In the Bible two verbs generally are used to refer to God's bringing the Israelites out of Egypt: *hôšêt*, literally "to bring out", and *heš’ēlāh*, literally "to bring up". Of the two the former is the more common. In the Pentateuch this trend is even more evident, and when God speaks in the first person it is still more evident. First-person usages in the Pentateuch appear in Exod. vi 6, vi 7, vii 4, vii 5, xii 7, xvi 32, xx 2, xxix 46; Lev. xi 45, xix 36, xxii 33, xxiii 43, xxv 38, xxv 42, xxv 55, xxvi 13, xxvi 45; Numb. xv 41; Deut. v 6 (these include perfect and imperfect verbs with first-person markers, infinitive construct with the suffix -î, and participle preceded by *ṯānî*). All these passages except one use the verb *hôšêt* (in its various forms). The exception is Lev. xi 45 where the rarer

*Vetus Testamentum* XLIII, 3 (1993)
verb *heṣēlāh* appears, in particular in the phrase 'āni yhwh hamma-
caleh 'etkem mezareš misrayim ‘I am the Lord who brought you up
from the land of Egypt’.

Such a ratio of usages prompts the question: why in Lev. xi 45
alone is the verb *heṣēlāh* used, in the particular form maCaleh, the
masculine singular participle? The answer lies in recognizing the
presence of an inclusio in this chapter. This section of the Pen-
tateuch deals with the permitted and forbidden animals. A common
word used at the beginning of Lev. xi is the term ma'āleh, ma'ālē,
ma'ālat, meaning ‘to chew the cud’ (vv. 3, 4 [bis], 5, 6). In
the light of this, the singular use of ma'āleh in Lev. xi 45 is explained.

The inclusio, ‘‘the bracketing device in which a composer
returns to a note he has already sounded in order to wrap it in an
envelope’’, is a technique usually associated with Hebrew poetry,
especially the book of Psalms. Examples of inclusio in prose texts
are rarer, though they do exist. For example, E. F. Campbell noted

The one genre of biblical literature wherein scholars have been
slow to recognize the presence of inclusios is the legal material. This
is not surprising, of course, since to many minds the law collections
of the Pentateuch are written in dry, legalistic language, devoid of
literary expression. But the brilliant study of Meir Paran already
has demonstrated the errancy of this judgement. Among the many
important conclusions reached by Paran is the widespread use of
numerous types of inclusios in the portions of the Torah tradi-
tionally associated with the priestly source, including the legal and
cultic material of Leviticus.

The literary approach to the Bible has made important strides in
recent years. There is no reason to exclude the legal portions of the
corpus from this enterprise. Instead, scholars should come to rec-
ognize the validity of the general observation of S. E.
Loewenstamm, who referred to ‘‘the distinctive literary character
of pentateuchal law’, in contrast to the legal material from
Mesopotamia. The presence of an inclusio in Lev. xi is just one
small example of a rhetorical device in the legal sections of the
Torah. When viewed in the light of the substantial amount of mate-
rial amassed by Paran, it speaks loudly in support of
Loewenstamm’s claim.
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Most commentators on this chapter have failed to notice this unique usage. For an exception, see J. Milgrom, *Leviticus I-16* (New York, 1991), p. 688, though there is no attempt to explain this single instance of *hešōlah*.

Another possible exception is Exod. iii 17, but these words are in the mouth of Moses.

In the Talmud (B. Baba Meši‘a 61b) there is recognition of the unique usage of *mašōleh* in Lev. xi 45. R. Hanina of Sura on the Euphrates asked: "nă ‡mōlah qă qyă ly m’y fnă ‡hıăh. Why the change to hammašōleh here?" This question arises in a context totally different from the subject of the present article, and there is no attempt to answer it through literary means. But the discussion points to the fact that, not surprisingly, the rabbis (or at least one among them) recognized the singular nature of *mašōleh* in Lev. xi 45.

Later in the Bible instances of *hešōlah* in the first person occur in Judg. vi 8; 1 Sam. x 18; Amos ii 10, iii 1, ix 7; Mic. vi 4. But as a whole the verb *hešōlah* (in all persons) becomes more common in later books of the Bible in contexts recalling God’s bringing the Israelites out of Egypt.


This finding may call into question the conclusion of J. Milgrom, “The Composition of Leviticus, Chapter 11”, in G. A. Anderson and S. M. Olyan (ed.), *Priesthood and Cult in Ancient Israel*, (Sheffield, 1991), pp. 182-91, that vv. 43-45 are “alien to the chapter” (p. 189) and were added at a late stage in the redactional process.


See also B. S. Jackson, “Practical Wisdom and Literary Artifice in the Covenant Code”, in B. S. Jackson and S. M. Passamanec (ed.), *The Jerusalem 1990 Conference Volume* (Atlanta, 1992), pp. 65-92. I am grateful to Professor Jackson for bringing his study to my attention.

An American jurist who is famous for literary input into his legal writings is Judge Bruce M. Selya of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in Boston. See David Margolick, “At the Bar: Sustained by dictionaries, a judge rules that no word, or word play, is inadmissible”, *The New York Times* (27 March 1992), p. B16.

a literary structure to the prologue and epilogue of Hammurapi’s Code (though these sections of the stela obviously are more literary, and less legal, in nature). But even these insights do not affect the overall accuracy of Loewenstamm’s observation. Anyone who has read both Israelite and Mesopotamian legal collections will realize that the former possesses a far greater literary quality than does the latter. For example, the structures uncovered by Eichler (he discussed not only Eshnuna, but also Hammurapi) pale in comparison with the “unified masterpiece of jurisprudential literature” which characterizes the laws of Deuteronomy. For the latter see S. A. Kaufman, “The Structure of Deuteronomic Law”, Maarav 1 (1978-9), pp. 105-58, in particular p. 147.

12 Again, one should consult Kaufman (n. 12) for further evidence of sophisticated literary input into the composition of biblical law.
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