book which Thou hast written.

3. A warning

Exod 23:21 Be on your guard before him and obey his voice; do not be rebellious toward him, for he will not pardon your transgression (*lo^ṣ yiššā^ṣ l'piš^ckem*) since my name is in him.

Comments

Dentan states about the passage in Exod 34:6, 7 that it is so remarkable, that the majority of modern commentators take it to be a "foreign intrusion into the present text" entered in a late editorial stage.¹ Others,

¹Ibid., 36.

like Moberley, see it rather as an original "part of the narrative tradition in which . . . [it] now stand[s]" from which other liturgical confessions were derived.¹

[It] stands out from the theological formularies of the OT by its "propositional" nature. It is not kerygmatic but descriptive; it is concerned not with God's acts, but with His character.²

This passage is a part of the so-called "Sinaitic theophany" which is used in various contexts throughout the OT.³ It is one of the high points of Biblical revelation, and it comes in response to Moses' request of God in Exod 33:19, "Show me thy glory." In response, God does not reveal himself in anthropological terms but rather in personal, relational terms. As a part of this revelation God not only shows himself compassionate (*raḥûm*) and gracious (*ḥannûn*), slow to anger (*ʔerek ʔappayim*) and abounding in lovingkindness and truth (*raḥ-ḥesed weʔemet*), but also as one who maintains and protects that covenant-loyalty or lovingkindness for thousands

¹R. W. L. Moberly, At the Mountain of God, JSOT Supplement Series 22 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1983), 128-31. The statement is clearly explicitly reflected in eight passages in the Old Testament: Num 14:18; Neh 9:17; Pss 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2; and Nah 1:3.

²Dentan, 48.

³An excellent discussion and bibliography is found in Dawn E. Waring, "The Nature of Yahweh's Relationship with His People: A Literary Analysis of Exodus 32-34" (Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1985), 169-88, and David N. Freedman, "God, Compassionate and Gracious," Western Watch 6 (1955):6-24.

(nošēr ḥesed lā³lāpīm) and a bearer of every kind of sin (nošē³ cāwōn wāpeša^c wḥaṭṭā³āh),¹ without, however, declaring the guilty guiltless (wḥnaqqēh lo³ yḥnaqqēh), one who visits the iniquity (poqēd cāwōn) of the fathers on the children and grandchildren to the third and the fourth generations.²

Many theologians consider this passage as a liturgical confession.³ Wright points out that this is the only confession in the OT composed solely of the divine attributes.⁴ The text, however, claims that these words are actually God's self-appraisal "in order to clarify and explain his role in the tragic incident of the golden calf."⁵ In the process of Moses' intercession for

¹The fact that the three OT key-words for sin/wrongdoing are listed as objects of nāšā³ does not necessarily imply that only these different aspects are included to the exclusion of others, but they are rather used to indicate the universality of wrongdoings involved, (i.e., all sins). See Knierim, 233; also Pedersen, 1:414; and K. H. J. Fahlgren, quoted Knierim, 234, note 28.

²These characteristics of God are ably discussed by Freedman, "God, Passionate and Gracious," 6-24, and G. Ernest Wright, "Divine Name and Divine Nature (Exod 33:12-34:9)," Perspective 12 (1971):177-85.

³Among them Gerhard von Rad, The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays (trans. E. W. Trueman Dicken from a 1958 reprint of the original German edition of 1938; London: 1966), 1-78; G. E. Wright, God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital (London: SCM Press, 1952) chapter 2, and Dentan, 36, notes 2-9.

⁴G. E. Wright, "Divine Name," 177.

⁵Freedman, "God, Compassionate and Gracious," 7.

the people, God proposes to blot out the people and begin anew with Moses,¹ but Moses insists that such an action would be irreconcilable with God's character.² Instead, Moses pleads with God to bear/forgive their sin (^{im}tiššā³ ḥaṭṭā³tām) or else "blot me out from thy book."³ Moses recognizes, and God confirms, the inevitable association between cause and effect which is the resounding undercurrent throughout the OT: the one who sins will bear his iniquity with all its engenders, including both immediate and ultimate consequences.⁴ But, within God's justice there is also room for mercy. God has not forsaken his people. He will remain with them through his angel.⁵

This theophany can be divided into two main parts, with the first consisting of two universal declarations about the character of God:

1. ³ēl raḥūm w'ḥannūn. "God, compassionate and gracious."

¹Exod 32:10

²Exod 32:11-13.

³Exod 32:32.

⁴Cf. the summary statement in Ezek 18:4, 20 "The soul that sins will die." See also G. E. Wright, "Divine Name," 181, where he points out that "to ancient Israel the Law of God cannot be broken or disregarded without someone bearing the burden of sin, that is, the penalty. Law cannot be broken with impunity."

⁵Exod 32:34.

2. ʔerek ʔappayim. "Slow to anger and abounding in lovingkindness and truth."

The second part consists of three action-oriented statements, indicating how the general characteristics of God are translated into actions at the point of contact between God and man. All of these statements begin with a participle indicating "a continual uninterrupted exercise of an activity."¹ God's acts are not at random, sporadic; they are predictable, reliable and permanent, in contrast to those of man.

1. nošer ḥesed lāʔlāpim. "One who keeps/maintains covenant-love for thousands."

2a. nošēʔ ʕāwōn wāpešaʕ wḥaṭṭāʔāh "One who forgives/carries iniquity, transgression and sin. . . ."

3a. poqēd ʕwōn ʔāwōt ʕal-bānīm wʕal-bʕné bānīm.
"One who visits the iniquity of the fathers upon children and descendants."

On the surface there appears to be a contradiction between the last two general statements. One proclaims forgiveness, the other punishments, not only for the wrongdoers but also on the descendants. Both of them, however, are qualified by balancing statements:

2b. wʕnaqqēh loʔ yʕnaqqēh ". . . but he will certainly not declare guiltless (or: leave unpunished)."

¹Gesenius, §116:a.

3b. *ʿal-šillēšim wʿal-ribbēʿim* ". . . to the third and fourth generation."

These statements indicate that there are limits both to God's mercy and his punishing. Being merciful and forgiving is not the same as letting the guilty go free or declaring them innocent, nor is punishing without limits. Whereas God's mercy is for the benefit of thousands, the consequences of wrong actions are, however, limited to a few generations.

The expression *nošēʿawôn* is crucial to the present study. It means literally "one who carries/removes wickedness." God is thus presented as one who continually bears the wickedness of his people.¹ Rather than destroying the people who had acted wrongly, God takes upon himself their wrongdoing, thereby subjecting himself to the consequences.² The people, on the other hand, would continue to live and benefit from his guidance

¹Note the use of the participle, which "tends to describe a state of affairs rather than to present a bare event" or "a continuing state of affairs." Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 614, 626.

²Compare with the concept of the suffering servant in Isa 52:13-53:12. Cf. Freedman, "God, Passionate and Gracious," 15-16. G. E. Wright, "Divine Name," 182, adds that God did this to maintain the covenant with Israel. "Such an expression, with the Biblical world behind it, has so much more depth of meaning than the simple English abstraction "to forgive" with its range of meanings."

and protection.¹ But this "forgiveness" by God does not mean that the people would be declared guiltless (*w'naqqēh lo³ y'naqqēh*) nor that they would totally escape the consequences of their actions.² So, *nāšā³*-forgiveness does not necessarily exclude punishment/consequences, nor does it mean a declaration of innocence, but it does involve participation and support by the forgiver in the suffering of the wrongdoer.

Also, *nāšā³*-forgiveness does not appear to involve forgetting in the regular sense of the word. This is brought out in the pericope about the spies, as they returned from exploring the Promised land in Num 14. The people refused to believe the faithful spies and rebelled against God's leadership and Moses.³ God proposed to Moses to dispossess the people and he would exalt Moses instead and make him into a great nation.⁴ Moses interceded for his people and appealed to the theophany in

¹As is revealed in Exod 32:34 where God promises to send his angel to lead the people. He also promises to fight the battles for them (34:10, 11).

²The people and their children still had to remain in the wilderness, and only two of the original group of those who were over twenty years of age when they left Egypt were allowed to enter the Promised Land (cf. comments on Num 14:18).

³Num 13-14.

⁴Num 14:12.

Exodus in a somewhat abbreviated form.¹ On the basis of that revelation of God's nature Moses pleaded with God to forgive (*sālah*) the iniquity of the people, just as he had forgiven/carried (*nāšā*²) them from Egypt onward.

God responds by assuring Moses that he had already forgiven (*sālah* gal perf.) them according to Moses' request, but this forgiveness did not imply the removal of the consequences of the wrong action.

Das Konkretwerden der Vergebung wird nicht im Aufheben der einzelnen Strafen gesehen, sondern primär in der Erhaltung der Beziehung zwischen JHVH und seinem Volk.²

God made an oath in which he proclaims that even though he has forgiven the people, they will have to bear the consequences of their rebellious actions. Following the people's rejection of Joshua and Caleb's spy-report, God appeared "exasperated" as he spoke to Moses. "How long will this people spurn (*y'na*²*šunī*) me? And how long will they not believe in me?" (vs. 11). Sakenfeld points out that all fourteen OT occurrences of *nā*²*aš* in Piel

¹He omits (1) the doubling of the name YHWH, (2) the title God, (3) the introductory statement "compassionate and gracious," (4) the expression "and truth," (5) the qualifying statement "who keeps lovingkindness for thousands," (6) the expression "and sin," and (7) the extended family "and on the grandchildren." None of these omissions appears to have any real theological significance in this context, however.

²J. Hausmann, "𐤓𐤀𐤋𐤁 *sālah*", *TWAT* (1986), 5:865. See also Katherine D. Sakenfeld, "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14," *CBO* 37 (1975):327.

refer without exception to the despising or spurning of God or something sacred to him. The contexts suggest that the action is regarded as tantamount to rejection of the whole covenant relationship.¹

That kind of an attitude will inevitably bring its consequences. When God pronounced the judgment on the people he was not arbitrarily unleashing his temper, but rather expressing the unavoidable results of their decision: disinheritance and pestilence (i.e., exclusion from God's protective covenant blessings).²

As Moses interceded, he did so, not on the basis that injustice was being done or that God was arbitrary in his decisions, but rather on the basis of God's nature, especially his *hesed* (vs. 13) which Sakenfeld has shown is used of God in the context of preserving a relationship which he has already created.³ The pericope does not indicate any forgetting⁴ or removal of the consequences as

¹Sakenfeld, 321. This is especially apparent in Deut 31:20 where despising of Yahweh is equated with the breaking of the covenant.

²Cf. Exod 15:26 and Deut 29:20.

³Sakenfeld, 324, note 16.

⁴In fact, the idea of forgetting is nowhere expressed or implied in the context of forgiving in the Pentateuch. In Jer 31:34 "forgive" is chiasmatically in parallel with "remember no more," which is clearly, at least partially, synonymous with forgive (see: Herrmann Eising, "לִישׁׁר זָכָר", *TDOT*, 4:65). That idea poses serious theological problems as to "How can God forget?" It may be helpful to note that the text does not actually say "forget," but rather "not remember." This may seem an insignificant difference, but whereas God's remembering always results in actions (Eising, 66), God's "non-remembering" may be seen as referring to God's "non-

being inherent in the concept of forgiveness. It appears to be more a relational process in which the forgiver removes or bypasses the obstacle which obstructs the relationship with the one forgiven, thus restoring/maintaining the relationship.

Sakenfeld is correct in her analysis of forgiveness in this context, that

[it] has to do with the preservation of the fundamental covenant relationship rather than simply with eliminating some particular act of punishment (e.g, Jer 5:1, 7; 31:34; 50:20). . . . Forgiveness is understood basically as preservation of the community, and this preservation need not be precluded or even cheapened by punishment of the community while the relationship is being continued.¹

As can be seen in table 21, the last text in this category, Exod 23:21, issues a warning to the people of Israel during their wandering in the wilderness as to the danger of rebelling against God's angel whom he promised to send before them to guard them on their way. Von Rad has pointed out that the expression *mal'āk yhwē* is "the personification of Yahweh's assistance to Israel" and obviously even God himself in human form.² Therefore, he

action" in bringing on the logical consequences of a given wrongdoing. For the sinner it has the same effect as if he had not sinned. (See also: Willy Schottroff, "לזכר *zākar gedenken*", *THAT*, 1:507-18.)

¹Sakenfeld, 327.

²Gerhard von Rad, "מלאך in the OT," *TDNT* (1964), 1:77-78, and idem, *Genesis*, trans. J. H. Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 188-9.

is to be obeyed, trusted and respected. Rebellion against him is rebellion against God himself and will not be tolerated nor forgiven (*nāšā*²).

The question arises, however, "Why will he not forgive?" since God had already established himself as a forgiver of the people and their wrongs.¹ This is, in fact, the only passage in the Pentateuch in which the *nāšā*² of wrongdoings is negated. There is one parallel passage involving *sālah* in Deut 29:20 (19 MT) speaking of someone who has turned away from God to serve other gods (cf. vs. 18)

The Lord shall never be willing to forgive (*s'lah*) him, but rather the anger of the Lord and His jealousy will burn against that man, and every curse which is written in this book will rest on him, and the Lord will blot out his name under heaven.

Besides these two passages in the Pentateuch there are eight outside that corpus with a similar message, five with *nāšā*²² and three with *sālah*.³ Both the Pentateuchal passages and six of those outside involve God as the subject. The cause for the negative reaction is a rebellious attitude leading to the worship of foreign

¹Cf. Exod 34:6, 7; and Num 14:18.

²Jos 24:19; Isa 2:9; Ezek 34:29; 36:15; and Job 7:21.

³2 Kgs 24:4; Jer 5:7; and Lam 3:42.

TABLE 21
*Nāšā*³ WRONGS OF OTHERS

	Subject	"Wrongs"	Effect [means]
Exod 28:12	Aaron	<i>š'môṭ</i> of people	A T [shoulderstones]
Exod 28:29	Aaron	<i>š'môṭ</i> of people	C A [stones in C N breastplate]
Exod 28:30	Aaron	<i>mišpāt</i> of people	E C [Urim & Thummim]
Exod 28:38	Aaron	<i>āwôn</i> of sacrifices	P E [headpiece]
Lev 10:17	Priests	<i>āwôn</i> of people	ATONEMENT [sin offering]
Lev 16:22	Goat	<i>āwôn</i> of people	[removal]
Num 18:1(2x)	Aaron/sons	<i>āwôn</i> of sanctuary/ priesthood	NO WRATH ON ISRAEL
Num 18:23	Levites	<i>āwôn</i> of people	(LIFE cf. 17:23)
Num 30:15	Husband	<i>āwôn</i> of wife	FORGIVENESS
Exod 34:6,7	God	<i>āwôn</i> , <i>peša</i> ^c , and <i>hattā</i> ³ <i>h</i>	ACCEPTANCE (cf. 34:9)
Num 14:18	God	<i>āwôn</i> and <i>peša</i> ^c	"LORD WITH US" (cf. 14:9)
Gen 50:15(2x)	Joseph	<i>peša</i> ^c of brothers	PROVISION and PRESERVATION (cf. 50:20-21)
Exod 23:21	Angel of God	<i>peša</i> ^c of people	LEADERSHIP and PROTECTION (cf. 23:22-31)
Exod 10:17	Moses/God	<i>hattā</i> ³ <i>h</i> of Pharaoh	PLAGUE REMOVED [prayer]
Exod 32:32	God	<i>hattā</i> ³ <i>h</i> of people	LIFE, GUIDANCE (cf. 32:34; 33:1-2)
Num 14:33	"Sons"	<i>z'nūt</i> of "fathers"	[endurance]

gods,¹ turning away from the Lord to serve the gods of heathen nations,² the worship of the "work of their hands,"³ the fact that "your sons have forsaken Me and sworn by those who are not gods,"⁴ general rebellion,⁵ or indescribable atrocities against innocent people.⁶ In one passage Job challenges God to explain why He has not forgiven him,⁷ and two passages in Ezekiel are more general in nature: that one nation will no longer bear the insults or reproach of other nations.⁸

All these texts, with the possible exception of the last two, speak of grievous and rebellious attitudes, even involving rejection of God as the leader and God of the people. The people have turned to others instead. That is why God cannot bear (*nāšā*⁹) their wrongdoings. They do not want him to. This is apparently the only context in which forgiveness is negated in the OT.⁹ God

¹Exod 23:21.

²Deut 29:18-20 and Josh 24:19.

³Isa 2:19.

⁴Jer 5:7.

⁵Lam 3:42.

⁶2 Kgs 24:4.

⁷Job 7:21.

⁸Ezek 34:29 and 36:15.

⁹This may be compared to the concept in the NT of the "sin against the Holy Spirit" which cannot be forgiven

cannot carry the wrongs of those who will not accept it, and he will not force their will. They have to bear the consequences of their actions themselves.

When someone carries the wrongs of others the consequences for the "carrier" are not explicitly stated. It becomes clear from the context, however, that the beneficiaries of that action are always relieved of their burden, whether that meant the responsibility for their actions, punishment, or death. The effect on the one who takes their "burden" can, however, be safely assumed in light of what happened to those that bore their own iniquities: suffering, disease, and/or death (see table 20).

Summary

Man, a designated animal, or God himself may be the subject of *nāšā*³ when the sins/wrongdoings of others are involved. The basic principle involved is that whoever does not live in accordance with a given standard becomes guilty and must bear (*nāšā*³) the consequences, whether that be guilt-feeling or some kind of punishment. Ultimately, the wrongdoer who bears his wrongdoings will suffer and even die.

(Matt 12:31-32 and Mark 3:28-29). There the context also indicates an attitude of rejection of God and what he stands for.

But because of his caring concern for his people God has provided a way out. In the sanctuary the priests and Levites were appointed to bear (*nāšāʾ*) the wrongdoings of the people within the confines of the sanctuary, thus releasing the people from the consequences of separation and death.¹ The priests sometimes ate of the flesh of the sin-bearing sacrifice, thereby making it a part of themselves,² or signified their substitutionary function visually by means of the stones which the highpriest carried (*nāšāʾ*) as part of his vestments, together with the inscribed golden plate on his forehead. Thus they carried (*nāšāʾ*) the wrongdoings of the people both on and in their body as they entered into the presence of the Lord. This process provided the people with an acceptance before the Lord.³

Once a year, as a part of the Day of Atonement ritual, the "goat for Azazel" was set apart for the purpose of transporting (*nāšāʾ*) the accumulated forgiven sins of the people from the sanctuary, away from the camp, out into the wilderness. This act of elimination culminated and sealed the forgiveness process which the people had already been experiencing through their

¹Num 18:1, 23.

²Lev 10:17.

³Exod 28:12, 29, 30, 38.

involvement in the daily rituals of the sanctuary through their substitute.

A husband could take on himself (*nāšāʾ*) the responsibility/consequences for a vow made by a "dependant" of the household,¹ thereby releasing that individual from his/her duty and providing forgiveness for that person.² In the same way the wronged could also take on himself (*nāšāʾ*) the wrongs of another, effectually remove it from their relationship, and ultimately also take care of the wrongdoer and provide for his needs.³

At times, individuals might have to share (*nāšāʾ*) in the immediate consequences of someone else's wrongs through no fault of their own, without being counted guilty or releasing the wrongdoers from their guilt.⁴ But they could also be instrumental in the removal of the consequences of someone's wrongdoings by taking (*nāšāʾ*) them in prayer to God, the ultimate bearer (*nošēʾ*) of wrongs, who also provides the ultimate release from the consequences.⁵

¹Only the wife is specified in the text, but it seems probable that other dependent individuals were implicitly included in this provision (cf. Num 30:3-5).

²Num 30:15, 12.

³Gen 50:17.

⁴Num 14:33.

⁵Exod 10:17.

CHAPTER VI

*nāšā*² AND INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

There are a total of twenty-two passages in the Pentateuch in which *nāšā*² is used in the context of an attitude or particular relationship towards someone. This concept is found in such expressions as *nāšā*² + person/people, seven times; *nāšā*² *pānīm*, six times; *nāšā*² *roš*³ and *nāšā*² *māqôm*, two times each; *nāšā*² *maššā*³, four times;¹ and *nāšā*² without an object, once. The subject may be either man or God.

In this group of texts we find positional indications with the verb in nine cases: *ʿal* is used three times: twice indicating a caring action,² and once it is not used directly with the verb but in the context to indicate a movement from disgrace to honor.³ *Min* is used twice: once about literally separating the head from the

¹These do not directly indicate relationship or attitude, but are semantically very closely related to the expressions with people as objects and are, therefore, included here.

²Num 11:12; Deut 32:11.

³Gen 40:13.

body,¹ once about Egypt as a point of departure.² ³El is used about the direction towards which God will show his favor,³ and l' appears also to indicate the direction of favor in three passages.⁴

Again, it appears difficult to distinguish clearly between movement and sustaining, but all but one of the passages with prepositions seem to indicate some kind of movement or attitude towards someone. The passage in Deut 32:11 with ^cal seems to emphasize the caring acts of the mother-eagle towards her young. Most of the remaining passages, which have no preposition, seem to imply an attitude of sustaining and favor.

People as Object

All of the occurrences in this category are in the context of the people of Israel passing through the wilderness at the time of the Exodus. Four have God as subject (1), three of which are in the form of a confession or declaration,⁵ one an intercessory prayer;⁶ and seven have Moses or his assistants as subject (2),

¹Gen 40:19.

²Num 14:19.

³Num 6:24, 25.

⁴Deut 28:50; Gen 18:24, 26. Cf. Waltke, 206.

⁵Exod 19:4; Deut 32:11; and 1:31.

⁶Num 14:19.

with four forming a part of Moses' complaint to God about the awesome responsibility of leading the people,¹ and the remaining three constituting God's response to these complaints.² Two of these passages present some generalizations with man as subject, used for comparison.³

Data

1. Subject: God

Confession/declaration

Exod 19:4 You yourselves have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bore you (*nāšā³tīkā*) on eagle's wings, and brought you to Myself.

Deut 32:11 Like an eagle that stirs up its nest, that hovers over its young, He spread His wings and caught them, He carried them (*yiššā³ēhū*) on His pinions.

Deut 1:31 And in the wilderness where you saw how the Lord your God carried you (*nāšā³kā*) just as a man carries (*yiššā³*) his son, in all the way which you have walked, until you came to this place.

Intercession

Num 14:19 Pardon, I pray (*s'lah-na³*) the iniquity of this people according to the greatness of Thy lovingkindness, . . . just as thou

¹Num 11:12, 14; and Deut 1:9, 12.

²Exod 18:22; and Num 11:17 (2x).

³Deut 1:31; and Num 11:12.

hast forgiven (nāšā^ʔtāh) this
people from Egypt until now.

2. Subject: Moses and his assistants

Moses' complaint

Num 11:12 Was it I who conceived this people?
Was it I who brought them forth,
that Thou shouldest say to me,
Carry them (šā^ʔāhū) in your bosom
as a nurse carries (yiššā^ʔ) a
nursing infant, to the land which
Thou didst swear to their fathers?

Num 11:14 I alone am not able to carry
(lāšē^ʔt) all this people, because
it is too burdensome for me.

Deut 1:9 And I spoke to you at that time,
saying, I am not able to bear
(š^ʔēt) the burden of you alone.

Deut 1:12 How can I alone bear (ʔeššā^ʔ) the
load and burden of you and your
strife?

God's response

Exod 18:22 And let them judge the people at
all times; . . . So it will be
easier for you, and they will bear
the burden with you (w^ʔnāš^ʔū
ʔittāk).

Num 11:17 And they shall bear the burden of
the people with you (w^ʔnāš^ʔū ʔittākā
b^ʔmaššā^ʔ), so that you shall not
bear (w^ʔlo^ʔ-tiššā^ʔ) it alone.

Comments

In the first of these passages, Exod 19:4, God is speaking to Moses in preparation for the giving of the covenant on Mount Sinai. This passage forms, in fact, an introduction to the giving of the covenant. In it God

compares the initial experience of Israel in the wilderness to that of their being carried on eagle's wings,¹ with God being the carrier. Kleinig² points out that this is the only text in which God speaks of bringing the people to himself. At other times he brings them to the land. This emphasis on God's care for his people, as the covenant is introduced, is significant, as it shows that it is based on a relationship of love. It also indicates the close interrelationship between the concepts of *nāšā*³-forgiveness and the covenant. The same simile is used again in Deut 32:11 as Moses reviews Israel's experience during the forty-year wandering in the Sinai desert. In this latter passage the simile is expanded by graphically describing the way eagles teach their young to fly, a scene readily visible to the people in the desert, especially in spring as they arrived at Mount Sinai. It has, however, been quite difficult to verify this behavior

¹Some scholars believe that the Hebrew *nešer* is not the eagle but rather the Griffon vulture which is abundant in these regions. See Samuel R. Driver, ICC, 162; Encyclopedia Judaica, 16:232-3, and Godfrey R. Driver, "Birds in the Old Testament" PEQ, 86 (1955): 8-9. The last one, however, indicates that it may be used for either the vulture or the eagle. In a later article, idem, "Once Again: Birds in the Bible", PEQ, 90 (1958): 56-57 he admits that he had wrongly ascribed Exod 19:4 and Deut 32:11 to the vulture "because of the great span of its wings."

²John W. Kleinig, "On Eagles' Wing. An Exegetical Study of Exodus 19:2-8," Lutheran Theological Journal 21/1 (1987):20.

of the eagle scientifically,¹ but the following description may be helpful in illuminating this unique event which is being used as a picture of God's nāšā³-care for his people.

The mother started from the nest in the crags and, roughly handling the youngster, she allowed him to drop, I should say, about ninety feet; then she would swoop down under him, wings spread, and he would alight on her back. She would soar to the top of the range with him and repeat the process. Once perhaps she waited fifteen minutes between flights. I should say the farthest she let him fall was a hundred and fifty feet. My father and I watched him, spellbound, for over an hour.²

The eagle is also frequently used as a symbol of royalty in Ancient Near Eastern cultures,³ and as such is an apt symbol of God, the almighty Ruler of the universe.

¹Some commentaries such as The Pulpit Commentary, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company: 1977), 3:500, quote a description from a book first published in 1829 by the name of Salmonia: Or Days of Fly Fishing by an Angler, but republished by Humphrey Davy (New York: Freshet Press, 1970), 85-86. It describes two parent eagles who were teaching their offspring the maneuvers of flight. The introduction, however, indicates that the book is basically a fiction, but may in part be based on some real experiences. This reduces its value as source material considerably. G. R. Driver, "Once Again: Birds in the Bible," 56-57, however, quotes Yeoman's England (1934):135-6 and Bulletin of the Smithsonian Institution CLXVII (1937):302, both of which record instances which verify the description of Deut 32:11 and Exod 19:4.

²A. C. Bent on the authority of Dr. L. Miller from the United States in Bulletin of the Smithsonian Institution CLXVII [1937]:302, quoted in G. R. Driver, "Once Again: Birds in the Bible," 56-57.

³See article "Adler" in Reallexikon der Assyriologie (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1932), 1:36.

At the same time it also conveys the idea of caring concern, as was mentioned above.

This concern is likewise present in the passages in Deut 1:31 and Num 11:12 where *nāšāʾ* is brought down on the human level. In these passages man is pictured as carrying (*nāšāʾ*) his son or a nurse carrying (*nāšaʾ*) a nursing infant (*yonēq*) in his bosom.¹ The fact that the images "father-son" and "nurse-young infant" are used implies that more is involved in the act of *nāšāʾ* than merely some impersonal physical transportation of an object. These images carry emotive overtones, implying intimacy, caring concern, and taking care of the needs of the object.² The early versions have perceived this connotation and translated accordingly. LXX translates *nāšāʾ* in Deut 1:31 with *τροφοφορεο* (literally: "to bring food"). This expression is translated in various ways. Some emphasize the caring aspect: "care for (someone) tenderly, bear in one's arms as a nurse,"³ others relate it to more specific actions: "bring one nourishment,

¹Cf. parallel idea in Hos 11:3 and Isa 46:3-4. In the latter *nāšāʾ* is paralleled with *ʿāmas* "load, carry, lift" and *sābal* "carry, support."

²See Freedman and Willoughby, "*nāšāʾ*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:632.

³William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 4th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952), 835.

sustain,"¹ while still others see it as referring to the function of the mother: "suckle."² Peshitta uses *tarsi* "to nourish, support, rear."³

This is what God has done for his people during the wandering in the wilderness, and this is a process he wants Moses to participate in. "Carry them in your bosom as a nurse carries a nursing infant," he commands Moses, and Moses clearly understands that this carrying involves more than just detached leadership or transport. In his reaction he worries that he will not be able to provide for their needs: "Where am I to get meat to give to all these people?"⁴ God responds by commanding Moses to appoint seventy assistants to share this burden with him.⁵

¹Henry G. Liddell & Robert Scott, comp., A Greek English Lexicon, 9th ed., rev. Henry S. Jones, (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1973), 1828.

²Geoffrey W. H. Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961), 1417.

³Probably *taphel* conjunctive from *rsy*. Jessie P. Smith, ed., A Compendious Syriac Dictionary (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957), 621.

⁴This image is also found in the prophets where God is envisioned as a shepherd carrying his lamb (Isa 40:11). In that passage *nāšā*³ is paralleled with *nāhal* "help along, lead carefully" (cf. Holladay, 230). In Isa 46:3 the context implies "taking care of" or "delivering" (*mālaṭ* meaning "get one to safety"). See also E. Ruprecht, "𐤒𐤕𐤍 *pl̄t retten*" THAT (1971), 2:423. In Isa 63:9 the context indicates that when God *nāšā*³ the people it involved his sharing or participating in their afflictions and trials.

⁵Num 11:17.

Again, the context indicates that the primary concern at this time was the "providing for" and "feeding" the people, or caring for all their needs. The people had been complaining about the food, and as soon as the seventy had been appointed to *nāšā*¹ the people together with Moses, God commanded the people to consecrate themselves in preparation for eating the meat which He was about to provide for them.¹ But it involved more. It involved taking the total responsibility for the people, their well-being, problems, and strife as a burden which Moses and his associates are to carry. They do that by supportively sharing in their condition, meeting their needs, and providing their necessities. Freedman has correctly pointed out that in this context *nāšā*² involves

eine warmherzige, liebende Fürsorge für das Volk. . . Ein Volk tragen heißt, es zu lieben, schützen, seine Sorgen mitzutragen, aber auch seine Fehler mit anzutragen.²

All of these concepts form an informative background to Moses' plea to God in Num 14:19. He pleads for Israel that God might forgive their iniquity in the same way as He has *nāšā*³ them from Egypt "until now." This is one of few cases where *sālah* and *nāšā*³ are used together in the Old Testament. It is also found in the

¹Num 11:18.

²Freedman and Willoughby, "*nāšā*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:632.

related context of Exod 34:9 and negatively in Deut 29:19. Sakenfeld has pointed out that in all these places *sālah* involves positively "the preservation of God's relationship to the community" and not simply the elimination of some particular act of punishment.¹ In fact, the subsequent verses indicate very strongly that God's forgiveness did not include a release from the consequences of the wrong action.

Indeed, as I live, all the earth will be filled with the glory of the Lord. Surely all the men who have seen My glory and My signs, which I performed in Egypt and in the wilderness, yet have put Me to the test these ten times and have not listened to my voice, shall by no means see the land which I swore to their fathers, nor shall any of those who spurned Me see it. . . . I the Lord have spoken, surely this I will do to all this evil congregation who are gathered together against Me. In this wilderness they shall be destroyed, and there they shall die.²

This punishment, however, in no way annuls the assurance of forgiveness. Sakenfeld comments on this passage, that

the punishment does not mean that forgiveness has not already occurred, even before the people's repentance,

¹Sakenfeld, "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14," *CBO* 37 (1975):327. *Sālah* is only used in the context of forgiveness, and is therefore considered to be the *terminus technicus* for forgiveness. Only God is the subject of *sālah*. Its etymology has been debated. The root is common in Semitic languages, but in most of them it has the idea of "sprinkling" or "pouring out" (HAL, 714). The same dictionary suggests a relationship with Ethiopic *zalḥa* "to create," whereas Stamm points out that it might be related to Arabic *slḥ* "to undress" or "to come to an end." (THAT, 2:150-60).

²Num 14:21-23, 35.

nor that forgiveness understood as preservation of the community's relationship to God is any less real.¹

That is the unexpected fact about forgiveness. It does not forget the wrong, neither does it necessarily remove the punishment. It is rather a supportive attitude and acceptance of the wrongdoer in spite of his wrongs.

"Face" as Object

Nāśā² with "face" as object occurs six times in the Pentateuch,² three times with the meaning of "be favorable to," "grant" (1), once indicating "respect," "honor" (2), and two times "be partial" (3). God is the subject in three passages;³ and man, in three.⁴ The idea behind this image is clearly taken from well-known contemporary experiences. When a captive was brought in before a king, he threw himself down on the ground, indicating full submission. The king might indicate his pleasure concerning the captive by either stepping on him⁵

¹Sakenfeld, 326.

²Outside of the Pentateuch it is found 18 times: 1 Sam 25:35; 2:22; 1 Kgs 3:14; 5:1; 9:32; Isa 3:3; 9:14; Zech 2:4; Mal 1:9; 2:9; Ps 82:2; 4:6; Job 11:15; 22:26; 32:22; 42:8, 9; Lam 4:16. The context and usage in those passages is quite similar to that of the Pentateuch.

³Gen 19:21; Num 6:24, 25; and Deut 10:17.

⁴Gen 32:21; Deut 28:50; and Lev 19:15.

⁵See Jens Ostrup, Orientalische Höflichkeit (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1929), 30-31: "Die vollkommenste Form der Begrüßung ist, daß man sich dem anderen völlig übergibt, indem man sich vor ihm

or lifting/raising him up, either bodily or his face, when he was standing.¹

Data

1. "Be favorable"

- Gen 32:21 And you shall say, "Behold, your servant Jacob also is behind us." For he said, "I will appease (³kaḫḫrāh pānāyw) with the present that goes before me (l'pānāy). Then afterward I will see his face (pānāyw); perhaps he will accept me (yiśšā³ pānāy).
- Gen 19:21 And he said to him, "Behold, I grant you (nāšā³ṭī pānēkā) this request also, not to overthrow the town of which you have spoken. . ."
- Num 6:24, 25 The Lord bless you, and keep you; the Lord make his face shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up his countenance upon you (yiśšā³ pānāyw ³elēkā) and give you peace.

niederwirft, daß er mit einem machen könne, was ihm beliebt; er kann einem den Fuß auf den Nacken setzen oder einen töten, man ist wehrlos." See also James K. Hoffmeier, "Some Egyptian Motifs Related to Warfare and Enemies and Their Old Testament Counter-parts," The Ancient World, 6:1-4 (1983), 60, also fig. 3, page 62.

¹An interesting illustration of "favor" being implied by the lifting up of someone's head can be seen in James B. Pritchard, The Ancient Near East in Pictures (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954), 184, illustration 545, showing the goddess Isis, seated upon her throne, with Seti I sitting on her lap. She is holding her hand under his chin, evidently "lifting up his face" toward her, so they are facing each other. The whole picture gives the impression of the goddess' acceptance and approval of the king. A related idea is also found in Akkadian, only with *rēšu* instead of *panu*: *ilum re-eš awīlim i-na-aš-ši* "the god will give honors to the man" (CAD, 108a). See also appendix D.

Deut 28:50 A nation of fierce countenance who shall have no respect for the old (*lo³-yiššā³ pānīm l'zāqēn*) nor show favor (*lo³ yāhon*) to the young.

2. "Be partial"

Deut 10:17 And the awesome God who does not show partiality (*lo³-yiššā³ pānīm*), nor take a bribe.

Lev 19:15 You shall do no injustice in judgment; you shall not be partial to the poor (*lo³-tiššā³ p'nē-dal*) nor defer to the great (*w³lo³-tehdar p'nē gādōl*), but you are to judge your neighbor fairly.

Comments

In the first category (1) man is subject once¹ and God twice.² An interesting wordplay on the word *pānīm* is found in the first passage. It occurs four times, one of which is the composite preposition *lipnē* with a pronominal suffix. On his way back to his home-country Jacob fears for his life as Esau approaches. In planning their first meeting, he expresses his hope that the gifts he is sending in advance may *kāpar pānāyw* (i.e., Esau's). The sequence is interesting. First, Jacob will *kāpar* his brother's face with a gift, then he will see his (i.e., Esau's) face, a process he hopes will lead Esau to lift his (i.e., Jacob's) face. In this context *kāpar* is seen

¹Gen 32:21.

²Gen 19:21 and Num 6:24,25.

as a process leading to the ultimate solution of the dilemma, the solution being in the form of an acceptance.

Commentators have offered various suggestions as to the meaning of *kāpar*. Most dictionaries give "cover" as its basic meaning,¹ while some commentators prefer "to clear, wipe away" based on Akkadian cognates.² Even if either of these concepts could be, and have been "defended" etymologically,³ neither of them seems quite to

¹See for instance KBL, 452, BDB, 497, Holladay, 163, based on the assumed meaning of *kpr* in Gen 6:14. See also Claus Westermann, Genesis (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 1/2:622. It should be noted, however, that the occurrence in Gen 6:14 is the only *qal*-form in the Old Testament. All the other occurrences are in the intensive forms. Because the *Qal* context appears to indicate some kind of "coating," that meaning has been assumed for the other forms. That argument leaves much to be desired, however, since it is a known fact that the intensive forms frequently have a meaning different from the basic *qal*. Cognate languages do not seem to support that idea either. For a thorough examination of the etymology and meaning of *kāpar* see Bernd Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen; Bernhard Lang, [?] "kippar," TWAT, 4:303-18; and Gillis Gerleman, Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie (Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1980), 11-37.

²See KBL, 452.

³See for instance William T. Hyde, "The Hebrew Word *kaphar* and Its Greek and English Equivalents in Relation to the Doctrine of the Atonement" (B.D. thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, MD, 1958) in which he shows how the idea of "cover" can fit and be defended in the respective passages. Three years earlier Albert R. Parker "successfully" did the same for the idea of "removing/wiping away" in his "Expiation and Propitiation in Relation to the Conciliation Concept of the Atonement" (B.D. thesis, SDA Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, MD, 1955). Methodologically, however, both of them would be classic examples of "eisegesis" rather than "exegesis." Neither of them made an inductive contextual study of the texts involved.

suit this context.¹ They even seem to be somewhat improbable. To "cover" Esau's face so he (Jacob) can see it makes no sense, and to "clear" it or "wipe [away the wrath?]" from it seems too literalistic. The context seems rather to suggest the idea of a process of restoration by means of some provisions. Jacob was interested in restoring his brother's favor towards himself by means of the gifts, so that he might be able to look him confidently in the face, hoping that Esau would then accept him. This becomes clearer in chap. 33 which describes their actual meeting. Vs. 10 reads:

Please, if now I have found favor in your sight, then take my present from my hand, for I see your face as one sees the face of God, and you have received me favorably (Emphasis added).

Some see the reference "I see your face as one sees the face of God" as referring to "the love and comfort that radiated from the presence of God";² Claus Westermann and others with him, see it rather as indicating that Jacob stands before Esau's face for the same purpose as he stands before God: to find mercy. He says

¹In fact, some cognate languages, such as Aramaic, seem to support the idea of "to make provision for" as one of the meanings of *kāpar*. In Sfire III:23 the noun *kpr* means "storage-house," "house of supply/provisions" (*KAI* 1:224, p. 45). The question is whether *kpr* in Hebrew cultic texts might also convey a similar idea.

²So Gerhard Ch. Aalders, *Genesis*, BSC, trans. William Heynen (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981), 2:150.

Wie man das Angesicht Gottes sieht, um vor ihm Gnade zu finden (vgl. Hi 33,26), so ist er vor das Angesicht seines Bruders getreten, um (^cl-kn) vor ihm Gnade, freundliche Annahme (rāṣāh) zu finden.¹

Still others see it as referring to the joy of meeting again with Esau, being like the appearance of a divinity in the sanctuary.²

Skinner³ and von Rad,⁴ however, see it as a reference to Jacob's experience at Peniel⁵ when he met God and wrestled with him. "I have seen God face to face, yet my life has been preserved,"⁶ is Jacob's reaction as he reflects on his conflict in the previous night. Now he has met his brother and the same has happened again, his life has been preserved even if he could only expect the opposite to happen. God's blessing and Esau's forgiving attitude have both really had life-preserving effects on Jacob, the receiver.

Esau confirms his forgiving attitude by suggesting that he join his brother on his travel, "Let us start our

¹Westermann, 1/2:641.

²Ehrlich, 1:169.

³John Skinner, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951), 414.

⁴von Rad, Genesis: A Commentary, trans. J. H. Marks (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 322.

⁵Gen 32:23-32.

⁶Gen 32:30.

journey and go, and I will go by your side (l'negdekā)."¹ His proposal and Jacob's polite response, as he declines the offer, indicate their attitude of care and concern for each other. It is well in line with the total thrust of the whole pericope which is the restoration of the relationship between the two brothers. Both remembered the wrongs of the past, but they decided not to let them interfere with their present and future relationship.

Num 6:25 contains the so-called Aaronic blessing. It comes at the end of a series of priestly instructions, mostly concerning the vows of the Nazirites. Structurally the blessing has an interesting feature in the Hebrew. It consists of three cola, each of which is made up of two semi-cola, the first one "long," the other "short." Put together, each successive colon is longer than the previous, so the end result is an intensifying, progressive parallelism, where the first line in Hebrew

¹Gen 33:12 (translation mine). Most translations translate this phrase as "go before," but the basic idea of *neged* is that of "presence." Ehrlich, quoting Rashi, has pointed out that the idea here is not "von dem gebraucht, was vornen ist, sondern von dem, was zur Seite parallel läuft" (Ehrlich 1:170). He admits, however, that this is a late meaning, but still classical. It is also supported by Jacob's suggestion in vs. 14 that Esau go before them rather than staying behind with the slow movement of Jacob's family. This request would not make much sense if Jacob had just rejected Esau's suggestion that he go before the group as suggested by most translations of vss. 12 and 13.

has three words; second line, five; and the third, seven words.¹

So entsteht durch zunehmende Zeilenlänge eine natürliche Steigerung, die nach drei Anläufen in dem überlangen Schlußsatz ihren Höhepunkt findet.²

All the cola are basically parallel in thought with the main thrust of the Hebrew "Tat-Folge Relation."³ The first semi-cola all emphasize God's action, whereas the second are "but the concrete manifestation of a beneficent divine state"⁴ which indicate their effect on the recipient man. It appears that the key word of this passage, *bārak*, dominates not only the first line but the

¹David N. Freedman has done a poetic analysis of the blessing in "The Aaronic Benediction (Numbers 6:24-26)," in No Famine in the Land: Studies in Honor of John L. McKenzie, ed. James W. Flanagan and Anita Weisbrod Robinson (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 35-48. With one minor vocalic emendation he suggests the following pattern:

1st colon: 7 + 5 = 12 syllables
2nd colon: 9 + 5 = 14 syllables
3rd colon: 9 + 7 = 16 syllables.

If accepted, this pattern offers an intervowel progression: the first semi-colon in cola 1 and 2 increases from 7 to 9 while the second remains the same (5 syllables), whereas the first semi-colon in cola 2 and 3 remains the same, while the second increases from 5 to 7.

²Klaus Seybold, Der aaronische Segen. Studien zu Numeri 6, 22-27 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 19.

³Ibid., 38.

⁴Michael Fishbane, "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing," JAOS 103:1 (1983):116. See also Patrick D. Miller, "The Blessing of God," Interpretation 29 (1975):243.

whole formula.¹ "The Lord bless you, and keep you" is actually the all-inclusive blessing. "Wenn Gott segnet, dann erbieht er . . . nicht nur ein Segenwort sondern eine Tat . . . die mit Fruchtbarkeit, Lebenskraft, Glück, Gedeihen identisch ist."² The parallel expressions in cola 2 and 3 merely explicate its meaning while they, at the same time, narrow it down, focusing it on the final word, *šālôm*. This concept is also found in parallel expressions such as *yhwh y'ḇārēk ʔet-ʿammô ḇaššālôm* "may the Lord bless his people with peace."³ The Aaronic blessing concretizes God's blessing to "keeping": "may he keep you (*w'yišm'rekā*)." God's protective care is found in many places in the Old Testament and is often likened to that of a shepherd caring for his flock.⁴

"The Lord make his face shine upon you and be gracious unto you." The "enlightened face" of a divine being was, in Ancient Near Eastern circles, seen as an evidence of friendliness, attention, and favor of a

¹Ibid., 37.

²Joseph Reindl, Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments (Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1970), 128.

³Ps 29:11. Other parallels include Ps 134:3; and 115:12.

⁴See for instance Ps 121:5-8 where the Lord is presented as the *šômer* who *šāmar* his people from both physical and spiritual dangers. See also Jer 31:10.

superior toward someone inferior.¹ Often it is almost synonymous with *rāṣôn* "pleasing, favorable."² An interesting parallel is found in a prayer to Iṣtar:

*damqāti ināki libšā elīja ina būnīki namrūti kīniš
naplisinni jāši*

Deine gütigen Augen mögen sich auf mich richten, mit deinem leuchtenden Antlitz blicke mich freundlich an.³

The light of God's face is thus simply an illuminous expression for his grace or mercy which he shows towards his people. It is "nirgends eine nur allgemein gnädige Gesinnung besagt, sondern immer den greifbaren Gnadenerweis oder die erwartete tatkräftige Hilfe."⁴ It is a well-accepted fact of life that

von einem, dessen Antlitz leuchtet, der also froh und glücklich ist, ist es leichter eine Gnade zu erlangen,

¹Cf. Marjo C. A. Korpel, "The Poetic Structure of the Priestly Blessing" *JSOT* 45 (1989):6.

²So for instance Ps 44:3, last part, "Thy right hand, and Thine arm, and the light of Thy presence, for Thou didst favor them."

³Quoted Oswald Lorenz, "Altorientalischer Hintergrund sowie inner- und nachbiblische Entwicklung des aaronitischen Segens (Num 6,24-26)" *UF* 10 (1978):117. Friedrich Nötscher, "Das Angesicht Gottes schauen" nach biblischer und babylonischer Auffassung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969), 13, points out that in Akkadian the ideogram for *damqu* "gnädig" is composed of the sign *igi* (*pānu*) "eye, face" and *lāh* "bright, shining." Compare also an expression by Assurbanipal: "Ich sah ihn freundlich an und richtete auf ihn mein gnädiges Antlitz."

⁴Reindl, 129. See also Korpel, 6, who points out that the light of the face of God can save Israel (Ps 44:4) and people can only be happy if they can walk in that light (Ps 89:16).

als von einem, der finster blickt, also betrübt und zornig ist . . . Seinen Antlitz über einen anderen leuchten lassen, heißt darum gnädig, huldvoll, nachsichtig sein, so daß er keine Furcht zu haben braucht.¹

The final line of the benediction contains two *hapax legomena*, neither of which has an exact parallel. The first of these is the expression *nāšāʔ pānim ʔēl*. It occurs only here with a divine subject, but when used with a human subject, it usually has the sense of literally looking up or metaphorically to face someone with confidence.² In the context of Num 6:26 it clearly denotes a favorable attitude of a superior towards someone inferior.

This concept is supported by Mesopotamian texts from the ninth and sixth centuries B.C., one of which describes how the goddess Gula,

pa-ni-šu tu-saḥ-ḥi-ram-ma ina bu-ni-šú nam-ru-ti ki-niṣ tap-pal-sa-an-ni-ma túš-ri-im-mi ra-am-ma.

¹Nötscher, 12-13.

²In 2 Kgs 9:32 it is used about Jehu turning his face upward, "looking up," to the window where Jezebel was standing. In 2 Sam 2:22 Abner refrains from killing Asahel, for, he said "How could I lift up my face (*ʔeššāʔ pānay*) to your brother Joab?" meaning: facing him with a good conscience. In Job 22:26 Eliphaz states that if Job returns to the Lord he will be restored and be able to "lift up [your] face (*wʔtiššāʔ . . . pānēkā*) to God." In 1 Sam 25 it is associated with the idea of forgiveness. Vs. 28 tells about Abigail asking David to "Please, forgive the transgression (*šāʔ-nāʔ lʔpešaʔ*) of your maidservant." In his response David claims, "I have shown you favor (*wāʔeššāʔ pānāyik*)" (vs. 35).

turned her countenance toward me (viz, Nabuna²id); with her shining face she faithfully looked at me and actually caused (him; i.e., Marduk) to show mercy.¹

In contrast to "letting the face fall" which indicates anger² or displeasure,³ God's lifting his face towards someone will result in his granting peace. The expression *šim šālôm* is only found once more in the Old Testament⁴ whereas the parallel word-pair *nāšā² pānīm* // *šim šālôm* is only found here. The usual expression is *‘āsāh šālôm⁵* or *nāṭan šālôm⁶*. The basic meaning of *šim* is "determine, fix,"⁷ in contrast to the other two expressions, *nāṭan* and *‘āsāh*, which are more general terms, often indicating the inception of an event whereas *šim* has more of a durative aspect, the establishment of a durative action (here: peace). Seybold⁸ points out, in accordance with Reindl,⁹ that this text is actually a

¹Quoted in Michael Fishbane, 117. Korpel, 6, points out that in Babylonian *pana našu* means "to care for."

²Jer 3:12.

³Gen 4:6.

⁴Ps 147:14.

⁵Found five times in the Old Testament: Josh 9:15, Isa 27:5 (2x); 45:7; and Job 25:2.

⁶Lev 26:6 and Hag 2:9.

⁷See KBL, 920.

⁸Seybold, 40; also note 6.

⁹Reindl, 130.

prayer that God may determine or appoint peace as the destiny of the people, with the emphasis on peace as something enduring rather than just some momentary lull in troublous times.

Šālôm has been defined as "freedom from all disaster,"¹ "good health, prosperity, happiness, both this worldly well-being and a right relationship with God,"² "state of wholeness,"³ "being complete so that nothing is missing . . . includ[ing] everything an individual or community needs for well-being and prosperity,"⁴ "das unfassendste Heilsgut, der Inbegriff vollkommensten Glückes,"⁵ and "the perfect peace or condition where all things function in harmony and nothing is wanting."⁶

The thrust of the Aaronic blessing is thus a plea that God may show his favorable attitude toward his people through active protection and unmerited assistance and

¹G. B. Gray, 73.

²John Sturdy, Numbers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 55.

³M. Noth, Numbers, A Commentary, OTL, trans., J. D. Martin (London: SCM Press, 1968), 59.

⁴Arie Noordtzij, Numbers, BSC, trans. Ed. van der Maas (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 69. See also Reindl, 130.

⁵Reindl, 130.

⁶A. Murtonen, "The Use and Meaning of the Words *l'pārēk* and *b'rākā* in the Old Testament," VT 9 (1959):162.

provide them with whatever is needed for maintenance of a harmonious, happy life.¹

This same concept of favor is also present in Gen 19:21 where Lot is pleading with God that he and his daughters need not flee any farther than Zoar. God responds by saying, "I have favored you (*nāšā²tī pānēkā*) also in this thing." The "also," *gam*, does not imply that this is one of many of Lot's requests which God is going to answer,² but rather that God has again in this matter shown his favorable attitude toward Lot. Earlier his angels had led Lot, his wife, and daughters out of the doomed city of Sodom. This agrees with Lot's admission in Gen 19:19 that he had already found favor before the Lord. Now the Lord adds another favor. The first was unsolicited; the second upon request.

The two texts, Num 6:25 and Gen 19:21, use expressions which are morphologically, syntactically, and semantically similar but with a somewhat different intent.

¹This idea is apparently also present in Ps 4:6-8 even though there is an ongoing discussion among scholars about the meaning of *nāsāh*. In general, however, most commentators do not comment on this issue but appear to accept it as a variant (spelling?) of *nāšā²*. The context combines the idea of "lifting up(?) the light of his countenance" which will result in "gladness in my heart, peace and safety" which is apparently a paraphrase of the Aaronic blessing in Num 6.

²So Westermann, 1/2:371-2, who claims that "the misplacement" of this passage indicates that it is a later addition. Such explanation is, however, not warranted by the text.

Both use the expression *nāšā¹ pānīm*, expressing the idea of beneficence and/or favor towards the receiver. The first one refers to the "lifting" of the subject's own face; the latter, that of the recipient of the action. In both cases, however, the effect is the same: a favorable attitude by the subject toward the recipient.

In one of the passages in this category, Deut 28:50, the expression *nāšā¹ pānīm* is used in the more general sense of "showing respect."¹ The statement is a prophetic warning about the coming of a nation having a "fierce countenance" which will neither respect/be favorable to (*lō² nāšā¹ pānīm*) the old nor favor (*yāḥon*) the young (i.e., it will completely disregard everyone's basic needs and rights "until they have caused you to perish").²

The last two passages, Deut 10:17 and Lev 19:15, also deal with a certain aspect of "favorable attitude" towards someone. This time, however, the sense implied is restricted to the idea of favoring someone over against someone else (i.e., taking sides). Both these passages are in the negative. Deut 10:17 sets the stage by referring to God as an example of one who does not favor one over another. This idea is not brought out by the

¹This idea is also found in several texts outside of the Pentateuch: 2 Kgs 3:14; 5:1; Isa 3:3; 9:1; and Lam 4:16.

²Deut 28:51.

expression itself, but rather by the context which parallels the expression *nāšāʾ pānīm* with "not taking bribe" (*loʿ yiqqah šohād*), and explains it further by stating that God "executes justice for the orphans and widows" and provides the alien with food and clothing.¹

On the surface, it may appear that this presents a contradiction. The initial phrase states that God does not *nāšāʾ pānīm*, which usually indicates "showing favorable attitude" towards someone, but then it is expanded to indicate how he does take care of the needy. The thrust of the context indicates, however, that God will not be bought to show favor to someone "meritorious" at the expense of a less favored one. God is not only favorable towards those who may think they merit it, his care is needs-oriented rather than status-oriented.

Based on this trait in God's character, his people are commanded not to let any status in society, be it high or low, influence their sense of justice. "You shall do no injustice in judgment; "You shall not be partial to the poor (*loʿ-tiššāʾ p'nē-dāl*) nor defer to the great (*w'loʿ tehdaṛ p'nē gādōl*), but you are to judge your neighbor fairly."² This stipulation comes within a series of laws dealing with social order. Vs. 13 prohibits oppression

¹Deut 20:17-18.

²Lev 19:15.

and theft and requires prompt payment of wages; it also prohibits taking advantage of those who are handicapped, thus making life difficult for them. Then there are the stipulations that no injustice be done in judgment, whether the subject be rich or poor. Taken by themselves, these stipulations may appear to contradict other passages in the Bible which speak critically of those who do not show favor to certain classes.¹ In this context, however, it is clear that the emphasis is on the importance of judicial equality. The judge is not to regard the status of those being judged. All are to be equal before the law, and the same law is to be applied to all persons.² The poor should not be favored because they are poor, neither are the powerful to receive preferential treatment on account of their power or wealth.³

¹See for instance Deut 28:50; also the emphasis on social justice in the prophets such as Amos.

²Cf. Exod 23:2-8; Deut 16:19-20; Zech 8:16. See also Abram Menes, Die vorexilischen Gesetze Israels, BZAW 50 (Giessen: Verlag von Alfred Töpelmann, 1928), 34-36; and A. Noordtzij, Leviticus, BSC, trans. Raymond Togtman (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982), 198. Similar concerns are also found in Ps 82:2--"How long will you judge unjustly, and show partiality to the wicked (*p'nē r'sā'im tiš'û*)?"--and in Mal 2:9--"So I also have made you despised and abased before all people, just as you are not keeping My ways, but are showing partiality (*noš'im pānim*) in the instruction."

³Ehrlich, 2:64, wants to emend *tiššā'* with *tāsēb* in agreement with 1 Kgs 2:16,17,20, meaning "You shall not turn the poor away." He claims that the contrast between *dāl* and *gādōl* requires it. That emendation seems, however, completely unjustified. The text is perfectly

"Head" as Object

In two Pentateuchal passages where *nāšāʔ* is used with "head" as object, the emphasis appears to be on attitude or relationship rather than a literal lifting per se.¹ Both of these passages are within the same narrative, the early part of the story of Joseph, and the subject in both is man.² The author makes an interesting play on words in this passage between the literal use and the metaphoric.

Data

Gen 40:13	Within three more days Pharaoh <u>will lift up your head</u> (<i>yīššāʔ</i> . . . <i>ʔet-roʔšekā</i>) and <u>restore you</u> (<i>wahʔšībkā</i>) to your office. . . .
[Gen 40:19 ³]	[Within three more days Pharaoh <u>will lift up your head from you</u> (<i>yīššāʔ</i> . . . <i>ʔet-roʔškā mēʔālēkā</i>) and will hang you (<i>wʔtālāh ʔōtkā</i>) on a tree.]

clear as it stands, and the context does not seem to be contrasting the two classes but rather putting them on an equal footing as far as the law and justice is concerned.

¹See pages 154-58 above where the literal meaning of this expression is discussed.

²A third passage in which a literal meaning of *nāšāʔ* is employed is included here for the sake of continuity since it is used within the same pericope and is quite closely tied to the other two. It is also important as a contrast and comparison for the other two.

³This passage does not really belong in this category since it deals with a literal meaning of *nāšāʔ*. It is, however listed here for comparison and completeness.

Gen 40:20 Thus it came about on the third day
 . . . that he . . . lifted up the
 head (wayyiśśā^ʔ ʔet-ro^ʔš) of the
 chief cup-bearer and the head
 (w^ʔet-ro^ʔš) of the chief baker
 among his servants.

Comments

The story is familiar. As Joseph interprets the dreams of the butler and baker he makes an interesting and important play on different meanings of nāsā^ʔ. To the butler he says, "Within three more days Pharaoh will lift up your head and restore you to your office (yiśśā^ʔ . . . ʔet-ro^ʔšekā wah^ʔšībkā ʿal-kannekā)." His response to the baker is structurally parallel, but has an ironic, fateful twist to it; "within three more days Pharaoh will lift up your head from you and hang you upon a tree (yiśśā^ʔ . . . ʔet-ro^ʔškā mē^ʿālēkā w^ʔtālāh ʔōtkā ʿal-ʿēš)." In fact, the only real structural difference between these two statements is the inclusion of the prepositional phrase mē^ʿālēkā in the latter. The key phrase in both responses is the same: yiśśā^ʔ par^ʿoh ʔet-ro^ʔškā "Pharaoh will lift up your head." The fact that the author feels a need to qualify the expression in both cases indicates the neutrality of the expression itself. Only the context fills it with meaning. This is further exemplified in vss. 20-22,

On the third day . . . he lifted up the head
 (wayyiśśā^ʔ ʔet-ro^ʔš) of the chief cup-bearer and the
 head (w^ʔet-ro^ʔš) of the chief baker . . . and he

restored the chief cup-bearer to his office . . . but he hanged the chief baker, just as Joseph had interpreted to them.

Some scholars see the expression *nāšāʾ roʾš* as a technical term for "taking up a case for review";¹ others see it as a technical expression for "release from prison."² Still others take a rather superficial view of this expression, that it "refers to [the act of] being raised up from a position of humiliation and dishonor to a position of honor and acceptance."³ All of these, however, seem to miss the real thrust of the passage by restricting the phrase to that of a technical expression. The author appears to make use of the neutrality of the expression in order to bring out the pun and let the context bring out the intent in each case. Von Rad has correctly pointed out that

this expression goes back ultimately to an actual custom in an audience: the petitioner stands or kneels

¹Ehrlich, 1:201-2. He explains that some time after a crime was committed the ruler might have the "main points" (*roʾš*) (or: "the sum of the matter" cf. Ps 119:160) of the case brought (*nāšāʾ*) to his attention in order to review it. At that time a previous judgment might be overturned. He bases this argument only on this passage and Jer 52:31, which refers to the release of king Jehoiachin during the Babylonian Exile. See also Anthony Phillips, Ancient Israel's Criminal Law (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970), 27; and Ephraim A. Speiser, "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and Israel" BASOR 149 (1958):21.

²So J. Skinner, 462; cf. also 2 Kgs 25:27; and Jer 52:31.

³Aalders, 2:208.

with bowed head while the one on the throne takes him under the chin and raises his head.¹

In that sense it is somewhat parallel to *nāšāʾ pānīm* "being favorable towards," but it goes apparently further. On both occasions where this expression is used in this sense in the Old Testament,² it implies not only a favorable attitude but also a restoration to honor. The butler was restored to his original post and place in society, and so was king Jehoiachin during the exile.

"Place" as Object

In two passages in the Pentateuch "place" is the object of *nāšāʾ*. Both of them are a part of the same pericope, and even the same verbal exchange between God and Abraham, with God as the subject.

Data

Gen 18:24	Wilt thou Indeed sweep it away and <u>not spare the place</u> (<i>wʾloʾ-tiššāʾ lammāqôm</i>) for the sake of the fifty righteous who are in it?
Gen 18:26	If I find in Sodom fifty right-eous within the city, then <u>I will spare the whole place</u> (<i>wʾnāšāʾtī lʾkol-hammāqôm</i>) on their account.

¹von Rad, Genesis, 367. See also appendix D.

²Here in the Pentateuch and 2 Kgs 25:27 (a parallel passage is found in Jer 52:31).

Comments

Abraham is pleading for the life of the inhabitants in Sodom and Gomorrah, following God's proclamation of their doom. It is clear from the context that "place" is used metonymously for the people who lived inside the city boundaries. It was the people of these cities who were wicked, not the places themselves. So it was also the people who were about to be punished. For this reason it is justifiable to include it in this context. Dillmann¹ suggests an emendation of the text by adding 'āwôn or peša^c as objects for nāšā³, thus reading "take away (or: forgive) the wickedness/rebellion of the place for the sake of the fifty righteous."² The context, however, does not demand such emendation. Abraham does not appear to be asking forgiveness for the wrongs of the people, as Moses did at a later time;³ rather he appears to be concerned about the survival of those who lived in the city, especially his relatives. The question is not so much about "forgiveness" of sins as the avoidance of

¹August Dillmann, Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded, trans. William B. Stevenson (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897), 2:100 based on texts such as Num 14:19; Isa 2:9; and Hos 1:6.

²This reading is also suggested by Keil and Delitzsch, 1:231.

³Cf. Moses' intercession in Exod 31:32 and Num 14:19.

their consequences and caring concern for those who lived in these cities.¹

Westermann² has pointed out that what is involved here is "nothing more than [a request] to annul the decision to destroy." In the light of other usages of *nāšā*³, however, more is clearly involved than simply a decision for some non-action. Most usages of *nāšā*³ are action-filled for the benefit of the receiver. God's promise to *nāšā*³ the place apparently implies his willingness to be favorable towards the place and even to help it prosper on account of the presence of the righteous ones in the city.³

Unspecified Object

The last passage in the category of interpersonal relations, Gen 4:7, is problematic, and as such has invited interpretations which are almost as numerous as their proponents are many. The history of its interpretation goes back to the ancient versions and

¹This usage fits very well with similar usages in Akkadian, a language and culture with which Abraham would have been well acquainted from his years of growing up in Ur. On this meaning in Akkadian, see pages 59-60 above.

²Westermann, 1/2, 355.

³The positive intent of *nāšā*³ is well illustrated by its use in the expression "to deal justly." The context implies that for the many unrighteous ones to benefit from the presence of a few righteous ones would be "to deal justly," whereas for the few righteous in the cities to suffer because of the unrighteous, would not be just.

traditions. The reason is that the text is very cryptic in style and presents both syntactical and morphological anomalies. All of these leave it wide open to speculation.

Data

Gen 4:7 If you do well, will not your
 countenance be lifted up (š'ēṭ).
 And if you do not do well, sin is
 crouching at the door; and its
 desire is for you, but you must
 master it.

Comments

Procksch has called this text "the most obscure verse in Genesis,"¹ and Westermann claims that no satisfactory explanation of these two verses (6 and 7) has been proposed as yet.²

There are four major syntactical problems: (1) š'ēṭ is apparently a qal infinitive and forms by itself an unattached apodosis for the conditional clause beginning with ʾim . . . tēṭib; (2) the function of the prefixed preposition in lappetaḥ; (3) the gender disagreement between ḥaṭṭāʾt (feminine singular) and robēs (masculine singular), and finally (4) the final word bō is

¹Procksch, quoted in Gordon J. Wenham, Genesis 1-15, Word Bible Commentary (Waco: Word Books Publishers, 1987), 1:104.

²Westermann, 1/1:406.

masculine singular, whereas the assumed antecedent $\text{ḥaṭṭā}^{\text{ṣ}}$ is feminine.

It is beyond the scope of this research to attempt to find a solution to these complex problems,¹ but despite them, the general meaning seems to be relatively clear. Cain's attitude in vs. 5 is wrong, and God warns him of the danger if he does not change. For our purposes the crucial word is $\text{ś}^{\text{ṣ}}\text{ēṭ}$. It has been taken as a noun for (1) forgiveness in general,² (2) God's acceptance of Cain and his offering,³ (3) lifting up of Cain's spirit as opposed to his depression,⁴ and (4) literal straightening up of Cain's posture in contrast to the crouching of sin.⁵ Even though all of these positions are theoretically possible in light of the text, it seems that the first two are most in line with the immediate context and the general usage of $\text{nāśā}^{\text{ṣ}}$.

Vs. 5 indicates that Cain's face "fell" and he became angry when he realized that Abel's sacrifice was

¹For a discussion of the issues involved and relevant literature see Westermann, 1/1:406-410; G. J. Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 92, 104-6; Aalders, 122-3; and J. Skinner, 106-7 (footnote).

²Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 93, 105.

³So Calvin, König, and Kidner, quoted in Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 105.

⁴So Speiser, Keil and Delitzsch, von Rad, and Westermann (also quoted in Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 105).

⁵So Cassuto, quoted in Wenham, Genesis 1-15, 105.

acceptable to the Lord, whereas his own was not. The Lord then gives Cain an opportunity to assess the situation and get to the root of the problem. In the process the Lord analyzes the problem and places it squarely before Cain in four steps:

1. Introduction--Why are you angry? Why is your face "fallen?"
2. General statement--If you do well [there is] $\acute{s}^{\text{c}}\acute{e}\underline{t}$.
3. Problem--If you do not do well [there is a problem awaiting]. Sin *robēš* at the door, waiting to enter. "It" desires you.
4. Admonition--you must master "it."

In light of the structural flow of the whole passage it seems most natural to see $\acute{s}^{\text{c}}\acute{e}\underline{t}$ in contrast to *nāpal* in the previous verse. Cain was angry and his face was "fallen" because of God's non-acceptance of him and his sacrifice, but Cain was aware that the wrong was on his part. God confirms that if Cain was right, or made things right, there was no need for him to go around with a "fallen" face; a $\acute{s}^{\text{c}}\acute{e}\underline{t}$ action was available to him, and his face could be lifted up (cf. *nāšā^c pānīm* = acceptance). An ongoing wrong-action, however, would prepare the way for a greater evil--the control of sin over Cain, but he must take control of his life, and by mastering the

"enemy" he would avail himself of the state of acceptance¹ being reflected in his physical posture.

Summary

In certain contexts *nāšā*⁷ implies an attitude of loving concern for and an intimate relationship either between God and man or between persons. God is seen as One who cares for his people, like a father who carries his child or an eagle caring for her young. This implies intimacy and a caring concern for their needs. God also invites leaders to participate in this caring concern for the people by sharing in their situation, meeting their needs and providing for their necessities. This supportive attitude is at times equated with the concept of forgiveness. The wrong may not be forgotten nor is there necessarily a release from the immediate conse-

¹This appears to be more in line with the general usage of the expressions *nāpal pānīm* and *nāšā*⁷ *pānīm* than simply considering them as indicating the physical downcast eyes and uplifted face (so Aalders, 1:122, and von Rad, *Genesis*, 101). As to the problematic gender disagreement between *ḥaṭṭā*⁷_ṭ and *roḇēš*, both Ehrlich (1:20) and von Rad (101) suggest the same solution: to look upon the final taw of *ḥaṭṭā*⁷_ṭ be taken as the initial taw of *roḇēš*, reading *tirbaš* which may be either third person, feminine singular, agreeing with *ḥaṭṭā*⁷, meaning "sin will lie in wait" (von Rad), or as second masculine singular, which together with the meaning "opportunity" for *pth* (cf. Hos 2:17) Ehrlich reads: "If not . . . you will lie under (or "be crushed under" cf. Exod 23:5) the [first] opportunity for sin" (p. 21). This latter suggestion seems very strained and requires several adjustments and emendations. Von Rad's suggestion appears much more viable.

quences, but neither is it any longer permitted to adversely affect the relationship between the wronged and the wrongdoer.

The expressions *nāšā³ pānīm*, usually, and *nāšā³ ro³š*, sometimes have the connotation of acceptance or "be favorable towards." It is an outward sign of an approved friendship, in spite of eventual wrongs, and may at times be seen as parallel with the process of "atonement" (*kpr*). This process is, however, not automatic. It calls for co-operation. Acceptance may be made available, but it only benefits the wrongdoer if he submits to its stipulations.

Nāšā³-forgiveness is not just a matter of some ceremonial rubber-stamping, rather it represents a sustained, favorable attitude. In reality, in the context of interpersonal relations, *nāšā³* takes persons as objects which are carried by a caring individual who is concerned about their well-being, shows them favor, and accepts them in spite of their wrongdoings.

The question which now remains is how, or if, this concept fits in with the general meaning of *nāšā³*, and whether it can be justified in the light of other more traditional words for forgiveness.

CHAPTER VII

nāšā AND FORGIVENESS

Is the concept of "forgiveness" really present within the semantic range of *nāšā*? Present research has shown that it is generally considered to be based on a derived meaning of *nāšā* rather than being one of its "basic" meanings.¹ Therefore, the question may arise whether that meaning is exegetically justified. As traditionally defined, forgiveness is usually associated with a repairing of shortcomings, either in the context of meeting a set standard or in relationships.²

Present research has brought to light three areas within which this concept is most likely to occur in the context of *nāšā*. The first category is linguistic. It is generally accepted that the terms *kpr* (piel) and *sālah*

¹Chap. 1 pointed out that practically all lexica placed "forgive" at the end of a long list of meanings, almost as an afterthought.

²Cf. the following definition by Bernhard Lang, "[9] *kippar*," *TWAT* (1984), 4:307: "Wenn ein positives oder neutrales Verhältnis zwischen zwei Gruppen oder Partnern durch Verbrechen, Fehler oder Sünde gestört wird, entsteht eine Spannung; diese muß . . . neutralisiert und aufgehoben werden, so daß die gewöhnliche Ordnung wiederhergestellt ist."

are in a sense *termini technici* for forgiveness in the Pentateuch, and other similar terms, such as *ksh* (piel) and *rāpāh*, are frequently used in that sense outside that corpus.¹ The second category is theological. The sanctuary service in general, and the sacrifices in particular, dealt with the sin-problem in the Old Testament, a process involving forgiveness.² Finally, there are certain social situations within which some reconciling actions are called for.³ The question is now how the various meanings of *nāšā*³ fit into the picture.

Linguistic Basis

*Nāšā*³ and "*kpr*"

In three texts within the Pentateuch, *nāšā*³ is used in parallel with *kpr* (piel), Gen 32:20; Exod 32:30, and Lev 10:17. In the first, Jacob is returning from his "exile" after twenty years of servitude.⁴ As he approaches Canaan he knows he will have to face his

¹See Helmer Ringgren, "𐤍𐤏𐤔 *kāsāh*," TWAT (1984), 4:272-77, and Hans Joachim Stoebe, "𐤍𐤏𐤔 *rāpāh*," THAT (1976), 2:808.

²Cf. William Dyrness, Themes in Old Testament Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1979), 157-58; and Elmer A. Martens, God's Design (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981), 52-59.

³Cf. the experience of the brothers of Joseph in Gen 50:15-21.

⁴Gen 31:41.

brother Esau with whom he had driven a hard bargain¹ and finally cheated out of his inheritance.² There was clearly a tension in their relationship which made Jacob quite apprehensive as he prepared to meet his brother. In the process he planned to "kpr" his brother's "face" by means of the gifts which he sent ahead of him in the hope that he might then see his brother's "face" and he (Esau) would then (hopefully) accept (nāšā³) Jacob's "face."³

It is clear that in this context the process of "kpr" is seen to be a means of obtaining nāšā³. The two terms are apparently not quite parallel here, even though their purpose is basically the same: to obtain favor with Esau and restore the relationship with him.⁴ Even though "kpr" is usually only translated "forgive" when God is the subject, it is always associated with the restorative process between estranged individuals or between God and man.⁵

This is also the case following the "golden-calf" experience in Exod 32. A few weeks earlier the people had entered into a covenant with God, in which they

¹See Gen 25:30-34.

²Gen 27.

³Gen 32:20.

⁴Cf. Gen 33:8,10.

⁵See Lang, 307.

acknowledged that he had delivered them out of Egypt and they would therefore be loyal to him.¹ As Moses was delayed on the mountain the people grew tired of waiting for him and decided to turn their worship and loyalty over to a god of their own choice--a god who, they claimed, had brought them out of Egypt.² By that action they, in fact, rescinded the covenant terms, which demanded absolute loyalty to the sovereign. God was, therefore, no longer "duty-bound" to protect the nation. It was within the framework of the covenant that God had even the full "right" to appear to them as an enemy, a destroyer.³

At this point Moses decided to intervene on the people's behalf, and he said to the people,

You yourselves have committed a great sin ($h^a\dot{t}a^{\text{b}}tem$ $h^a\dot{t}a^{\text{b}}ah$ $g^{\text{d}}olāh$); and now I am going up to the Lord, perhaps I can make atonement ($^{\text{b}}kapp'rāh$) for your sin.⁴

As he returned to the Lord he confessed the people's wrongdoing and asked God to forgive ($nāśā^{\text{b}}$) their sin.⁵ Thus, making atonement (kpr) for their sin and forgiving

¹See Exod 19:8 and 20:2, 3.

²Exod 32:8.

³Cf. the curses in ancient treaties such as Sfire I and others. Dennis J. McCarthy has also pointed out in his Treaty and Covenant (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 137 that whoever was not an ally or a vassal was considered an enemy.

⁴Exod 32:30.

⁵Exod 32:32.

(nāšā²) their sin are seen as parallels, but not necessarily synonymous. But the "kpr"-process is again presented as a means of obtaining nāšā²-forgiveness. In the story of Jacob it was obtained by means of a generous gift to the "superior"; in this case Moses brings no gift, but instead he offers himself to suffer the consequences of the people's wrongdoing--to be cut off from God.¹ Basically, what Moses is suggesting to God is, "Either you, God, nāšā² the wrongs of the people [i.e. forgive them] or let me nāšā² them and suffer the consequences [i.e. die]."² The effect for the people would be the same. In both cases they would be released from the immediate consequences of their attitude and actions, but only God's act of nāšā² would provide them with real forgiveness.

These two passages both show that the process of "kpr" does not necessarily require blood sacrifices to be effective, even though that was generally the rule.³ In

¹Exod 32:32.

²Cf. also chap. 5 above where it is pointed out that to nāšā² wrongdoings will ultimately lead to the death of the bearer.

³On the general meaning of kpr see Bernd Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. Even though in most cases kpr involved blood sacrifices, there were several instances where that was not so. But, all kpr processes demanded something of value to be presented; cf. Gudmundur Olafsson, "The Use of Kaphar in the Pentateuch" (Unpublished term paper, Andrews University, 1983).

one sense, however, it can be said that in the Exodus passage there was a sacrifice involved, since Moses offered himself in an effort to save the people. His was a symbolic/real offer of life similar to the sacrifices in the sanctuary. It was substitution in line with Lev 17:11, where one life is substituted for another--one obtains life by means of another's death. In his response God promised to continue to lead the people by his angel,¹ even though the people had to suffer the immediate consequences of their wrong actions.

Freedman and Willoughby have pointed out in this connection that "Gott zwar nicht die Konsequenzen für den Sünder aufhebt, sie aber auch nicht prolongiert. Er vergibt, aber verstößt nicht."² This is so because the *nāšāʾ*-process is not primarily concerned with individual wrongdoings; it involves, rather, a general attitude of patience and endurance.³ In spite of the people's wrongdoing God was willing to go with them and renew the covenant with them.⁴ This meant restoring them as his possession,⁵ and driving out their enemies before them.⁶

¹See Exod 32:34.

²Freedman and Willoughby, "*nāšāʾ*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:638.

³*Ibid.*

⁴See Exod 34:10-28.

⁵Exod 34:9.

God's *nāšā*²-forgiveness meant acceptance of the people without necessarily approving their actions.

The third passage is found in Lev 10:17 in the context of the sanctuary service. Some of the sin-offerings were to be eaten by the priest in the holy place.¹ Once, when the sons of Aaron had failed to do so, Moses rebuked them saying, "He [God] gave it to you to bear away (*nāšā*²) the guilt (^c*wōn*) of the congregation, to make atonement (*kpr*) for them before the Lord."² In this passage "*kpr*" and *nāšā*² are apparently synonymous. There is nothing in the context that subordinates one to the other. *Nāšā*² could also be translated "forgive" in this context. These theologically distinct aspects of *nāšā*² are not distinguished in Hebrew.³ Whereas "*kpr*" is seen as a process leading to *nāšā*² in Gen 32 and Exod 32, in Lev 10 they appear to be parallel or even synonymous.

²See Exod 34:11, 24.

¹See Lev 6:24-30. Some scholars, such as David P. Wright, 133, and Jacob Milgrom "Two Kinds of *ḥaṭṭā*²*t*" VT 26 (1976):333-4, see it, however, as a payment to the priest for bearing the responsibility for performing the purgatory rites. Wright points out, though, that Milgrom apparently no longer is so sure, and eating the *ḥaṭṭā*²*t* may actually be a means of disposal.

²Lev 10:17.

³See Knierim, 52, 220. "Einmal muß der Mensch seinen *ḥet*² selbst tragen (und sterben), das andere Mal trägt Jähwe oder ein anderer Mensch den *ḥet*² des Menschen weg, und der Täter lebt. Im letzteren Falle übersetzen wir herkömmlich: vergeben. Beidemal aber ist die hebräische Wendung die gleiche."

If there is any difference at all *nāšā*³ may be seen as a process leading to "kpr." In the light of the other two passages it seems to indicate that the sequence *nāšā*³-*"kpr"/"kpr"-nāšā*³ at times was interchangeable. The important point for the present study is, however, the fact that *nāšā*³ is clearly parallel with "kpr" in the process of restoration and/or forgiveness.¹

*Nāšā*³ and *sālah*

The terms *nāšā*³ and *sālah* are placed in parallel two times in the Pentateuch: in Exod 34:7,9 and Num 14:18-20. Both are in the context of Moses' mediating for the wrongdoings of the people. The former follows the making of the covenant and the latter is in the context of the people's receiving the report of the spies. As God revealed to Moses his nature, Moses "made haste to bow low toward the earth and worship" (Exod 34:8) and plead with God to forgive (*sālah*) the iniquity and sin of the people (vs. 9). This is clearly a reference to the parallel expression in the theophany where God revealed himself as "the Lord . . . who forgives (*nošē*³) iniquity, transgression and sin." In this passage Moses pleads with

¹The three passages being considered here are often assigned to three different sources: Gen 32:20 (E), Exod 32:30 (J), and Lev 10:17 (P). In spite of that, they appear to be quite uniform, both theologically and structurally.

God that he "forgive (*sālaḥ*) our iniquity and our sin."¹

The basic meaning of *sālaḥ* may not be entirely clear,² but it is usually seen as being a *terminus technicus* for forgiveness, as it is only used in that sense and has only God as subject. In the present context there is no apparent difference between *sālaḥ* and *nāšā*³, except that *sālaḥ* seems to be a specific application of the more general *nāšā* in a given situation. This becomes evident as Moses explains what he expects from God's *sālaḥ*: "take us as your possession (*ūn'ḥaltānū*).\" Moses is actually requesting God to accept the people, but acceptance is exactly one of the main concepts of *nāšā* when used in interpersonal relations.³ In his response God promises to establish a covenant with the people in order to formalize the relationship between himself and the people (vss. 10-17), a fact which indicates that the *nāšā* process involves a relationship.

The other passage in which *sālaḥ* and *nāšā* are used in parallel, Num 14:18-20, is based on the same theophany. As the people heard the report of the ten spies upon their return from Canaan they began to grumble,

¹Targum Onkelos and Peshitta translate both of these terms with the root *šbwq* in these passages.

²Cf. J. Hausmann, "𐤒𐤔𐤁 *sālaḥ*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:860-1.

³See chapter 6 above.

wishing to abort the exodus and return to Egypt.¹ Thereby, they in effect rejected God's leadership and decided to elect a new leader to bring them back to the land of Egypt. By that suggestion they implied that God's plan of salvation was a total failure, as far as they were concerned. The synonymous, parallel use of *nāšāʾ*² and *sālah* in this passage is quite significant. Because God is a forgiver of iniquity (*nošēʾ ʿāwôn*)² Moses asks him to forgive the iniquity (*sālah laʿwôn*) of the people,³ as he has forgiven/carried them (*nāšāʾ tāh lāʿām*) from Egypt onward;⁴ to which God replies that he has already forgiven (*sālah*).⁵

Both God's forgiving (*nāšāʾ*) and Moses' request for forgiveness (*sālah*) are grounded in God's *ḥesed* which in this context Sakenfeld⁶ has correctly pointed out means "faithfulness to be given expression in willingness to forgive, ability to forgive, as known from God's forgiving

¹See Num 14:1-3.

²Num 14:18.

³Num 14:19a.

⁴Num 14:19b.

⁵Num 14:20. Both TgN, TgO, and Peshitta translate these terms with *šbwq*. The LXX uses the sequence *ἀφαιρω*, *ἀφιημι*, *ἵλεος ἐγένου*, and *ἵλεος εἰμι*. This last parallel also confirms the early translators' perception of the parallel between *nāšāʾ*² and *sālah* in this context.

⁶Sakenfeld, 123. Cf. Num 14:19b.

action thus far."

God's forgiveness of Israel's lack of trust has already been experienced. He has shown willingness to maintain that covenant relationship even when Israel's actions ought to have freed him from any responsibility for the people. Once he established the relationship he has maintained it.¹

The fact that God has forgiven (*sālah*) does not, however, release the people from punishment, as some scholars have suggested;² neither does it involve forgetting, as is often popularly believed. The forgiven people and their descendants still had to *nāšā*³ the consequences of their wrong actions and attitude. None of the people involved in the rebellion were permitted to enter the Promised Land and their children had to wait almost forty years for their share in the promise. In this way they had to share in the immediate consequence of their fathers' wrongs, even though they themselves were not guilty. The context shows that forgiveness meant

¹Ibid., 124.

²So Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament, 2 vols., trans. J. A. Baker (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961 and 1967), 2: 453, 457, where he defines forgiveness as "Jahweh remov[ing] the baneful influence of an act." Cf. also Freedman, "*nāšā*," 627, 639; and G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology, 1:268. Th. Raitt, "The Concept of Forgiveness in the Pre-Exilic Prophets," 297, contends that "God steps in and stops the [sin-consequence] process before it culminates. Forgiveness thus provides reprieve, healing, clemency, and life." Eugene H. Maly sees it as "refusal to seek revenge" in his article "Sin and Forgiveness in the Scriptures," in Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit, ed. Daniel Durken (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979), 45.

that, in spite of the people's wrongdoing, God would not forsake them even in their suffering. He would continue to go with them and guide them on their way to the Promised Land.¹ The fact that they suffered the consequences of their actions did not nullify God's forgiveness, nor the other way around. The consequences were the natural outgrowth of their wrongdoings, whereas forgiveness works in spite of them.

The perceived parallelism/synonymity of *nāša*² and *sālah* is later confirmed by Neh 9:16, 17 which is clearly a reference to this very event.

But they, our fathers, acted arrogantly; they became stubborn and would not listen to Thy commandments. And they refused to listen, and did not remember Thy wondrous deeds which Thou hadst performed among them; so they became stubborn and appointed a leader to return to their slavery in Egypt. But Thou art a God of forgiveness (*s'liḥōt*),² gracious and compassionate, slow to anger, and abounding in lovingkindness; and Thou didst not forsake them.

The entire passage in Neh 9 (especially vss. 16-21) is enlightening in the context of this research. It relates the two experiences in the life of Israel under consideration here and gives an important insight into the understanding of the terms under consideration. First, the God of forgiveness (*nošē*²) in Numbers and Exodus is

¹Cf. Exod 23:20-23; 32:34; and 33:2.

²Cf. also Ps 130:4.

presented in Nehemiah as the God of forgiveness (*s'liḥōt*).¹ Second, God's *s'liḥōt*, both in the experience recorded in Numbers 14 and in the rebellion at Sinai, is demonstrated by the fact that God did not forsake them (vss. 17,19), but rather kept guiding them on their way, instructing them and providing them with their physical necessities (vss. 19-21), all of which have been shown to be included in the act of *nāšā*² in the Pentateuch.²

Theological Context

As we observe the concept of *nāšā*³-forgiveness in the Pentateuch we see that it is basically a caring attitude which is activated when there is a breach in a relationship. Such breach or rupture is what constitutes sin.³ When that happens, a healing process of forgiveness is needed,⁴ and is mostly found in some relation to the

¹Cf. also Ps 103:3.

²See chapter 4 above. Comparing these references from the Pentateuch and Nehemiah there appears to be an indication of a movement from the more general and comprehensive *nāšā*² in the earlier writings to the more specific term *sālah* for forgiveness in the later writings.

³See Robert Koch, Il Peccato nel Vecchio Testamento, (Rome: Edizioni Paoline, 1973), 14. Moshe Weinfeld, "וְנָשָׂא בְרִית," TDOT (1975), 2:276, points out that in case of a broken covenant, the document must be destroyed. In Babylonian legal literature the cancelling of a contract is to "break the tablet."

⁴Cf. Moses' action following the golden calf incident as he pleads with God that he *nāšā*³ the wrongdoing of the people (Exod 32:32).

covenant. In fact, there is a close interrelationship between these two concepts, forgiveness and covenant. Nevertheless, there were no *nāšā*² texts found explicitly within a covenant context in the Pentateuch, i.e., because there is a covenant therefore there is forgiveness. On the other hand, the covenant is twice related to the concept of *nāšā*²-forgiveness. As God was about to introduce his covenant to the people he referred to his actions towards them as those of an eagle who carried (*nāšā*²) them to himself (Exod 19:4); an action which Moses later equates with forgiveness (Num 14:19). On that basis God offers the people to enter into a covenant relationship with him (Exod 19:5-8). Similarly, when the covenant had been broken following the golden calf incident, Moses pleads with God to forgive the people (Exod 32:32). Before the covenant is renewed God reveals himself to Moses and indicates that his forgiving (*nōšē*²) of sins is a part of his nature (Exod 34:7). Based on that, God again offers to (re-)enter into a covenant relationship with his people (Exod 34:10).

This may suggest that the concept of *nāšā*² forgiveness is really foundational to that of the covenant, so even before there was a formal covenant there was forgiveness.¹ It is rooted in who God is, not a

¹Cf. the experience of Cain in Gen 4:7.

formal arrangement. Forgiveness is thus both the basis for and also the outgrowth of the covenant.¹ That is why God can freely offer it even to individuals outside of that formal arrangement.

When it comes to the actual process of dealing with the sins and wrongdoings, Knierim² has pointed out that the Hebrew language *per se* does not make a distinction between suffering the consequences of one's actions and forgiving them in the context of *nāsā*³. The only difference is found in the change of subjects. In one case man *nāsā*³ his own wrongdoing and dies; in the other, someone else is doing the *nāsā*³ and the wrongdoer lives. In both cases the object is the same--sins and/or wrongdoings. The latter condition is usually correctly associated with the concept of forgiveness, but it is on the basis of interpretation rather than translation.

In these passages the context indicates a process leading to a restored relationship or full acceptance, both of which are closely associated with the concept of forgiveness. By bearing (*nāsā*³) the wrongs (*ʿāwôn*) of the people by substitution, the priests and Levites effected

¹Moshe Weinfeld, "B'rit--Covenant vs. Obligation," *Biblica* 56 (1975), 124, has pointed out that in the stories of David and Jonathan *hesed* and "love" seem to be both the preconditions of *b'rit* and also the outcome.

²See Knierim, 51-54.

acceptance and atonement for the people,¹ which are basic elements in the *nāšāʾ* process. The experience of the husband bearing (*nāšāʾ*) his wife's guilt, because of a wrongly cancelled vow, in Num 30, also confirms this concept. He bore (*nāšāʾ*) her guilt (*ʿwōnāh*) (vs. 15), whereas she received forgiveness (*sālah*) from the Lord (vs. 12).²

In some cases the *nāšāʾ*-process does not necessarily involve acceptance, but appears to limit itself to the removal of the immediate consequences of some wrongdoing, or is at least interpreted as such. This was apparently the case with Pharaoh in Exod 10. In response to his pleading for forgiveness (*nāšāʾ*) for his sins (*ḥaṭṭaʾtī*), the plague of locusts was removed without any evidence of him ever being accepted by God or Moses.

Then there are cases of acceptance without the removal of the immediate consequences. That was the experience of the children of Israel as they listened and reacted to the report by the spies in Num 14. Because they rejected the report of the faithful spies the people were told they would not enter the Promised Land, and

¹See Lev 10:17.

²A similar idea is also present in the experience of Joseph's brothers. As they pleaded for forgiveness (*nāšāʾ*) for their wrongs (*pešaʾ*), Joseph assured them of his acceptance which was confirmed by his support (*ʾkalkēl*) of them and their families. See Gen 50:15-21 and further discussion in chapter 6 above.

their children would have to suffer for their (i.e., the parents') unfaithfulness for forty years.¹ The children's suffering, however, did not secure forgiveness for the parents--they were already forgiven (*sālah*) according to Num 14:20. God had forgiven and accepted the people, but everyone still had to share in the immediate consequences of their parents' wrong actions.

Finally, there is the removal of wrongdoings from among the people, confirming an already existing acceptance. This process took place by means of the "goat for Azazel" which was appointed by a lot² to transport or remove (*nāšā*³) the sins (*ʿāwôn*) from the camp into the uninhabited wasteland.³ The Azazel-process is the only account in the Pentateuch explicitly emphasizing the aspect of removal of sin and/or wrongdoing. People were already experiencing forgiveness, evidenced by the fact that whenever the atonement process took place through the year, it led to forgiveness (*sālah*).⁴ The *nāšā*³ process of sins, however, always led to the suffering and/or death

¹Num 14:33-35.

²See Lev 16:8.

³Lev 16:10, 21.

⁴Cf. the formula "And he [the priest] shall make atonement for X, and he [X] shall be forgiven" which occurs some 13 times in the Pentateuch (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18; 6:7; 19:22; Num 15:25, 26, 28).

of the bearer.¹ There is, however, no evidence for the death of the goat for Azazel.² Therefore, it can not be seen to represent the "forgiver."³ The other goat, on the other hand, called "the goat for the Lord," was sacrificed.⁴ It represented what God had revealed about himself in Exod 34:6, 7 and Num 14:18, that he is the forgiver (*nošē*³) of iniquities and transgressions, taking on himself all its consequences, including suffering and death.⁵ Knierim shies away from making that connection, even though the evidence points that way. He probably finds it too unbelievable. "Ist Gott der Träger, dann kann allerdings kaum davon die Rede sein, daß Gott selbst dadurch--stellvertretend--zu Schaden kommt."⁶ But this is the great mystery and greatness of forgiveness. God

¹See chapter 5 above.

²A later Jewish tradition stipulated that the goat be pushed over a ragged edge to its death, but the Bible only states that it was brought out into the wilderness. (Cf. Gladson's "The Enigma of Azazel in Leviticus 16.")

³Some scholars, as Freedman, "*nāšā*³," TWAT, (1986), 5:637, seem to overlook that aspect, and therefore see the goat as representing the forgiving aspect of Christ's ministry.

⁴See Lev 16:9.

⁵That concept, however, is only implied at this stage. It is further explicated in the Servant passage in Isa 53, but only fully revealed in the Gospels and other New Testament writings in statements such as, "Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away [or: forgives] the sins of the world."

⁶Knierim, 52.

presents himself as the ultimate carrier of man's wrongdoings.¹

God is thus the prime provider of forgiveness. But man can only enjoy its benefits if he is willing to accept and cooperate with God's leadership and guidance. That is the message of Gen 4:7 and Exod 23:21. In the Genesis passage God presents the availability of forgiveness/acceptance (š'ēṭ) to Cain if he is willing to cooperate; otherwise, he will be at the mercy of his own wrongdoings. The latter passage presents the opposite picture. If anyone rebels against God and his leadership, acceptance/forgiveness is no longer available (lo' yiššā' l'piš^ckem) for God cannot approve of rebellion.

In all of these situations nāšā' is used to express actions and/or attitude employed for the purpose of providing relief from the burden of wrongdoing or a confirmation of its availability. Ultimately, nāšā'-forgiveness is an expression of God's ḥesed. Actually, it is an expression of it in action, and most commonly it leads to acceptance and/or relief from the consequences of committed wrongdoings.

Social Context

There are four situations in the Pentateuch which involve individuals facing the consequences of their wrong

¹Cf. Ibid., 220.

actions, but whose cause-effect relationship is broken by means of a *nāšāʾ*-action. Two of these involve human relationships¹ and two deal with the relationship between God and man. Once the entire population of two cities is involved,² and once an individual.³ In all of these situations someone either had or was suspected of having overstepped the boundaries of acceptable behavior in some way. The process of rectifying the situation differs somewhat in these three cases. In Gen 40 the butler waits passively for the ultimate decision, which is entirely in the hands of Pharaoh who, in the end, lifts up (*nāšaʾ*) his head and restores him to his honorable position. On what basis he does so, we are not told, but the important fact is that it did happen.

In Gen 32 and 33, Jacob set up a detailed plan, supplemented by prayers to God, as he prepared for his encounter with Esau, whom he had frequently wronged, in the hope of finding acceptance in his sight.⁴ In this case the wrongdoer is actively involved in preparing for the *nāšaʾ* process, but the decision is again entirely in the hands of the wronged. According to Gen 33:10 Jacob found

¹Gen 32 and 40:12-22.

²Gen 18:22-32.

³Gen 4:7.

⁴Cf. Gen 33:8.

the hoped-for acceptance as he found favor in the eyes of Esau, his brother.

In Gen 18 the population of Sodom and Gomorrah had overstepped the boundaries of acceptable behavior towards God and mankind and were about to receive the just consequences of their actions. Upon hearing God's plan, Abraham appealed to God's justice¹ that he spare/forgive (*nāšā*²) the cities if x number of righteous people were present in these cities. God agreed, but unfortunately, the plan failed because the stipulated number was not achieved.² In this case the people involved were not even aware of the fact that someone was negotiating for their lives, without any demands being made on them in return.

Three facts about the process of *nāšā*² emerge from this story: the preserving impact of even a few righteous ones on their community; God's willingness to hold back the consequences of wrongdoing; and God's care which can be mediated by a third party without any demands being made on the wrongdoer.

In Gen 4 Cain realizes that his sacrifice is not

¹There is no evidence that Abraham's commitment to mediation had any "atoning value sufficient for removal of guilt" as Eichrodt, 1:450, suggests. Abraham's request is entirely based on God's sense of justice and not any merits of men.

²See Gen 18:32. Only Lot, his wife, and two of his daughters were brought out, even though their righteousness was apparently quite "limited," according to Gen 19:25, 30-38.

acceptable to God, so he feels rejected and his countenance falls. God approaches him and opens up to him the prospect of acceptance ($\acute{s}^{\text{c}}\acute{e}\acute{t}$) if he responds correctly. Cain rejects the offer, or at least ignores it, commits a heinous crime by killing his brother, and then realizes that the consequences are too heavy for him to bear ($n\acute{a}\acute{s}\acute{a}^{\text{c}}$).¹ This short passage reveals quite clearly the basic concept of the $n\acute{a}\acute{s}\acute{a}^{\text{c}}$ -process. When an individual does something wrong or unacceptable, the consequences are seen as a heavy burden ($m\acute{a}\acute{s}\acute{s}\acute{a}^{\text{c}}$) which the wrongdoer must bear ($n\acute{a}\acute{s}\acute{a}^{\text{c}}$) to the bitter end. But, the wronged one may offer a relief in the form of acceptance ($\acute{s}^{\text{c}}\acute{e}\acute{t}$), restoring the relationship rather than permitting the wrong to destroy it. But it must be freely accepted if it is to benefit the wrongdoer. In this case, Cain did not accept the offer, but severed his relationship with the Lord as he "went out from the presence of the Lord."²

All four stories have certain features in common while some details vary. None of them is explicitly in the context of traditional forgiveness and none of them is translated thus. But they are all associated with some wrongdoing which has created a breach between two parties of individuals. This breach needs to be bridged. That

¹Gen 4:10.

²Gen 4:16.

happens through a process of *nāšāʾ*-actions. The result is in the form of favor, acceptance, or restoration, and these have been shown to be the ingredients of forgiveness, whether *sālah* or *nāšāʾ*.

God as Forgiver

Four additional passages within the Pentateuch complete the picture of the *nāšāʾ*-process, even though they are not explicitly used in the context of traditional forgiveness. They do, however, have an indirect, but significant, link with it through Num 14:19. There Moses appeals to God to forgive (*sālah*) the people as he has carried/forgiven (*nāšāʾ*) them in the past. Moses' reference is clearly to previous *nāšāʾ*-experiences in the relationship between God and Israel, described in Exod 19:4; Deut 32:11; and 1:31. The first two passages speak of God who *nāšāʾ* the people like an eagle, a picture which Kleinig correctly points out shows God, who did not leave the people

helpless and abandoned in a hostile world, but . . . 'carried' them along and 'brought' them to himself. He . . . not only tolerated and led them like a shepherd with his sheep (cf. Isa 40:11; 46:3; 63:9), but . . . also supported and sustained them like a father with his children.¹

He also draws attention to the fact that the expression "brought them to himself" is without parallel in the Old

¹Kleinig, "On Eagles' Wing," 20.

Testament. The usual expression speaks of God bringing the people to the Promised Land.¹ But this expression makes the process all the more personal, and God wants man to participate in that process. As he instructed Moses he told him that Moses was to *nāšā*² the people in his bosom like a nurse *nāšā*² a nursing infant,² including providing them with their physical needs such as food.³ All of these aspects are clearly in the mind of Moses as he approached God, asking him to forgive (*sālah*) the people in the same way as he had *nāšā*² them all the way from Egypt until then, and purposefully he seems to employ *nāšā*² in his request in order to indicate what he understands forgiveness to mean.

In summary, the context implies an active loving, caring concern both on interpersonal level and between God and man. This can find place within the family, between a ruler and his servant, a leader towards those he is leading, or the priests as they effect forgiveness for sins. Most frequently, however, we find God providing forgiveness/acceptance to individuals, cities, or his own people (see table 22).

¹Ibid.

²Num 11:12.

³The dialogue between God and Moses takes place in the middle of a pericope dealing with the problem of providing adequate food for the people; Num 11:4-24.

TABLE 22
"FORGIVENESS" IN THE PENTATEUCH

	Subject	"Object"	Effect (implied)
Gen 32:20 Gen 50:17	Esau Joseph	Jacob's face brothers' wrongs	acceptance (sustenance)

Gen 40:13	Pharaoh	butler's face	restoration

Num 11:12	Moses like a nurse	people	care and sustenance

Exod 28:12, 29,30,38	Priest	people's wrongs	acceptance by God
Lev 10:17	Aaron	people's sins	

Gen 4:7	God	Cain	acceptance

Gen 18:16	God	cities	(life to people)

Exod 10:17	God/Moses	Pharaoh	release from plague

Exod 19:4	God like an eagle	people	(care, protection, sustenance)
Exod 32:32	God	people	(life guidance)
Num 14:19	God	people	(protection guidance)
Deut 1:31	God	people	care, protection
Deut 32:11	God like an eagle	people	care, protection

Exod 34:7	God	sins of people	(acceptance)
Num 14:18	God	sins of people	(protection guidance)
[Exod 23:21	Angel of God	wrongs of people	no forgive- ness]

Other Parallels

Besides these clear indicators of the forgiveness aspect of *nāša*² within the Pentateuch, supporting parallels also are found outside that corpus. Most of the passages are in the form of requests by individuals to God to forgive their wrongdoings. The basis for forgiveness is the same as in the Pentateuch: God forgives (*nāša*²/*sālah*) iniquity and passes over the rebellious acts of the remnant of his possession forever, and he does so because he delights in unchanging love (*hesed*) and will not retain anger forever.¹

The same concept is also found in Ps 99:8: "Oh Lord our God, Thou didst answer them [i.e., Moses and Aaron]; Thou wast a forgiving God (*ʾēl nošē*²) to them, and yet an avenger of their evil deeds." This is basically a summary statement of the events described in Num 14. God's forgiving nature forms the basis for his answering Moses' requests, but at the same time it is clearly stated that this forgiveness does not mean guiltlessness or a declaration of innocence. God forgave, but he also punished. But even in the punishment he did not leave his people. Again, in referring to the Exodus experience the prophet Isaiah bases his request on God's *hesed*.

For he said, "Surely, they are my people . . . so he

¹Mic 7:18. See also Neh 9:17; Ps 86:15; 103:8; 145:8; Joel 2:13; and Jonah 4:2.

became their Savior. In all their affliction He was afflicted, And the angel of His presence saved them; in His love and in His mercy He redeemed them; and He lifted them (waynatt^llēm) and carried them (waynaśś^ēēm) all the days of old.¹

This passage combines several Pentateuchal nāśā^ē images: the angel of God's presence whom God sent before his people in order to guide them on their way.² This angel, as YHWH's representative,³ stayed with the people all through the wilderness wandering and carried them like a father,⁴ a nurse,⁵ and an eagle⁶ all the way from Egypt onward.⁷ That is why the Psalmist could also cry to God, "Save Thy people, bless Thine inheritance; be their Shepherd also and carry (naśś^ēēm) them forever."⁸ In that process God also participated in their suffering and afflictions as is implied in the expression "God [is a] forgiver (nośē^ē) of iniquity, transgression and sin." This did not only involve physical hardships but also the bearing of the sins of the people as was symbolically

¹Isa 63:8,9.

²Exod 23:20.

³Or even YHWH himself, as von Rad (Genesis, 188-9) has suggested.

⁴Deut 1:31.

⁵Num 11:12.

⁶Exod 19:4 and Deut 32:11.

⁷Num 14:19.

⁸Ps 28:9.

transacted in the sanctuary and ultimately led to the death of the "goat for the Lord" on the Day of Atonement. Later, that picture is picked up by Isaiah in the image of the Suffering Servant: "Surely our griefs He Himself bore (*nāšāʾ*), and our sorrows He carried (*sābal*) . . . He Himself bore (*nāšaʾ*) the sins of many and interceded for the transgressors"¹ and ultimately died for them.²

But in order to benefit from this provision the people had to choose to accept and cooperate. If they chose to forsake the Lord and serve foreign gods, God would "not forgive your transgressions or your sins,"³ nor would he forgive his people when they had left him.⁴ When the land is filled with idols which the people worship and they rely on material things, there is no forgiveness available.⁵ This is in line with the warning issued in the Pentateuch that the angel of the Lord would not forgive the people if they turned their backs in rebellion against him.⁶

Most of the remaining non-Pentateuchal *nāšāʾ*-

¹Isa 53:4, 12.

²Isa 53:8, 9.

³Josh 24:19.

⁴Hos 1:6.

⁵Isa 2:6-9.

⁶Exod 23:21.

passages are in poetry and in the form of prayers for forgiveness. Hosea cries out, "Take words with you and return to the Lord, Say to Him, Take away [or: forgive] (*tiššā*¹) all iniquity and receive us graciously."¹

Forgiveness is here presented as gracious acceptance which will result in caring salvific actions through which the people will be healed (*rāpā*²) in love.² The same idea is also expressed by Isaiah, where the concept of forgiveness (*nāšā*³) of iniquities is associated with healing, so no one will say "I am sick."³ In Ps 103:3 similar healing is associated with *sālah*: "Who pardons (*sālah*) all your iniquities; who heals (*rāpā*²) all your diseases."

Iniquity is presented as a disease that needs to be healed. The same idea is also found in Ps 25:16-18:

Turn to me and be gracious to me,
For I am lonely and afflicted;
The troubles of my heart are enlarged;
Bring me out of my distress.
Look upon my affliction and my trouble,
And forgive (*wšā*³) all my sins.

Sin is seen as affliction, trouble, distress, and loneliness from which the Psalmist pleads for forgiveness, involving graciousness and awareness that God is turned towards him (signifying acceptance and favor).⁴ Another

¹Hos 14:2.

²Cf. vss. 4-5.

³Isa 33:24.

⁴Cf. chap. 6 above.

Psalm speaks of the happy feeling resulting from experienced forgiveness "whose sins are covered (*n'sûy peša^c*)."¹ Ringgren has pointed out that covering does not mean "hiding" or "stoving away"² but rather the non-activation of the consequences of the wrongdoing.³ When an individual brings his wrongs to God, he is willing to bear/forgive (*nāšā³tā*) them.⁴ In the final declaration all the key concepts of forgiveness come together:

O Lord, Thou didst show favor to Thy land
 Thou didst restore the fortunes⁵ of Jacob.
 Thou didst forgive (*nāšā³tā*) the iniquity of
 thy people;
 Thou didst cover (*kissītā*) all their sin.
 Thou didst withdraw all Thy fury;
 Thou didst turn away from Thy burning anger⁶

The conceptual chiastic structure places "forgive" and "cover" in a central parallelism which is then further expanded in the "arms" of the chiasm. God's forgiveness

¹Ps 32:1.

²Ringgren, "𐤏𐤍𐤕 *kāsāh*," *TWAT*, (1984), 4:276. In Neh 4:57 *kisseh* is used parallel with *māḥāh* "wipe out," "destroy."

³Cf. Ps 32:2.

⁴Ps 32:5.

⁵Commentators point out the ambiguity of this term. The *kethib* is *š'būt* "restoration," "returning," whereas the *qere* reads *š'bit* "captivity." Michael D. Goulder, *The Psalms of the Sons of Korah*, JSOT Supplement Series 20 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 99-102, argues for "fortunes" as more general and contextually more applicable.

⁶Ps 85:1-3.

is evidenced in his favor to the land, turning away his anger and fury as he restores the fortunes of Jacob which eventually will be evidenced in the experience of salvation.¹ The key concepts of this passage, "favor," and "restoration" were also associated with *nāšāʾ*-forgiveness in the Pentateuch, as was pointed out above. Throughout the Old Testament there is thus no apparent development or change in this concept of *nāšāʾ*.

Listen to Me, O house of Jacob, All the remnant of the house of Israel, You who have been borne (*ha^cmusim*) by Me from birth, and have been carried (*hann^ʾšūʾim*) from the womb; Even to your old age, I shall be the same, And even to your graying years I shall bear (*ʾesbol*) you! I have done it, and I shall carry (*ʾeššāʾ*) you; And I shall bear (*ʾesbol*) you, and I shall deliver you.²

This passage clearly has the overtones of caring concern for the well-being of the individual, which eventually leads to deliverance, an idea which was also quite evident in the Pentateuchal usage of *nāšāʾ*.

Summary

The evidence thus indicates that "forgiveness" is not merely an "attached" secondary meaning of *nāšāʾ*. It is definitely just as much within its semantic range as "carry," "bear," and "lift." Parallel usage of *nāšāʾ* with "accepted" terms for forgiveness (i.e., *sālah* and *kpr*),

¹See vss. 4-7.

²Isa 46:3,4.

together with its use in contexts of reconciliation, both within and outside of the cultus, confirm this.

Additional support is also found outside the Pentateuchal corpus. It is just a matter of contextual interpretation to identify the differences.

Frequently, the authors appear deliberately to use the wide-ranged, flexible term *nāšā*¹ rather than the apparently more restricted *sālah* in order to emphasize the broadness and "down-to-earth-ness" of the concept and also to draw the attention to the "schicksalwirkende Tatsphäre"¹ of *nāšā*², which includes the whole range from the wrongdoer's suffering the consequences of his actions² to the beneficial effects for him from someone else's substituting for him as the sin-bearer.³ Ultimately, the bearer of the wrongs (the forgiver) will bear the consequences of wrongdoing: suffering, separation, and even death. In the same way as any sin is seen as affecting man's relationship with God,⁴ so is the process of forgiveness also ultimately rooted in him.⁵

The fact that a common, every day term is used

¹K. Koch, quoted in Knierim, 74,89.

²See chapter 5 above.

³See chapter 6 above.

⁴Cf. Joseph's experience in Gen 39:9.

⁵Cf. the context of the theophanies of Exod 34 and Num 14.

indicates the attempt to make the concept understandable and relevant to common human beings, all of whom have intimate knowledge of what burdens are, and have experienced the relief of having them removed and "carried" by someone who cares. *Nāśa*³-forgiveness is not a static, legal declaration of innocence. Rather, it is concerned with ongoing relationships, acceptance, and an attitude of active care for the individual's well-being and needs. This aspect is reflected in references to God's parental care for his people in connection with the concept of forgiveness.¹ In its broadest sense it embraces God's acceptance of and caring concern for the human race, not because of who man is or what he has accomplished, but because of who God is. And he makes this forgiveness available to all, even before or without repentance, but mankind can only benefit from it through submission and cooperative participation.

¹For a further discussion of this aspect see chapter 6 above.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This investigative journey was initiated by a desire to understand more fully the Biblical concept of forgiveness, especially as it relates to the common Hebrew root *nāšāʾ*¹. Ideally, it should have covered all of the Old Testament, but practical considerations seemed to justify limiting the research to the Pentateuch. It was found that the Pentateuch presented a representative use of the term,¹ had the heaviest concentration of the root, or .75 per printed page,² and also the highest ratio of metaphoric usages or 37.2 percent of the total,³ within which the concept of forgiveness is most likely to be found.

The use of the root *nāšāʾ*¹ in some representative cognate languages was surveyed and classified as to its meanings and contexts to form a basis for a more detailed study of the Biblical usage. The purpose was to determine (1) whether *nāšāʾ*¹ had a basic, universal meaning; (2) if

¹Some 25 percent of the total occurrences in the OT.

²See table 2, above.

³See table 8, above.

the concept of forgiveness was really within its semantic range, and (3) what the use of the root *nāša*² might reveal about the Biblical concept of forgiveness.

Looking back at the evidence presented it is first noticed in chapter 1 that, generally speaking, lexicographers and theologians seem to agree on the basic meaning of the root *nāša*² as "lift," "carry," or "take," in that order.¹ The idea of forgiveness is usually based on the derived meaning of "remove," thus implying that it is seen merely as a matter of legal logistics: a removal of some more or less "concrete" burden of guilt or its consequences, away from the wrongdoer. One lexicographer, Holladay, also saw some uses of *nāšā*² *ro*²*š* as indicating pardon, and a few have noticed the concept of "caring" as being a part of *nāšā*², but no one has undertaken to explain the full significance of the use of this term for forgiveness.² That lack justified the present study.

Chapter 2 was devoted to the study of cognate languages most closely associated with Hebrew: Aramaic, Akkadian, and Ugaritic. It revealed that the usage of *nāšā*² could be classified under three main headings: "transport," "support," and "utilization." Aramaic and

¹HAL₃, however, places "carry" first. See chapter 1.

²David N. Freedman comes closest as he hints at the significance of *nāšā*² as it relates to the concept of forgiveness in a couple of his writings.

Akkadian use the root also in interpersonal relations, and in Akkadian the semantic range extends to include caring concern for someone in need. Akkadian also uses it in the process of dealing with wrongdoings, either for tempering the consequences or removing the wrong.

A survey of the Biblical data in chapter 3 revealed close affinity with the cognate languages both as to the usage and meanings of the root *nāšā*³. A brief survey of the nominal forms, however, added nothing new to the research except that most of them tend to confirm the concreteness of the root.

The verbal root is used almost exclusively in the Qal, or 598 times out of 654 occurrences. It is used both literally and metaphorically in all types of texts: narratives, legal texts, and poetry, and distributed fairly evenly throughout the OT, with no apparent indication of any significant development or change related to time, authorship or type of literature. The ratio of literal use is highest in the Early Prophets, 71.2 percent, whereas the Pentateuch has 24.8 percent, with the Old Testament average of 34.7 percent. As to the metaphoric usage, the Pentateuch has the highest ratio with 55 percent, while the Old Testament average is 40.4 percent.

Man is the most frequent subject, or in 75.1 percent of the cases, with God or divine beings coming

second with 13 percent. This indicates that *nāšā*³ is basically a "human" term in contrast to *sālah*, which only has God as subject. Morphological survey failed to reveal anything that might clarify or distinguish between the various meanings of the root. The same can also be said about syntactical studies. It is only when it comes to synonyms, parallels, sequels, and semantic contexts that the different meanings emerge.

In general, the Biblical usage appears to be closest to the Akkadian, which was also the cradle of the Hebrew culture. No evidence was found of any homonymous roots, but the data revealed rather a neutral and flexible root with definite concrete connotations which is then "shaped" and "honed" by the immediate context.

A closer look at the semantic scope of *nāšā*³ in the Pentateuchal corpus in chapter 4 indicated the presence of the same three basic concepts of *nāšā*³ which were found in the cognate languages. First, the idea of "transport," involving a movement from one place or position to another. That concept is brought out in forty-two instances, or in 24.8 percent of the Pentateuchal occurrences. It is clearly indicated by the use of prepositions of movement or direction, morphs or parallel expressions which signify movement, or by the context. Second is the idea of "sustained support" or the ability to hold, contain, or maintain. That meaning is

found fourteen times, or in 8.3 percent of the cases. The distinction between these meanings is, however, neither based on morphology *per se* nor syntax, but rather on the context. The last of the general meanings is that of "utilization" of certain body parts/functions (i.e., eyes, hands, feet, head or voice), or weapons and words. This usage is found fifty-one times in the Pentateuch, which is 30.2 percent of the total. Most scholars tend to take the expression in its literal sense of lifting or taking, and appear to overlook the idea of utilization, or fail to see it as an expression of ingression, or an initiation of an action.¹ Practically all the expressions in this last category were followed by a sequel indicating the purpose of the *nāšāʾ*-action.

The expression *nāšāʾ roʾš* was found to be most ambiguous. In places it was clearly used in its literal sense, meaning "to raise one's head," but in others it was used idiomatically for "head-counting" or census-taking. In still other instances it is used to indicate a process of restoration of someone who has "fallen from grace."

Chapter 5 looked at the use of *nāšāʾ* in the context of wrongdoings. It became clear that wrongdoings, in general, are seen as concrete burdens which must be carried. In nineteen passages *nāšāʾ* is used in the

¹Similar to ingressive aorist in Greek.

context of the subject's own wrongdoings, and in eighteen it refers to wrongdoings of someone else. In all of these the emphasis is on the aspect of "carrying" in the sphere of supporting or enduring rather than that of transport or removal. In the former group, *nāšā*¹ indicates that the wrongdoer must bear the guilt and/or suffer the consequences, which in most cases were death; whereas in the latter group, *nāšā*² at times indicates forgiveness.

*Nāšā*² with wrongdoings of others is mostly found in cultic contexts, or in fourteen out of eighteen cases. In thirteen of these, man is the subject: priests and Levites in eight,¹ with other persons in five.² The usage within the cultus strongly indicates substitution. Two texts state explicitly that one person carried someone else's wrongs: once a husband for his wife (Num 30:15) and once the Levites for the people (Num 18:23). Other passages strongly support that concept without stating it explicitly. Instead, it is indicated by means of various symbols, including certain items of clothing, or by the priest's symbolically eating a portion of certain offerings. *Nāšā*² is never translated as "forgiveness" in any of these texts, even though the concept is clearly present by implication.

¹Num 18:1(2x), 23; Exod 28:12, 29, 30, 38; Lev 10:17.

²Gen 50:17(2x); Exod 10:17; Num 14:33; 30:15.

In the non-cultic contexts three passages are in the form of requests and one is a statement. One is a request for the removal of the consequences of wrongdoing (Exod 10:17), two plead for an assurance that a former wrongdoing will not be allowed to affect present relationship (Gen 50:17). Finally, one deals with individuals who share the consequences of the wrong action of others (Num 14:33). A positive response to the requests in the first three passages is seen as forgiveness, whereas the last involves sharing the consequences.

Even though animals played a large role in the sanctuary services, there is only one passage which explicitly involved an animal in the *nāšāʾ*-process of wrongdoings. It was the goat for Azazel on the Day of Atonement in Lev 16:22. In spite of various opinions as to the identity of this goat, it is clear from the context that it was never seen as a sacrifice. Its only function was one of transport or removal of all the "accumulated" sins from the sanctuary, away from the people. This is the only Pentateuchal text which explicitly speaks of the aspect of removal of wrongdoings in the *nāšāʾ*-process.

In the last four passages related to wrongdoings of others, God or divine beings are the subject. They present three different aspects of the *nāšāʾ*-process. First, there is a declaration about *nāšāʾ*-forgiveness

being a part of God's nature (Exod 34:6,7; Num 14:18); the second is a plea for forgiveness, based on that conviction (Num 14:19); and finally, there is a warning against presumption in light of that fact (Exod 23:21). All of these texts are generally seen as presenting forgiveness.

Three important issues also emerge from these passages. First, *nāšā*³-forgiveness of sins involves suffering their consequences. This implies that God suffers as he forgives, however preposterous that may sound to some. Second, if the wrongdoer rejects God's forgiveness by his actions, it will not be forced on him. He will have to bear his own wrongdoings. Finally, *nāšā*³-forgiveness does not mean a declaration of innocence (Exod 34:7; Num 14:18a). The wrongdoer is still guilty of his wrongdoing, but the difference is that the forgiver no longer holds the wrongs against the wrongdoer or permits them to come between them and adversely affect their relationship.

In chapter 6 we moved from the more impersonal aspect of *nāšā*³ to its use in interpersonal relations, which is found in twenty-two passages. In this context also we find both literal and metaphoric uses. The literal usage covered in chapter 4 forms the basis for the metaphoric uses dealt with in this chapter. In the same way as a father or a nurse carry (*nāšā*³) their nursing young and provide them with protection, loving care,

nourishment, and meet all their needs, so God has carried (*nāšāʾ*) his people through the Exodus experience and provided for all their needs because of his caring concern for them.¹ Moses appeals to this well-known fact as he pleads with God to forgive the people once more following their rejection of the report from the faithful spies. It is then used as an illustration of what *nāšāʾ*-forgiveness really means²--a caring concern for someone in need. The need may be physical--food, water, healing, protection--or spiritual, such as sin or guilt. Both are included. God in his mercy provides both, and he wants human beings to join him in the process.³

When you may suffer guilt as a consequence of your wrongdoings you tend to be downcast. When you are "cleared" you can freely look up. That metaphor of rejection and acceptance is used eight times in the Pentateuch, expressed by *nāšāʾ pānīm* or *nāšāʾ roʾš* with both God and man as subjects. A lifted-up face or head means acceptance, approval, or favorable attitude towards someone. Whether the subject lifts his face toward the object⁴ or lifts the face/head of the object upwards

¹Exod 19:4; Deut 1:31; 32:10, 11.

²See Num 14:19.

³Num 11:12-17.

⁴Num 6:24,25; Deut 10:17; 28:50.

toward himself¹ the effect is the same. Both actions signify favor and acceptance. In the same way a "place" may also be lifted up, thus becoming the object of some favor.² This favorable attitude may be mediated by a concerned "bystander," as in the case of Abraham who negotiated with God about the cities of the plain without their knowledge or any known effort on their part. God responded by showing his willingness to grant them favor. Sometimes God even takes the initiative to make that attitude available to individuals in need, as in the case of Cain (Gen 4:7). He offered Cain acceptance, but he did not force him to accept it. Human beings are given a free choice to accept its conditions or to reject them.

In chapter 7 we finally looked at three basic arguments which corroborate the fact that the concept of forgiveness is clearly within the semantic range of *nāšāʾ*. First, the root *nāšāʾ* is used in parallel with generally "accepted" terms for forgiveness, such as *kpr* and *sālah*. There are even indications that the author(s) deliberately used the ambiguous term *nāšāʾ* rather than the more specific ones in order to emphasize the broadness and relational aspect of forgiveness. Second, it is used in theological contexts where sin is being dealt with and

¹Gen 19:21; 32:21; Lev 19:15(2x).

²Gen 18:24,26.

removed from the relational sphere of God and man. The attitude of forgiveness is a part of God's nature and thus precedes the formal covenant, but is also an integral part of it. Ultimately, God himself is presented as the one who *nāšāʾ* man's wrongdoings, taking on himself all its consequences, even death, so that man may live in his presence. Finally, *nāšāʾ* is used in certain social contexts where an attitude/action of restoration and/or reconciliation is called for.

A further clarification of the "contents" of *nāšāʾ*-forgiveness was found in the fact that in Num 14:19 Moses requests the Lord to forgive (*sālah*) his people as he has forgiven/carried (*nāšāʾ*) them in the past. Contextually, this meant (1) caring for them and teaching them like an eagle cares for and teaches her young (Exod 19:4; Deut 32:11), (2) protecting them and providing for their needs like a father (Deut 1:31) or a nurse (cf. Num 11:12), (3) treating them as friends in spite of their stiffnecked attitude (cf. Exod 23:23-30), and (4) even preventing them from being destroyed by their own, often foolish, actions as evidenced during the Exodus experience. This is, however, not unique in the Pentateuch; it is one of the basic teachings of the various parts of the Old Testament, be it the Prophets (cf. for instance, Isa 46:3,4; and 63:8,9), the Psalms (cf. Ps 85:1-3), or the Writings (e.g., Neh 9:16-25).

The findings of this study have inevitably raised several questions and issues that invite further investigation. Hopefully, additional studies will clarify issues such as, how this concept of forgiveness affects the traditional concepts of justification and sanctification; if *nāša*²-forgiveness is different from one expressed by *sālah*, *kpr* or any other term; or how this concept affects the ethics of forgiveness in general.

In order to answer these and similar questions, a study needs to survey all of the Old Testament and include all direct and indirect references to the restoration of a broken relationship. It is the conviction of this researcher that such a study will show that forgiveness is not only a major New Testament theme, but it is also a key theme in Old Testament theology.

However, this research has shown that the concept of forgiveness needs to be expanded. Some may only see forgiveness as the removal of guilt and the barrier that exists between God and man.¹ But it is much more.² In non-cultic texts forgiveness is found in family relations between brothers,³ as the wrongdoers are being accepted by the one they had wronged. It is also found as a ruler

¹Freedman and Willoughby, "*nāša*," *TWAT* (1986), 5:638, 639.

²See table 22 on page 281.

³Gen 32:20; 50:17.

restores a suspected servant,¹ and when God commands Moses, as the leader of his people, to care for them.²

Ultimately, we find God offering forgiveness/ acceptance to an individual--even before he committed a crime--at the beginning of human history.³ Later he shows his willingness to extend it to wicked cities,⁴ and he responds favorably to a request by an enemy king.⁵ Most often, however, God extends his forgiving to his covenant people.⁶

In cultic contexts we find both Aaron and the priests effecting forgiveness for the people's sins,⁷ and ultimately God, whose nature it is to forgive sins.⁸ In fact, all forgiveness--apart from Pharaoh's restoration of his servant⁹--is associated with God.¹⁰ Human beings

¹Gen 40:13. This is, in fact, the only passage in which God is not in some way associated with the process.

²Num 11:12.

³Gen 4:7.

⁴Gen 18:16.

⁵Exod 10:17.

⁶Exod 19:4; 32:32; Num 14:19; Deut 1:31; 32:11.

⁷Exod 28:12, 29, 30, 38; Lev 10:17.

⁸Exod 34:7; Num 14:18.

⁹Gen 40:13.

¹⁰See Jacob's interpretation of Esau's accepting him (Gen 33:10), Joseph's reaction as his brothers ask for forgiveness (Gen 50:19), and Moses response when Pharaoh asks for forgiveness (Exod 10:17).

participate with God in the process.

Therefore, forgiveness should not be restricted to being a legal declaration of non-guilt, a passing over or a cancellation of debt or guilt, a wiping out or taking away of a record of guilt, or an undeserved response to repentance and confession. But it includes the sharing or bearing the burdens of those in need, whether they are physical or spiritual. Rather than being a single act, *nāšā*³-forgiveness is an attitude; rather than being a simple declaration of innocence, it involves a continued personal interest in those you care for, in spite of their wrongdoings.

It is tempting to see this image of carrying (*nāšā*³) being drawn from the Hebrew people's own daily experience who spent their "infancy" as a nation in slavery, constantly carrying heavy burdens. All must carry their own burdens. That process frequently led to the death of the carriers unless someone offered to take/carry it for them. That imagery is then transferred to the context of wrongdoing in the Old Testament. Any wrongdoing is seen as a burden that must be carried to its bitter end--death. Sometimes, someone might offer to take the burden and carry it for the wrongdoers, in which case they were "released" from their burdens. They were free--forgiven. The substitute carrier, however, took the consequences. In the Hebrew language there is no

distinction made between these two actions. The former action causes pain and suffering for the wrongdoer-carrier, whereas the latter brings relief to the wrongdoer. Only the context makes the distinction. The latter action is associated with forgiveness. This ambiguity of the $nāšā^{\text{p}}$ -process, which is lost in translation, leads to an unawareness of the suffering to the "forgiver"-carrier for taking on the burden of guilt.

In cultic contexts the $nāšā^{\text{p}}$ -process was acted out by means of a visual aid in the sanctuary service, as both the priests and the Levites substituted for the wrongdoer and symbolically removed and carried ($nāšā^{\text{p}}$) his sin-burden "in" and "on" their bodies into the sanctuary, bringing experiential forgiveness to the wrongdoer. Once a year "the accounts were closed" and the accumulation of forgiven sins of the people were "loaded" on the "goat for Azazel" who transported ($nāšā^{\text{p}}$) them away from the people, out into the wilderness, away from the camp. This is, in fact, the only indication in the $nāšā^{\text{p}}$ -process of wrongs explicitly involving a removal, reinforced by the use of two morphs of movement: $^{\text{p}}el$ and the directional $-āh$. The $nāšā^{\text{p}}$ -process is thus not primarily a removal of sin, even though that may be its ultimate goal.

In non-cultic contexts the $nāšā^{\text{p}}$ -process took place as someone--either the wronged or someone else--took ($nāšā^{\text{p}}$) upon himself the wrongs of another, or acted as an

intermediary between the wrongdoer and God. The effect on the wrongdoer was the same: an experience of relief or forgiveness, a release from the burden of guilt which might also include a release from punishment. It is not explicitly stated what happened to the one who took on himself the burden, but the logical indication is that he ultimately suffered the consequences that were due the wrongdoer, because he, in fact, became his substitute.

Forgiveness did not, however, necessarily remove all aspects of the consequences from the wrongdoer. Cause-and-effect relationships are not necessarily broken by forgiveness. Suffering the consequences of one's wrong actions is not necessarily an evidence of the absence of forgiveness. Neither is the immediate absence of consequences necessarily an evidence of forgiveness. Forgiveness involves a personal relationship, whereas consequences are impersonal. In this process of dealing with wrongdoing, uninvolved bystanders might be affected to some extent. They might suffer some of the consequences, not because they did something wrong, but because they happened to be among those who did.

In contrast to the popular idea which sees forgiveness only, or at least primarily, as a legal declaration of innocence, based on repentance and forgetting, leading to the removal of guilt and punishment, the Pentateuch pictures *nāšā*³-forgiveness as

not satisfied with mere toleration. It involves acceptance of the individual, restoring him to a position of full honor, not because of his worthiness but because of who the forgiver is. It does not presuppose repentance, nor necessarily lead to the removal of punishment, but expects submission. In Num 14:20 God states that he has forgiven the people, but they will still suffer the immediate consequences of their action, even forty years later. However, God continues to be with them in their suffering and care for them as before. Their wrongdoing led to suffering, but due to God's mercy their relationship with him was not severed. That is what *nāśā*³-forgiveness indicates: a caring concern for the wrongdoer in spite of knowing and remembering all about him. Experientially, that knowledge/remembrance becomes inactive. It is not permitted to affect the relationship, as long as the wrongdoer chooses to remain in that loving relationship.

*Nāśā*³-forgiveness is ultimately an expression of God's loving attitude toward human beings, evidenced throughout salvation history for the purpose of restoring them to a position of acceptance before God, in spite of knowing all about their shortcomings. This involves showing caring concern for them in their struggle throughout life, offering to take on the burden of sin and guilt, thus releasing the wrongdoer, and ultimately

suffering its cruel consequences, death, thereby removing it from their sphere of existence, so they may again be free to live their lives in perfect peace before God and among each other. It is really the story of redemption in action.

On the personal level *nāśā*²-forgiveness means that human beings cooperate with God in this process, and show the same caring concern for their neighbors. Thereby they will reflect the true image of God to their environment. Rather than attempting to forget the wrongs of the wrongdoers, or passively sending them off with a mere legal declaration of forgiveness, the wronged will *nāśā*² their neighbors by not allowing the knowledge of their wrongs to get in the way of establishing and maintaining a caring relationship. The forgiver will also actively endeavour to restore the wrongdoer to a position of full acceptance in society. This is not done by a single act. It involves an ongoing attitude in line with Jesus' instruction to Peter about being ready to forgive seventy times seven. Only then and thus will human beings truly *nāśā*² their fellow human and become bringers of peace.

Bear one another's burdens
and thus fulfill the law of Christ.¹

¹Gal 6:2.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

GENERAL DISTRIBUTION OF NS³ IN THE OT

		Qal					Niphal					Piel					Hiphil					Hithpael								
		'	F	P	P	P	'	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	'	P	P	P	P	P			
T O R A H	Gen	6	5	3	27	6																						47	169	
	Ex	9	10	1	11	1	1																					33		
	Lev	1	5	4	10	1										1												22		
	Num	5	8	3	23	5																				3		47		
	Deut	3	1	3	12	1																						20		
P R O P H E T S	Early	Jos			14	7	3																					24	125	
		Jud	1		2	7																						10		
		1Sam	1	1	21	7	2																					32		
		2Sam		2	6	12		1				1				1												23		
		1Kgs		2	3	6						1													1			13		
		2Kgs		6	2	10	4	1																				23		
	Later	Isa	2	9	6	21	5	2	8	4				1																58
		Jer	4	2		8	8	1		1			2																	26
		Ezek	6	28		27	8	2			3											1				1				76
		Hos	1	1		4																						6		
		Joel		1																								1		
		Amos		2	1								1															4		
		Ob																										0		
		Jon				1	1																					2		
		Mic		1	1	4				1																		7		
Nah					1																						1			
Hab			1		2																						3			
Zeph																											0			
Hag			1		1																						2			
Zech			1	1	7	1			1																			11		
Mal		1	1	2																							4	201	326	
W R I T I N G S	Wisdan	Ps	3	14	4	15	9				3				1													49	86	
		Job	2	3	1	21	1																					28		
		Prov	2		1	4					1											1						9		
	1 Scrolls	Ruth				4																								4
		Cant		1																										1
		Lam		2		2	1																					5		
		Eccl	1			1																						2		
		Esth		1	1	2						1	1	1														7		
		Dan			1	2		1																		1		5		
		Ezra		2		1						1		1														5		
		Neh		1	1	2																						4		
		1Chr	3	2	10	7	1		1																	1		25		
		2Chr		3	4	7																				1		15		54
		50	117	95	278	58	2	8	10	9	3	5	3	3	1	2					2			2	6		654			
		598					32					12					2					10					654			

Based on: Abraham Eben-Shoshan: A New Concordance of the Old Testament.

Appendix B

LITERARY CONTEXT

NON-CULTIC CONTEXT (103x)

Narrative (88x)

Gen 4:7
 Gen 4:13
 Gen 7:17
 Gen 13:6,10,14
 Gen 18:2,24,26
 Gen 19:21
 Gen 21:16,18
 Gen 22:4,13
 Gen 24:63,64
 Gen 27:3,38
 Gen 29:1,11
 Gen 31:10,12,17
 Gen 32:21
 Gen 33:1,5
 Gen 36:7
 Gen 37:25(2x)
 Gen 39:7
 Gen 40:13,19,20
 Gen 42:26
 Gen 43:29,34
 Gen 44:1
 Gen 45:19,23(2x)
 Gen 45:27
 Gen 46:5(2x)
 Gen 47:30
 Gen 50:13,17(2x)
 Exod 6:8
 Exod 10:13,17,19
 Exod 12:34
 Exod 14:10
 Exod 18:22
 Exod 19:4
 Exod 32:32
 Exod 34:7
 Num 11:12(2x)
 Num 11:14,17(2x)
 Num 13:23
 Num 14:1,18,19
 Num 14:30,33,34
 Num 16:15
 Num 23:7,18
 Num 24:2,3,15
 Num 24:20,21,23
 Num 31:49
 Deut 1:9,12,31(2x)

Deut 3:27
 Deut 4:19
 Deut 10:17
 Deut 28:49,50

Poetry (5x)

Num 23:24
 Num 24:7
 Deut 32:11,40
 Deut 33:3

Legal (10x)

Exod 20:7(2x)
 Exod 23:1
 Num 1:2,49
 Num 26:2
 Num 31:25
 Deut 5:11(2x)
 Deut 24:15

CULTIC CONTEXT (66x)

Narrative (20x)

Exod 35:21,26
 Exod 36:2
 Exod 37:5,14,15
 Exod 37:27
 Exod 38:7
 Lev 9:22
 Lev 10:4,5,17
 Num 6:25
 Num 7:9
 Num 10:17,21
 Num 16:3
 Deut 10:8
 Deut 31:9,25

Legal (46x)

Exod 23:21
 Exod 25:14,27,28
 Exod 27:7
 Exod 28:12,29,30
 Exod 28:38,43
 Exod 30:4,12
 Lev 5:1,17
 Lev 7:18
 Lev 11:25,28,40
 Lev 15:10
 Lev 16:22
 Lev 17:16
 Lev 19:8,15,17
 Lev 20:17,19,20
 Lev 22:9,16
 Lev 24:15
 Num 1:50
 Num 3:40
 Num 4:2,15,22,25
 Num 5:31
 Num 9:13
 Num 18:1(2x),22
 Num 18:23,32
 Num 30:16
 Deut 12:26
 Deut 14:24

Appendix C

PENTATEUCHAL USE: SUBJECT--man (135x)

LITERAL OBJECTS (42x)	METAPHORIC (92x)	OBJECTS
<u>Persons</u> (6x)	<u>Soul</u> (1x)	<u>Other obj</u> (3x)
Gen 21:18	Deut 24:15	Num 3:40
Gen 31:17		Num 16:3
Gen 45:19	<u>Voice</u> (4x)	Deut 33:3
Gen 46:5	Gen 21:16	-----
Num 11:12	Gen 27:38	<u>Persons</u> (10x)
Deut 1:31	Gen 29:11	Gen 32:21
	Num 14:1	Gen 40:13,19,20
<u>Animals</u> (1x)		Exod 18:22
Num 16:15	<u>Eyes</u> (18x)	Lev 19:15
	Gen 13:10,14	Num 11:12,14
<u>Weapons/tools</u> (1x)	Gen 18:2	Deut 1:9
Gen 27:3	Gen 22:4,13	Deut 28:50
	Gen 24:63,64	
<u>Food</u> (5x)	Gen 31:10,12	<u>Name of God</u> (4x)
Gen 42:26	Gen 33:1,5	Exod 20:7 (2x)
Gen 43:34	Gen 37:25	Deut 5:11 (2x)
Gen 44:1	Gen 39:7	
Exod 12:34	Gen 43:29	<u>Responsibility</u>
Num 13:23	Exod 14:10	(2x)
	Num 24:2	Num 11:17 (2x)
<u>Other</u> (gen) (8x)	Deut 3:27	
Gen 47:30	Deut 4:19	<u>Sin/wrongdoings</u>
Gen 50:13		(27x)
Lev 10:4,5	<u>Head</u> (8x)	Gen 4:13
Lev 11:25,28,40	Exod 30:12	Gen 50:17 (2x)
Lev 15:10	Num 1:2,48	Exod 10:17
	Num 4:2	Lev 5:1,18
<u>Cultic objects</u>	Num 4:22	Lev 7:18
(21x)	Num 26:2	Lev 10:17
Exod 25:14,27,28	Num 31:25,49	Lev 17:16
Exod 27:7		Lev 19:8,17
Exod 30:4	<u>Hand</u> (1x)	Lev 20:17,19,20
Exod 37:5,14,15	Lev 9:22	Lev 22:9,16
Exod 37:27		Lev 24:15
Exod 38:7	<u>Feet</u> (1x)	Num 5:31
Num 1:50	Gen 29:1	Num 9:13
Num 4:15,25		Num 14:33,34
Num 7:9	<u>False report</u> (1x)	Num 18:1 (2x)
Num 10:17,21	Exod 23:1	Num 18:22,23,32
Deut 10:8		Num 30:16
Deut 12:26	<u>Parable</u> (7x)	
Deut 14:24	Num 23:7,18	<u>Names/judgments</u>
Deut 31:9,25	Num 24:3,15,20	(6x)
	Num 24:21,23	Exod 28:12,29
		Exod 28:30,38,43
		Deut 1:12

GOD subject (17x)	ANIMALS subject (5x)	INANIMATE subj. (11x)
METAPHORIC USE (17x)	LITERAL USE (3x)	METAPHORIC USE
<u>Hand</u> (3x)	<u>Burdens</u> (3x)	<u>Things</u> (1x)
Exod 6:8	Gen 37:25	Gen 7:17
Num 14:30	Gen 45:23 (2x)	
Deut 32:40	METAPHORIC USE (2x)	<u>Beings</u> (10x)
-----		Gen 13:6
<u>Face</u> (2x)	<u>Itself</u> (1x)	Gen 36:7
Num 6:25	Num 23:24	Gen 45:27
Deut 10:17	-----	Gen 46:5
	<u>Sins</u> (1x)	Exod 10:13,19
<u>Persons</u> (6x)	Lev 16:22	Exod 35:21,26
Gen 19:21		Exod 36:2
Exod 19:4		Num 24:7
Num 14:19		-----
Deut 1:31		NO SUBJECT (1x)
Deut 28:49		
Deut 32:11		Gen 4:7
<u>Sins/wrongdoings</u> (4x)		
Exod 23:21		
Exod 32:32		
Exod 34:7		
Num 14:18		
<u>Place</u> (2x)		
Gen 18:24,26		

"LIFTING THE HEAD"

345 The goddess Isis holding King Seti I in her lap, from Abydos.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aalders, Gerhard Ch. Genesis. vol. 2. Bible Students Commentary. Translated by William Heynen. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.
- Ackroyd, Peter R., and Barnabas Lindard, eds. Words and Meaning. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1968.
- Aistleitner, Joseph. Wörterbuch der Ugaritischen Sprache. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.
- Amsler, Samuel. "𐤓𐤓𐤕 qūm aufstehen" Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann, Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971. 2:635-41.
- André, Gunnel. Determinining the Destiny. Lund, Sweden: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1980.
- Andreasen, Milian L. The Sanctuary Service. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1947.
- Ararat, Nisan. "𐤁𐤕𐤌𐤓 𐤁𐤕𐤌𐤓 𐤁𐤕𐤌𐤓 𐤁𐤕𐤌𐤓" Beth Mikra 19 (1974): 536-48.
- Arndt, William F., and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. 4th edition. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.
- Aufrecht, Walter E. and John Coolidge Hurd. A Synoptic Concordance of Aramaic Inscriptions, according to Herbert Donner and Wolfgang Roellig. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.
- Balentine, Samuel E. The Hidden God. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Barr, James. Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968.

- Barr, James. The Semantics of Biblical Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Bartlett, John R. "The Use of the Word שָׁמַיִם as a Title in the Old Testament." Vetus Testamentum 19 (1969):1-10.
- Bauer, Hans, and Pontus Leander. Historische Grammatik der Hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1962.
- Baumgartner, Walter, et al., eds. Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexicon zum Alten Testament. 3rd edition. 4 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967-90.
- Baumann, A. "שָׁמַיִם kwl." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry, Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1984. 4:91-95.
- Beyse, Karl-Martin. "שָׁמַיִם I māšal I." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1986. 5:69-72.
- Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.
- Biga, Maria Giovanna, and Lucio Milano. Testi Amministrativi: Assegnazioni di Tessuti. Archivi Reali di Ebla IV. Rome: Missione Archeologica Italiana in Siria, 1984.
- Blake, Frank R. A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1951.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament. Translated by Robert Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blau, Joshua. On Pseudo-Corrections in Some Semitic Languages. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1970.
- Borland, James E. Christ in the Old Testament. Chicago: Moody Press, 1978.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren, et al., eds. Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1970-.

- Brinkman, John A., Miguel Civil, Ignace J. Gelb, A. Leo Oppenheim, and Erica Reiner, eds. The Assyrian Dictionary. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1956-.
- Brockelmann, Karl. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, vol. 1. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961.
- Brockelmann, Karl. Lexicon Syriacum. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, eds. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1907.
- Buber, Martin and Franz Rosenzweig. Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung. Berlin: Im Schocken Verlag, 1936.
- Budd, Philip J. Numbers. Word Bible Commentary. Waco: Word Books, Publishers, 1984.
- Buhl, Frants, ed. Gesenius' Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament. Berlin: Springer Verlag, (1915) 1949.
- Burney, Charles F. Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1903.
- Caird, George B. The Language and Imagery of the Bible. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1980.
- Calberini, Oliviera. "Considerazioni sul *nāšf*² ebraico, il *naši biltim* babilonese e il *nāšû* assiro." Bibbia e Oriente 21 (1979):273-81.
- _____. "Evoluzione della funzione del *nāšf*²: il libro dei Numeri." Bibbia e Oriente 20 (1978): 123-33.
- _____. "Il *nāšf*² biblico nell'epoca patriarcale e arcaica." Bibbia e Oriente 20 (1978):65-74.
- Cambridge Ancient History, The. Vol. 3. Edited by John B. Bury, Stanley A. Cook, and Frank E. Adcock. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1929.

- Carson, D. A. Exegetical Fallacies. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Castellino, G. R. "Genesis iv 7." Vetus Testamentum 10 (1960): 442-45.
- Cate, Robert L. Old Testament Roots for New Testament Faith. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1982.
- Childs, Brevard S. Exodus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1974.
- Childs, Brevard S. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Childs, Brevard S. Review of The Semantics of Biblical Language by James Barr. Journal of Biblical Literature 80/4 (1961):374-77.
- Christiansen, Duane L. "Two Stanzas of a Hymn in Deuteronomy 33." Biblica 65 (1984):382-89.
- Cole, Robert A. Exodus. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1977.
- Collins, John J. "The Meaning of Sacrifice: A Contrast of Methods." Biblical Research 22 (1977):19-34.
- Complete Concordance to the Bible. New York: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1983.
- Concordance of the Bible in the Moffatt Translation. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1950.
- Concordance to the Good News Bible. Edited by David Robinson. Swindon: Bible Societies, 1983.
- Cross, Frank M. and David Noel Freedman. "The Blessing of Moses." Journal of Biblical Literature 67 (1948): 191-210.
- Crown, Alan D. "Aposiopesis in the Old Testament." Abr-Nahrain 4 (1963-64):96-111.
- Dahood, Mitchell. "Ebla, Ugarit, and the Bible." In Giovanni Pettinato. The Archives of Ebla. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1981.
- Daube, David. Sin, Ignorance and Forgiveness in the Bible. London: Liberal Jewish Synagogue, 1961.

- David, Martin. "Zabal (Gen. xxx 20)." Vetus Testamentum 1 (1951):59-60.
- Davidson, Benjamin. The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- Davies, Benjamin, ed. Student's Hebrew Lexicon. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1957.
- Davies, Douglas. "An Interpretation of Sacrifice in Leviticus." Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft 89 (1977):387-99.
- de Boer, Pieter A. H. "An Inquiry into the Meaning of the Term *māššā*." Oudtestamentische Studien. Edited by Pieter A. H. de Boer, 5:197-214. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948.
- de Jong, Pieter. "Divine and Human Forgiveness: An Investigation into the Biblical Data about God's and Man's Forgiveness and the Relation between Them, Followed by a Comparison of the Biblical Data and Some of the Systematic and Ethical Approaches to the Problem." Ph.D. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York, 1951.
- de Vaulx, J. Les Nombres. Paris: Libraire Lecoffre J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs, 1972.
- De Meyer, Freddy. "Buber's Translation of the Bible." Louvain Studies 7/3 (1979):212-18.
- Delitzsch, Friedrich. Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896.
- Dentan, Robert C. "The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f." Vetus Testamentum 13 (1963):34-51.
- Dhorme, Edouard P. "L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien." Revue Biblique 29-32 (1920-23): 466-506; 374-99, 517-40; 215-33, 489-517; 185-212.
- Diehm, Werner. "Das Problem von *W* in Althebräischen und die kanaanäische Lautverschiebung." Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenwissenschaftes 124 (1974):221-52.
- diez Macho, Alejandro. Neophyti 1. Vols. 1-5. Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de investigaciones Científicas, 1970-.

- Dillmann, August. Genesis Critically and Exegetically Expounded. Vol. 2. Translated by Wm. B. Stevenson. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Dillon, George L. Introduction Contemporary Linguistic Semantics. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Dohmen, Christoph. "Zur Bedeutung und Verwendung von hebräischen ׀." Biblische Notizen 16 (1981):7-10.
- Donner, Herbert, and Wolfgang Röllig. Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften. 3 vols. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1966.
- Doukhan, Jacques. "L'hébreu en vie." Thesis for Docteur ès Lettres hébraïques. University of Strasbourg, 1973.
- Driver, Godfrey R. Aramaic Documents. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957.
- _____. "Birds in the Old Testament." Palestine Exploration Quarterly 86 (1955):5-20; 129-40.
- _____. "Once Again: Birds in the Bible." Palestine Exploration Quarterly 90 (1958):56-58.
- _____. "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament." Journal of Theological Studies 33 (1931):38-47; and 34 (1932):375-85.
- Driver, Samuel R. A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951.
- Durham, John I. Exodus. Word Bible Commentary. Waco, TX: Word Book Publishers, 1987.
- Dyrness, William. Themes in Old Testament Theology. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1979.
- Ehrlich, Arnold B. Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Vols. 1-7. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, (1908) 1968.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961 & 1967.
- Eisenbeis, Walter. Die Wurzel šlm im Alten Testament. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969.

- Eising, H. "זָכָר." Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Translated by David E. Green. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980. 4:64-82.
- Ellison, John W., compiler. Nelson's Complete Concordance of the Revised Standard Version Bible. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1957.
- Emerson, James G., Jr. The Dynamics of Forgiveness. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.
- Encyclopedia Judaica. New York: Macmillan Company, 1971.
- Even-Shoshan, Avraham. A New Concordance of the Old Testament. Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sefer" Publishing House, Ltd., 1985.
- Ewert, David. From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.
- Feliks, Jehuda. "Vultures." Encyclopedia Judaica. Jerusalem: Kefer Publishing House, Ltd., 1972. 16:232-33.
- Fishbane, Michael. "Form and Reformulation of the Biblical Priestly Blessing." Journal of the American Oriental Society 103/1 (1983):115-21.
- Fitzgerald, Aloysius. "MTNDBYM in 1QS." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 36 (1974):495-502.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967.
- Floristán, Casiano and Christian Duquoc, eds. Forgiveness. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1986.
- Fox, Everett. Now These Are the Names. New York: Schocken Books, 1986.
- Frazer, James G. The Golden Bough. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1940.
- Freedman, David Noel. "The Aaronic Benediction (Numbers 6:24-26)." In No Famine in the Land: Studies in Honor of John L. McKenzie, Edited by James W. Flanagan and Anita Weisbrod Robinson, 35-48. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

Freedman, David Noel. "God, Compassionate and Gracious." Western Watch 6 (1955):6-24.

_____, and B. E. Willoughby. "נָשָׂא nāšā." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1986. 5:626-43.

Fretheim, Terence E. The Suffering of God. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Fries, Heinrich. Handbuch Theologischer Grundbegriffe. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1963.

Frost, Stanley B. "Daniel." Interpreter's Bible Dictionary. Edited by George A. Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. 1:761-68.

Fuerst, Julius. A Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament. Translated by Samuel Davidson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1867.

Gaster, Theodore H. Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1969.

Gehman, Henry S. "The 'Burden' of the Prophets." The Jewish Quarterly Review 31 (1940):107-121.

Gerleman, Gillis. Essays on Biblical Theology. Minnesota: Augsburg Publishing House, 1981.

_____. "נִשְׁחַן nsh pi. versuchen." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971. 2:69-71.

_____. Studien zur alttestamentlichen Theologie. Heidelberg: Verlag Lambert Schneider, 1980.

Gese, Hartmut. "Die Sühne." Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie 73 (1977):85-106.

Gesenius, Guilielmi. Thesaurus Philologicus Criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti. Lipsiae: Sumtibus Typisque Fr. Chr. Guil. Vogelii, 1835.

- Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. Edited by E. Kautzsch. 2d edition revised by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980.
- Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament. Translated by Samuel P. Tregelles. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1905.
- Gibson, Arthur. Biblical Semantic Logic. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1981.
- Gibson, John C. L. Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions. Vol. 2. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Giesen, Georg. Die Wurzel šb^c 'schwören.' Eine semasiologische Studie zum Eid im Alten Testament. Bonner Biblische Beiträge, 56. Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1981.
- Gispen, Willem H. Exodus. Translated by Ed. van der Maas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1982.
- Gladson, Jerry A. "The Enigma of 'Azazel' in Leviticus 16." M.A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1973.
- Göbel, Christa. "'Denn bei dir ist Vergebung. . . .' slh im Alten Testament." Theologische Versuche 8 (1977): 21-33.
- Goodrick, Edward W., and John Kohlenberger III. The NIV Complete Concordance. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. Ugaritic Textbook. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.
- Gottstein, Moshe H. "אֵלֶּיךָ וְאֵלֶּיךָ (Gen 23:6)." Vetus Testamentum 3 (1953):298-99.
- Gottwald, Norman K. The Hebrew Bible. A Socio-Literary Introduction. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Goulder, Michael D. The Psalms of the Sons of Korah. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "The Scapegoat Tradition: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation." Journal for the Study of Judaism 48/2 (1987):152-67.

- Gray, George B. A Critical & Exegetical Commentary on Numbers. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.
- Gray, John. I and II Kings. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Greenberg, Moshe. Ezekiel 1-20. Anchor Bible. Vol. 22. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1983.
- Grelot, Pierre. Sens Crétien de l'Ancien Testament. Paris: Desclée et Cie, Éditeurs, 1962.
- Gruber, Mayer I. "The Many Faces of Hebrew 'וַיִּשָּׂא וַיִּשְׂא' 'lift up the face'." Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft 95/2 (1983):252-60.
- Gunkel, Herrmann. Genesis. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1969.
- Gunneweg, Antonius H. J. "Schuld ohne Vergebung?" Evangelische Theologie 36 (1976):2-14.
- Harkavy, Alexander. Students' Hebrew and Chaldee Dictionary to the Old Testament. New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1914.
- Harrison, Roland K. Leviticus. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1980.
- Hartdegen, Stephen J., ed. Nelsons Complete Concordance of the New American Bible. Toronto: G. Welch Co., 1977.
- Hasel, Gerhard F. "Studies in Biblical Atonement, I: Continual Sacrifice, Defilement//Cleansing and sanctuary." In The Sanctuary and the Atonement. Edited by Arnold V. Wallenkampf and W. Richard Leshner, 87-133. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1981.
- Hausmann, J. "וַיִּשָּׂא sālāh." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1986. 5:859-67.
- Hayes, John H. "Restitution, Forgiveness, and the Victim in OT Law." Trinity University Studies in Religion 11 (1982):1-23.

- Hazard, Marshall C. A Complete Concordance to the American Standard Version of the Holy Bible. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1922.
- Hedby, Karl. "Handpåläggningsrit och försoningsoffer." Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 49 (1984):58-65.
- Heinisch, Paul. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated by William Heidt. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1950.
- Held, Moshe. "The Root ZBL/SBL in Akkadian, Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew." Journal of the American Oriental Society 88 (1968):90-96.
- Helfmeyer, Franz Josef. "𐤌𐤁𐤏 nissāh." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry, Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1986. 5:473-88.
- Herner, Sven. "Sühne und Vergebung in Israel." Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund, 1941-1942, 47-121. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerups Förlag, 1942.
- Herrmann, Johannes. Die Idee der Sühne in Alten Testament. Eine Untersuchung über Gebrauch und Bedeutung des Wortes Kipper. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905.
- Hills, Sidney Oscar. "A Semantic and Conceptual Study of the Root KPR in the Hebrew Old Testament with Special Reference to the Accadian Kuppuru." Ph.D. dissertation, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, 1954.
- Hoffmeier, James K. "Some Egyptian Motifs Related to Warfare and Enemies and Their Old Testament Counterparts." The Ancient World 6/1-4 (1983):53-70.
- Holladay, William L. A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1971.
- Horn, Siegfried, ed. Seventh-day Adventist Bible Dictionary. Washington, DC: Review and Herald Publishing Association, 1960.
- Horst, Friedrich. Gottes Recht. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1961.

- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. "Versöhnung und Sühne." Bibel und Kirche 41 (1986):54-60.
- Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar, and E. Reuter. "כָּפַר II, nāšā² II." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry, Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer GMBH, 1986. 5:658-63.
- Hummel, Horace D. "Justification in the Old Testament." Concord Journal 9 (1983):9-17.
- _____. "Enclitic Mem in Early Northwest Semitic, Especially Hebrew." Journal of Biblical Literature 76 (1957):85-107.
- Hyde, William T. "The Hebrew Word kaphar and Its Greek and English Equivalents in Relation to the Doctrine of Atonement." B.D. thesis, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, 1958.
- Janowski, Bernd. "Auslösung des verwirkten Lebens." Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 79/1 (1982): 25-59.
- _____. "Sühne als Heilsgeschehen." Theologische Literaturzeitung 106 (1981): 779.
- _____. Sühne als Heilsgeschehen. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982.
- Jastrow, Marcus. A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature. New York: Judaica Press, 1975.
- Jean, Charles-F., and Jacob Hoftijser. Dictionnaire des Inscriptions Sémitique de l'Ouest. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Jenni, Ernst and Claus Westermann, eds. Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. 2 vols. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971-76.
- Jirku, Anton. Altorientalischer Kommentar zum alten Testament. Hildesheim: Verlag Dr. H. A. Gerstenberg, 1972.
- Joüon, Paul P. Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique. Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1947.

- Kaiser, Walter C. "K[ו] lift, carry, take." Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. Edited by R. L. Harris, Gleason L. Archer, and Bruce K. Waltke. Chicago: Moody Press, 1981. 600-601.
- Kaye, Michael. "Forgiveness." The Hibbert Journal 29 (1930):202-18.
- Keil, Carl F., and Franz Delitzsch. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament. Vols. 1-3. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949.
- Kellems, Jesse R. Studies in the Forgiveness of Sins. New York: George H. Doran Co., 1926.
- Kent, Homer A. "The Forgiveness of Sins in the OT." The Expositor 21 (1921):365-86.
- Kidner, Derek. "Sacrifice-Metaphors and Meaning." Tyndale Bulletin 33 (1982):119-36.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich Gerhard, eds. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76
- Kiuchi, N. The Purification Offering in the Priestly Literature. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 56. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Kleinig, John W. "On Eagles' Wing. An Exegetical Study of Exodus 19:2-8." Lutheran Theological Journal 21/1 (1987):18-27.
- Klopfenstein, Martin A. Die Lüge nach dem Alten Testament. Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1964.
- Knierim, Rolf. Die Hauptbegriffe für Sünde im Alten Testament. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1967.
- Koch, Klaus. "Gibt es ein Vergeltungsdogma im Alten Testament?" Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 52 (1955):1-42.
- _____. "Sühne und Sündenvergebung um die Wende von der exilischen zur nachexilischen Zeit." Evangelische Theologie 26 (1966):217-39.
- _____, ed. Um das Prinzip der Vergeltung in Religion und Recht des Alten Testaments. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.

- Koch, Robert. "La confession et la confession des péchés selon l'Ancien Testament." Studia Moralia 10 (1972): 219-47.
- _____. Il Peccato nel Vecchio Testamento. Rome: Edizioni Paoline, 1973.
- Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner. Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.
- Köhler, Ludwig. Old Testament Theology. Translated by A. S. Todd. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957.
- _____. "Zabal-tragen, ertragen." Theologische Zeitschrift 5 (1949):395.
- König, Eduard. Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1936.
- Kopf, Lothar. "Arabische Etymologien und Parallelen zum Bibelwörterbuch." Vetus Testamentum 8 (1958):161-215.
- Korpel, Marjo C. A. "The Poetic Structure of the Priestly Blessing." Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 45 (1989):3-13.
- Kraeling, Emil. The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.
- Ktba Ddytyga ^ctyga. [Syriac Bible]. New York: United Bible Societies, 1979.
- Kutscher, Edward Y. "Contemporary Studies in North-Western Semitic." Journal of Semitic Studies 10/1 (1965):35-41.
- Kuzlivelil, Matthew V. "Reconciliation in the Old Testament." Biblehashyam 9 (1983):168-178.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. H. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Lang, Bernhard. "[?] kippær." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1984. 4:303-18.

- LaSor, William S., David A. Hubbard, and Frederic W. Bush. Old Testament Survey. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1982.
- Leroy, Herbert. Zur Vergebung der Sünden. Stuttgart: K. B. W. Verlag, 1974.
- Levy, Jacob. Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midrashim. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
- Liddell, Henry G., and Robert Scott, compilers. A Greek English Lexicon. 9th edition, revised by Henry S. Jones. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1978.
- Limbeck, Meinrad. "Die Sühne der Sünden." Bibel und Kirche 33 (1978):15-19.
- Lindenberger, James M. The Aramaic Proverbs of Ahiqar. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Lipinski, Edward. "Urim and Thummim." Vetus Testamentum 20 (1970):495-96.
- Lorenz, Oswald. "Altorientalischer Hintergrund sowie inner-und nachbiblische Entwicklung des aaronitischen Segens (Num 6,24-26)." Ugaritforschungen 10 (1978):115-19.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. Sin, Redemption and Sacrifice. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970.
- Maly, Eugene H. "Sin and Forgiveness in the Scriptures." In Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit. Edited by Daniel Durken, 40-48. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979.
- Mangatt, George. "Forgiveness." Biblehashyam 8/1 (1982):42-53.
- Mannuci, Valerio. "Peccato, perdono e reconciliazione nell' antico testamento." Bibbia e Oriente 25 (1983):87-96.
- Marcus, David. A Manual of Akkadian. New York: University Press of America, 1978.
- Margain, Jean. Essais de sémantique sur l'hébreu ancien. Paris: Librairie orientaliste Paul Geuthner S. A., 1976.

- Martens, Elmer A. God's Design. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1981.
- Mayes, Andrew D. H. Deuteronomy. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1979.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. Treaty and Covenant. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- McCree, Walter T. "The Covenant Meal in the Old Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature 45 (1926):120-28.
- McFall, Leslie. The Enigma of the Hebrew Verbal System. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1982.
- McKane, William. "Maššā³ in Jeremiah 23:33-40." In Prophecy. Edited by J. A. Emerton, 35-54. New York: Walter Gruyter, 1980.
- Médebielle, A. "Expiation." Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplement. Paris: Libraire Letonzey et Ané, 1938. 7:1-262.
- Menes, Abram. Die vorexilischen Gesetze Israels. Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, Beihefte 50. Giessen: Verlag vom Alfred Töpelmann, 1928.
- Milgrom, Jacob. Leviticus 1-16. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- _____. "Priestly Terminology and the Political and Social Structure of Pre-Monarchic Israel." Jewish Quarterly Review 68 (1978):65-81.
- _____. "The Literary Structure of Numbers 8:5-22 and the Levitical Kippûr." In Perspectives on Language and Text. Edited by Edgar W. Conrad and Edward G. Newing. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987.
- _____. Studies in Levitical Terminology. Vol. 1. London: University of California Press, 1970.
- _____. "Two Kinds of Ḥāṭṭā³t." Vetus Testamentum 26 (1976):333-37.
- Miller, Edward F. The Influence of Gesenius on Hebrew Lexicography. New York: Columbia University Press, 1927.

- Miller, Patrick D. "The Blessing of God." Interpretation
29 (1975):240-51.
- Moberly, R. W. L. At the Mountain of God. JSOT
Supplement Series, 22. 1983.
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. Psalmenstudien. Vol. 1. Amsterdam:
P. Schippers, 1966.
- Montgomery, J. A. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on
the Book of Daniel. International Critical
Commentary. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark,
1950.
- Morro, William Charles. "Forgiveness." In The
International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Edited by
James Orr. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1939.
2:1132-35.
- Moscatti, Sabatino, Anton Spitaler, Edward Ullendorff and
Wolfram von Soden. An Introduction to the
Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages. Edited
by Sabatino Moscati. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz,
1980.
- Müller, H.-P. "𐤍𐤏𐤔𐤁𐤃 maššāḇ." Theologisches Wörterbuch
zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes
Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry.
Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:20-25.
- _____. "𐤍𐤏𐤔𐤁𐤃 rōš Kopf." Theologisches Handwörterbuch
zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus
Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976.
2:701-15.
- Murtonen, A. "The Use and Meaning of the Words l'ḥārāk
and b'rākā in the Old Testament." Vetus
Testamentum 9 (1959):158-177.
- Neusner, Jacob. The Talmud of the Land of Israel.
Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983.
- Niehr, Herbert. "𐤍𐤏𐤔𐤁𐤃 nāšīḇ." Theologisches Wörterbuch
zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes
Botterweck, H. Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry.
Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:647-56.
- Noordtziĳ, Arie. Leviticus. Bible Students Commentary.
Translated by R. Togtman. Grand Rapids: Zondervan
Publishing House, 1982.

- Noordtzij, Arie. Numbers. Bible Students Commentary. Translated by Ed. van der Maas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.
- Noth, Martin. Numbers: A Commentary. Old Testament Library. Translated by J.D. Martin. London: SCM Press, 1968.
- _____. Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966.
- Noth, Martin. Das Zweite Buch Mose. Exodus. Alte Testament Deutsch. Neues Göttingen Bibelwerk. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Nötscher, Friedrich. "Das Angesicht Gottes schauen" nach biblischer und babylonischer Auffassung. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969.
- Nyberg, Henrik S. Hebreisk Grammatik. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1952.
- Oesterley, William O. E., and Theodore H. Robinson. An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament. London: SPCK, 1958.
- Olafsson, Gudmundur. "The Use of Kaphar in the Penta-teuch." Term paper, Andrews University Theological Seminary, 1983.
- Olsen, Viggo Nørskov. "The Doctrine of Forgiveness in the Light of Biblical Hebrew and Greek Words." M.A. thesis, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, 1950.
- Ostrup, Jens. Orientalische Höflichkeit. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1929.
- Oswalt, John. The Book of Isaiah 1-39. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1986.
- Parker, Albert R. "Expiation and Propitiation in Relation to the Conciliation Concept of the Atonement." B.D. thesis, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, Takoma Park, 1955.
- Parmelee, Alice. A Guidebook to the Bible. London: University Press, 1954.
- Paton, Margaret. "Can God Forget?" Scottish Journal of Theology 35 (1982):385-402.

- Pedersen, Johannes. Israel: Its Life and Culture. 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1926-40.
- Pentateuch with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Prayers for the Sabbath and Rashi's Commentary. Deuteronomy. Translated by M. Rosenbaum and A. M. Silbermann. London: Shapiro, Vallentine & Co., 1946.
- Pettinato, Giovanni. The Archives of Ebla. Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Company, 1981.
- Phillips, Anthony. Ancient Israel's Criminal Law. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1970.
- Polzin, Robert. Late Biblical Hebrew: toward a Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Pope, Marvin H. "Oaths." The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. 3:575-77.
- Porteus, N. W. "Semantics and Old Testament Theology." Oudtestamentische Studien. Edited by Pieter A. H. de Boer. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1950. 8:1-14.
- Pritchard, James B. The Ancient Near East in Pictures. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954.
- Procksch, Otto. Die Genesis. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.
- _____. Theologie des Alten Testaments. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950.
- Quanbeck, Warren A. "Forgiveness." The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962. 2:315-19.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibel-gesellschaft, 1979.
- Raitt, Thomas Marshall. "The Concept of Forgiveness in the Pre-Exilic Prophets in Relation to Its Form-Historical Setting." Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1964.
- Reallexicon der Assyriologie. Vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1932. S.v. "Adler."
- Redlich, E. Basil. The Forgiveness of Sins. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937.

- Reif, C. S. "A Root to Look Up? A Study of the Hebrew nāšā^ʔ ayin." Vetus Testamentum Supplement 36 (1985):230-44.
- Reindl, Joseph. Das Angesicht Gottes im Sprachgebrauch des Alten Testaments. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag GMBH, 1970.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. The Old Testament. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "𐤏𐤍𐤔 kāsāh." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1984. 4:272-77.
- _____. "Some Remarks on the Language of Religion." Temenos 2 (1969):103-111.
- _____. "Sin and Forgiveness in the Koran." Temenos 2 (1966):98-111.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Robertson, Edward. "The Urim and Thummim; What Were They?" Vetus Testamentum 14 (1964):67-74.
- Robinson, Edward. Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Cambridge: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1882.
- Rodriguez, Angel M. Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series. Vol. 3. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1979.
- Rowley, Harold H. Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Forms and Meaning. London: SPCK, 1967.
- Ruprecht, Erich. "𐤏𐤍𐤔 plt retten." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testaments. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971. 2:420-27.
- Sabottka, Liudger. "Is 30, 27-30: Ein Übersetzungsvorschlag." Biblische Zeitschrift 12 (1968):241-243.

Sakenfeld, Katharine D. The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978.

———. "The Problem of Divine Forgiveness in Numbers 14." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 37 (1975):317-30.

Salmonia: or Days of Fly Fishing, by an "Angler". Republished by Humphrey Davy. New York: Freshet Press, 1970.

Sanda, Albert. Die Bücher der Könige. Münster in Westfalen: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1911.

Sansom, M. C. "Laying-On of Hands in the Old Testament." Expository Times 94 (1983):323-26.

Sasson, Victor. "An Unrecognized "Smoke-signal" in Isaiah XXX 27." Vetus Testamentum 33 (1983):90-95.

Sawyer, John F. A. "Root-Meanings in Hebrew." Journal of Semitic Studies 12 (1967):37-50.

Scharbert, Josef. "Vergebung." Handbuch Theologischer Grundbegriffe. Edited by Heinrich Fries. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1963. 740-49.

Schenker, Adrian. Versöhnung und Sühne. Freiburg: Verlag Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981.

———. "Wege gewaltfreier Konfliktlösung im Alten Testament." Bibel und Kirche 37 (1982):44-50.

Schmitt, Elmer William John. "Sin and Forgiveness in the Old Testament." Ph.D. dissertation, Drew Theological Seminary, 1943.

Schökel, Alonso. "מָחָה māḥāh." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1984. 4:804-8.

Schottroff, Willy. "זָכַר zkr gedenken." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1971. 1:507-18.

Schwager, Raymond. Brauchen wir einen Sündenbock? Gewalt und Erlösung in den biblischen Schriften. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1978.

- Schwarz, Günther. "'Begünstige nicht. . . ?" Lev 19:15b." Biblische Zeitschrift 19 (1975):1100.
- Scott, R. B. Young. "ק'ול = Cumulus Clouds." Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft 64 (1952):25.
- Seeligmann, I. L. "A Psalm from Pre-Regal Times." Vetus Testamentum 14 (1964):75-92.
- _____. "Zur Terminologie für das Gerichts-verfahren im Wortschatz des biblischen Hebräisch." Hebräische Wortforschung. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von W. Baumgartner. Vetus Testamentum Supplement, 16:251-78. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Seow, Choon L. A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987.
- Seybold, Klaus. Der aaronische Segen. Studien zu Numeri 6, 22-27. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977.
- Silva, Moisés. Biblical Words and Their Meaning. Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1983.
- Simian-Yofre, H. "ו'לפ pānīm." Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Helmer Ringgren. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1989. 6:629-59.
- Skinner, John. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1951.
- Smith, Jessie Payne, ed. A Compendious Syriac Dictionary. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1957.
- Smith, R. Payne. Thesaurus Syriacus. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1879.
- Smith, William R. Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. Jerusalem: KTAV Publishing House, Inc., 1969.
- Snaith, Norman H., ed. Leviticus and Numbers. Century Bible. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1967.
- Sollberger, Edmond. Archivi Reali di Ebla VIII. Rome: Missione Archeologica Italiana di siria, 1986.

- Speer, Jack Atkeson. The Living Bible Concordance.
 Poolesville, MD: Poolesville Presbyterian Church,
 1973.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. "Background and Function of the
 Biblical nāšî." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 25
 (1963):111-17.
- _____. "Census and Ritual Expiation in Mari and
 Israel." Bulletin of the American School of
 Oriental Research 149 (1958):17-25.
- Speiser, Ephraim A. Genesis. Anchor Bible. Vol. 1.
 Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., 1964.
- Spence, Henry D. M. and J. Exell, eds. Pulpit Commentary.
 Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing
 Company, 1977.
- Stähli, Hans-Peter. "וְיָרָם, הוֹךְ הָיָה." Theologisches
 Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst
 Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser
 Verlag, 1976. 2:753-61.
- Stamm, Johann J. "Dreißig Jahre Dekalogforschung."
Theologische Rundschau 27/4 (1961): 288-290.
- _____. Erlösen und Vergeben im Alten Testament.
 Bern: A. Francke, A.-G. Verlag, 1940.
- _____. "וְיָרָם הוֹךְ הָיָה." Theologisches
 Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst
 Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser
 Verlag, 1971. 2:150-160.
- Staples, W. E. "The Third Commandment." Journal of
 Biblical Literature 58 (1939):325-29.
- Steinmetzer, Franz X. "Bemerkungen zu den babylonischen
 Grenzsteinurkunden." Orientalische Literatur-
 zeitung 7,8 (1920):151-154.
- Stendebach, Franz Josef. "וְיָרָם הוֹךְ הָיָה." Theologisches
 Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by G.
 Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef
 Fabry. Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1986. 5:
 31-48.
- Stoebe, Hans Joachim. Gott, sei mir Sünder gnädig.
 Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1958.

- Stoebe, Hans Joachim. "כָּפַר ^{rp} heilen" Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976. 2:803-809.
- Stolz, Fritz. "נָסַח ^{ns} aufheben, tragen." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976. 2:109-17.
- Strong, James. The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1986.
- Sturdy, John. Numbers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Sung, Chong-Hyon. "Sündenvergebung Jesu bei den Synoptikern und seine Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum." Inaugural Dissertation zur Erlangung der Doktorwürde der Evangelisch Theologischen Fakultät an der Eberhard-Karls-Universität, Tübingen, 1984.
- Swete, Henry Barclay. The Forgiveness of Sins. London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1916.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Martin Buber's Ways of Interpreting the Bible." Journal of Jewish Studies 27 (1976): 195-209.
- Tawil, Hayim. "Azazel, The Prince of the Steepe: A Comparative Study." Zeitschrift der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft 92 (1980):45-59.
- Taylor, Vincent. "Forgiveness." Expository Times 51 (1939):16-21.
- Telfer, William. The Forgiveness of Sins. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1960.
- Thierry, G. J. "Notes on Hebrew Grammar and Etymology." Oudtestamentische Studien. Edited by Pieter A. H. deBoer. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1951. 9:1-17.
- Thomas, David W., ed. Hebrew and Semitic Studies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.
- Thomas, Robert L., ed. New American Standard Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. Nashville: Holman Bible Publishers, 1981.

- Thyen, Hartwig. Studien zur Sündenvergebung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970.
- Traduction oecuménique de la Bible. Paris: Alliance biblique universelle-Le Cerf, 1982.
- Tsevat, Matitiah. "Alalakhiana." Hebrew Union College Annual 29 (1958):109-134.
- Ullman, Stephen. Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967.
- van der Ploeg, Johannes. "Les chefs du peuple d'Israel et leurs titres." Revue Biblique 57 (1950):40-61.
- van der Woude, Adam S. "𐤌𐤍 𐤔𐤌, Name." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976. 2:935-63.
- Veijola, Timo. "Das dritte Gebot (Namenverbot) im Lichte einer ägyptischer Parallele." Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 103 (1991):1-17.
- Vogt, Ernst. Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum, 1971.
- von Rad, Gerhard. Genesis: A Commentary. Translated by J. H. Marks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- _____. "𐤌𐤍 in the Old Testament." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964. 1:76-80.
- _____. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1962 & 1965.
- _____. The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Translated by E. W. Trueman Dicken. London: 1966.
- von Soden, Wolfram. Akkadisches Handwörterbuch. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1965-.
- Vriezen, Theodore C. "Sündenvergebung." Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Edited by Kurt Galling, 6:507-11. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1962.

- Wainwright, Geoffrey. Eucharist and Eschatology. London: Epworth Press, 1971.
- Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Waring, Dawn E. "The Nature of Yahweh's Relationship with His People: A Literary Analysis of Exodus 32-34." Ph.D. dissertation, Fuller Theological Seminary, 1985.
- Wehmeier, Gerhard. "אָלס הָיָא הִנְיָא הִנְיָא." Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. Munich: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1976. 2:272-90.
- Weidner, Ernst. "Hof- und Harems-Erlasse assyrischer Könige." Archiv für Orientforschung 17 (1954-6): 268-79.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "בְּרִית בְּרִית," Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament. Translated by John T. Willis. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1975. 2:253-279.
- _____. "B'rit--Covenant vs. Obligation." Biblica 56 (1975):120-128.
- Wells, Paul R. James Barr and the Bible. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, 1980.
- Wenham, Gordon J. The Book of Leviticus. The New International Commentary of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.
- _____. Genesis 1-15. Word Bible Commentary. Waco: Word Book, Publishers, 1987.
- _____. Numbers. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1981.
- Westermann, Claus. Genesis. Vols. 1-3. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.
- Whitaker, Richard E. A Concordance of the Ugaritic Literature. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

- Whybray, R. N. Thanksgiving for a Liberated Prophet.
Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old
Testament Supplement Series, 4, 1978.
- Wigram, George V. The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldee
Concordance of the Old Testament. 5th edition.
Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1970.
- Winer, Georg Benedict, ed. Lexicon Manuale Hebraicum et
Chaldaicum in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Lipsiae:
Apud Fridericum Fleischer, 1828.
- Wood, John G. Bible Animals. New York: Charles Scribner
and Company, 1870.
- Woodring, Hoyt C. "Grace under the Mosaic Covenant."
Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary,
1956.
- Wright, David P. The Disposal of Impurity. Society of
Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, 101.
Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Wright, G. Ernest. "Divine Name and Divine Nature (Exod
33:12-34:9)." Perspective 12 (1971):177-85.
- _____. God Who Acts: Biblical Theology as Recital.
London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Wright, William. Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of
the Semitic Languages. Cambridge: At the University
Press, 1890.
- Zimmerli, Walther. "Die Eigenart der prophetischen Rede
des Ezechiel." Zeitschrift für die alttestament-
liche Wissenschaft 66 (1954):1-26.
- _____. Ezechiel, vol. 1. Neukirchen-Vluyn:
Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Zorell, Franciscus. Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum
Veteris Testamenti. Roma: Sumtibus Pontificii
Instituti Biblici, 1946.