

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES (LEVITICUS)

TRANSLATED BY
JAMES MARTIN

INTRODUCTION

CONTENTS AND PLAN OF LEVITICUS

The third book of Moses is headed **סֵפֶר־לֵוִי** in the original text, from the opening word. In the Septuagint and Vulgate it is called **Λευιτικόν**, sc., **βιβλίον**, *Leviticus*, from the leading character of its contents, and probably also with some reference to the titles which had obtained currency among the Rabbins, viz., “law of the priests,” “law-book of sacrificial offerings.” It carries on to its completion the giving of the law at Sinai, which commenced at Exo. 25, and by which the covenant constitution was firmly established. It contains more particularly the laws regulating the relation of Israel to its God, including both the fundamental principles upon which its covenant fellowship with the Lord depended, and the directions for the sanctification of the covenant people in that communion. Consequently the laws contained in this book might justly be described as the “spiritual statute-book of Israel as the congregation of Jehovah.” As every treaty establishes a reciprocal relation between those who are parties to it, so not only did Jehovah as Lord of the whole earth enter into a special relation to His chosen people Israel in the covenant made by Him with the seed of Abraham, which He had chosen as His own possession out of all the nations, but the nation of Israel was also to be brought into a real and living fellowship with Him as its God and Lord. And whereas Jehovah would be Israel’s God, manifesting Himself to it in all the fulness of His divine nature; so was it also His purpose to train Israel as His own nation, to sanctify it for the truest life in fellowship with Him, and to bless it with all the fulness of His salvation. To give effect to the former, or the first condition of the covenant, God had commanded the erection of a sanctuary for the dwelling-place of His name, or the true manifestation of His own essence; and on its erection, i.e., on the setting up of the tabernacle, He filled the most holy place with a visible sign of His divine glory (Exo. 40:34), a proof that He would be ever near and present to His people with His almighty grace. When this was done, it was necessary that the other side of the covenant relation should be realized in a manner suited to the spiritual, religious, and moral condition of Israel, in order that Israel might become His people in truth. But as the nation of Israel was separated from God, the Holy One, by the sin and unholiness of its nature, the

only way in which God could render access to His gracious presence possible, was by institutions and legal regulations, which served on the one hand to sharpen the consciousness of sin in the hearts of the people, and thereby to awaken the desire for mercy and for reconciliation with the holy God, and on the other hand furnished them with the means of expiating their sins and sanctifying their walk before God according to the standard of His holy commandments.

All the laws and regulations of Leviticus have this for their object, inasmuch as they, each and all, aim quite as much at the restoration of an inward fellowship on the part of the nation as a whole and the individual members with Jehovah their God, through the expiation or forgiveness of sin and the removal of all natural uncleanness, as at the strengthening and deepening of this fellowship by the sanctification of every relation of life. In accordance with this twofold object, the contents of the book are arranged in two larger series of laws and rules of life, the first extending from Lev. 1 to Lev. 16, the second from Lev. 17 to Lev. 25. The *first* of these, which occupies the earlier half of the book of Leviticus, opens with the laws of sacrifice in Lev. 1-7. As sacrifices had been from the very beginning the principal medium by which men entered into fellowship with God, the Creator, Preserver, and Governor of the world, to supplicate and appropriate His favour and grace, so Israel was not only permitted to draw near to its God with sacrificial gifts, but, by thus offering its sacrifices according to the precepts of the divine law, would have an ever open way of access to the throne of grace. The laws of sacrifice are followed in Lev. 8-10 by the consecration of Aaron and his sons, the divinely appointed priests, by their solemn entrance upon their official duties, and by the sanctification of their priesthood on the part of God, both in word and act. Then follow in Lev. 11-15 the regulations concerning the clean and unclean animals, and various bodily impurities, with directions for the removal of all defilements; and these regulations culminate in the institution of a yearly day of atonement (Lev. 16), inasmuch as this day, with its all-embracing expiation, foreshadowed typically and prefigured prophetically the ultimate and highest aim of the Old Testament economy, viz., perfect reconciliation. Whilst all these laws and institutions opened up to the people of Israel the way of access to the throne of grace, the *second* series of laws, contained in the later half of the book (Lev. 17-25), set forth the demands made by the holiness of God upon His people, that they might remain in fellowship with Him, and rejoice in the blessings of His grace. This series of laws commences with directions for the sanctification of life in food, marriage, and morals (Lev. 17-20); it then advances to the holiness of the priests and the sacrifices (Lev. 21 and 22), and from that to the sanctification of the feasts and the daily worship of God (chs. 23 and 24), and closes with the sanctification of the whole land by the

appointment of the sabbatical and jubilee years (Lev. 25). In these the sanctification of Israel as the congregation of Jehovah was to be glorified into the blessedness of the sabbatical rest in the full enjoyment of the blessings of the saving grace of its God; and in the keeping of the year of jubilee more especially, the land and kingdom of Israel were to be transformed into a kingdom of peace and liberty, which also foreshadowed typically and prefigured prophetically the time of the completion of the kingdom of God, the dawn of the glorious liberty of the children of God, when the bondage of sin and death shall be abolished for ever.

Whilst, therefore, the laws of sacrifice and purification, on the one hand, culminate in the institution of the *yearly day of atonement*, so, on the other, do those relating to the sanctification of life culminate in the appointment of the *sabbatical and jubilee years*; and thus the two series of laws in Leviticus are placed in unmistakable correspondence to one another. In the ordinances, rights, and laws thus given to the covenant nation, not only was the way clearly indicated, by which the end of its divine calling was to be attained, but a constitution was given to it, fully adapted to all the conditions incident to this end, and this completed the establishment of the kingdom of God in Israel. To give a finish, however, to the covenant transaction at Sinai, it was still necessary to impress upon the hearts of the people, on the one hand, the blessings that would follow the faithful observance of the covenant of their God, and on the other hand, the evil of transgressing it (Lev. 26). To this there are also added, in the form of an appendix, the instructions concerning vows. The book of Leviticus is thus rounded off, and its unity and independence within the *Thorah* are established, not only by the internal unity of its laws and their organic connection, but also by the fact, so clearly proved by the closing formula in Lev. 26:46 and 27:34, that it finishes with the conclusion of the giving of the law at Sinai.

EXPOSITION

I. Laws and Ordinances Determining the Covenant Fellowship Between the Lord and Israel (Ch. 1-16).

THE LAWS OF SACRIFICE. — CH. 1-7.

Lev. 1-7. When the glory of the Lord had entered the tabernacle in a cloud, God revealed Himself to Moses from this place of His gracious presence, according to His promise in Exo. 25:22, to make known His sacred will through him to the people (Lev. 1: 1). The first of these revelations related to

the sacrifices, in which the Israelites were to draw near to Him, that they might become partakers of His grace. ^{f1}

The patriarchs, when sojourning in Canaan, had already worshipped the God who revealed Himself to them, with both burnt-offerings and slain-offerings. Whether their descendants, the children of Israel, had offered sacrifices to the God of their fathers during their stay in the foreign land of Egypt, we cannot tell, as there is no allusion whatever to the subject in the short account of these 430 years. So much, however, is certain, that they had not forgotten to regard the sacrifices as a leading part of the worship of God, and were ready to follow Moses into the desert, to serve the God of their fathers there by a solemn act of sacrificial worship (Exo. 5: 1-3, compared with Lev. 4:31; 8: 4, etc.); and also, that after the exodus from Egypt, not only did Jethro offer burnt-offerings and slain-offerings to God in the camp of the Israelites, and prepare a sacrificial meal in which the elders of Israel took part along with Moses and Aaron (Exo. 18:12), but young men offered burnt-offerings and slain-offerings by the command of Moses at the conclusion of the covenant (Exo. 24: 5). Consequently the sacrificial laws of these chapters presuppose the presentation of burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and slain-offerings as a custom well known to the people, and a necessity demanded by their religious feelings (Lev. 1: 2, 3, 10, 14; 2: 1, 4, 5, 14; 3: 1, 6, 11). They were not introduced among the Israelites for the first time by Moses, as *Knobel* affirms, who also maintains that the feast of the Passover was the first animal sacrifice, and in fact a very imperfect one. Even animal sacrifices date from the earliest period of our race. Not only did Noah offer burnt-offerings of all clean animals and birds (Gen. 8:20), but Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock an offering to the Lord (Gen. 4: 4). ^{f2}

The object of the sacrificial laws in this book was neither to enforce sacrificial worship upon the Israelites, nor to apply “a theory concerning the Hebrew sacrifices” (*Knobel*), but simply to organize and expand the sacrificial worship of the Israelites into an institution in harmony with the covenant between the Lord and His people, and adapted to promote the end for which it was established.

But although sacrifice in general reaches up to the earliest times of man’s history, and is met with in every nation, it was not enjoined upon the human race by any positive command of God, but sprang out of a religious necessity for fellowship with God, the author, protector, and preserver of life, which was as innate in man as the consciousness of God itself, though it assumed very different forms in different tribes and nations, in consequence of their estrangement from God, and their growing loss of all true knowledge of Him, inasmuch as their ideas of the Divine Being so completely regulated the nature,

object, and signification of the sacrifices they offered, that they were quite as subservient to the worship of idols as to that of the one true God. To discover the fundamental idea, which was common to all the sacrifices, we must bear in mind, on the one hand, that the first sacrifices were presented after the fall, and on the other hand, that we never meet with any allusion to expiation in the pre-Mosaic sacrifices of the Old Testament. Before the fall, man lived in blessed unity with God. This unity was destroyed by sin, and the fellowship between God and man was disturbed, though not entirely abolished. In the punishment which God inflicted upon the sinners, He did not withdraw His mercy from men; and before driving them out of paradise, He gave them clothes to cover the nakedness of their shame, by which they had first of all become conscious of their sin. Even after their expulsion He still manifested Himself to them, so that they were able once more to draw near to Him and enter into fellowship with Him. This fellowship they sought through the medium of sacrifices, in which they gave a visible expression not only to their gratitude towards God for His blessing and His grace, but also to their supplication for the further continuance of His divine favour. It was in this sense that both Cain and Abel offered sacrifice, though not with the same motives, or in the same state of heart towards God. In this sense Noah also offered sacrifice after his deliverance from the flood; the only apparent difference being this, that the sons of Adam offered their sacrifices to God from the fruit of their labour, in the tilling of the ground and the keeping of sheep, whereas Noah presented his burnt-offerings from the clean cattle and birds that had been shut up with him in the ark, i. e., from those animals which at any rate from that time forward were assigned to man as food (Gen. 9: 3). Noah was probably led to make this selection by the command of God to take with him into the ark not one or more pairs, but seven of every kind of clean beasts, as he may have discerned in this an indication of the divine will, that the seventh animal of every description of clean beast and bird should be offered in sacrifice to the Lord, for His gracious protection from destruction by the flood. Moses also received a still further intimation as to the meaning of the animal sacrifices, in the prohibition which God appended to the permission to make use of animals as well as green herbs for food; viz., “flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat” (Gen. 9: 4, 5), that is to say, flesh which still contained the blood as the animal’s soul. In this there was already an intimation, that in the bleeding sacrifice the soul of the animals was given up to God with the blood; and therefore, that by virtue of its blood, as the vehicle of the soul, animal sacrifice was the most fitting means of representing the surrender of the human soul to God. This truth may possibly have been only dimly surmised by Noah and his sons; but it must have been clearly revealed to the patriarch Abraham, when God demanded the sacrifice of his only son, with whom his whole heart was bound up, as a proof of his obedience of faith, and then, after he had attested his faith in his readiness to offer this sacrifice,

supplied him with a ram to offer as a burnt-offering instead of his son (Gen. 22). In this the truth was practically revealed to him, that the true God did not require human sacrifice from His worshippers, but the surrender of the heart and the denial of the natural life, even though it should amount to a submission to death itself, and also that this act of surrender was to be perfected in the animal sacrifice; and that it was only when presented with these motives that sacrifice could be well-pleasing to God. Even before this, however, God had given His sanction to the choice of clean or edible beasts and birds for sacrifice, in the command to Abram to offer such animals, as the sacrificial substratum for the covenant to be concluded with him (Gen. 15).

Now, though nothing has been handed down concerning the sacrifices of the patriarchs, with the exception of Gen. 46: 1ff., there can be no doubt that they offered burnt-offerings upon the altars which they built to the Lord, who appeared to them in different places in Canaan (Gen. 12: 7; 13: 4, 18; 26:25; 33:20; 35: 1-7), and embodied in these their solemn invocation of the name of God in prayer; since the close connection between sacrifice and prayer is clearly proved by such passages as Hos. 14: 3, Heb. 13:15, and is universally admitted.

^B To the burnt-offering there was added, in the course of time, the slain-offering, which is mentioned for the first time in Gen. 31:54, where Jacob seals the covenant, which has been concluded with Laban and sworn to by God, with a covenant meal. Whilst the burnt-offering, which was given wholly up to God and entirely consumed upon the altar, and which ascended to heaven in the smoke, set forth the self-surrender of man to God, the slain-offering, which culminated in the sacrificial meal, served as a seal of the covenant fellowship, and represented the living fellowship of man with God. Thus, when Jacob-Israel went down with his house to Egypt, he sacrificed at Beersheba, on the border of the promised land, to the God of his father Isaac, not burnt-offerings, but slain-offerings (Gen. 46: 1), through which he presented his prayer to the Lord for preservation in covenant fellowship even in a foreign land, and in consequence of which he received the promise from God in a nocturnal vision, that He, the God of his father, would go with him to Egypt and bring him up again to Canaan, and so maintain the covenant which He had made with his fathers, and assuredly fulfil it in due time. The expiatory offerings, properly so called, viz., the sin and trespass-offerings, were altogether unknown before the economy of the Sinaitic law; and even if an expiatory element was included in the burnt-offerings, so far as they embodied self-surrender to God, and thus involved the need of union and reconciliation with Him, so little prominence is given to this in the pre-Mosaic sacrifices, that, as we have already stated, no reference is made to expiation in connection with them. ^{f4}

The reason for this striking fact is to be found in the circumstance, that godly men of the primeval age offered their sacrifices to a God who had drawn near

to them in revelations of love. It is true that in former times God had made known His holy justice in the destruction of the wicked and the deliverance of the righteous (Gen. 6:13ff., 18:16ff.), and had commanded Abraham to walk blamelessly before Him (Gen. 17: 1); but He had only manifested Himself to the patriarchs in His condescending love and mercy, whereas He had made known His holiness in His very first revelation to Moses in the words, "Draw not nigh hither; put off thy shoes," etc. (Exo. 3: 5), and unfolded it more and more in all subsequent revelations, especially at Sinai. After Jehovah had there declared to the people of Israel, whom He had redeemed out of Egypt, that they were to be a holy nation to Him (Exo. 19: 6), He appeared upon the mountain in the terrible glory of His holy nature, to conclude His covenant of grace with them by the blood of burnt-offerings and slain-offerings, so that the people trembled and were afraid of death if the Lord should speak to them any more (Exo. 20:18ff.). These facts preceded the laws of sacrifice, and not only prepared the way for them, but furnished the key to their true interpretation, by showing that it was only by sacrifice that the sinful nation could enter into fellowship with the holy God.

The laws of sacrifice in Lev. 1-7 are divisible into two groups. The first (Lev. 1-5) contains the general instructions, which were applicable both to the community as a whole and also the individual Israelites. Ch. 1-3 contain an account of the animals and vegetables which could be used for the three kinds of offerings that were already common among them, viz., the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and slain-offerings; and precise rules are laid down for the mode in which they were to be offered. In Lev. 4 and 5 the occasions are described on which sin-offerings and trespass-offerings were to be presented; and directions are given as to the sacrifices to be offered, and the mode of presentation on each separate occasion. The second group (Lev. 6 and 7) contains special rules for the priests, with reference to their duties in connection with the different sacrifices, and the portions they were to receive; together with several supplementary laws, for example, with regard to the meat-offering of the priests, and the various kinds of slain or peace-offering. All these laws relate exclusively to the sacrifices to be offered spontaneously, either by individuals or by the whole community, the consciousness and confession of sin or debt being presupposed, even in the case of the sin and trespass-offerings, and their presentation being made to depend upon the free-will of those who had sinned. This is a sufficient explanation of the fact, that they contain no rules respecting either the time for presenting them, or the order in which they were to follow one another, when two or more were offered together. At the same time, the different rules laid down with regard to the ritual to be observed, applied not only to the private sacrifices, but also to those of the congregation, which were prescribed by special laws for every day, and for the annual festivals, as well as

to the sacrifices of purification and consecration, for which no separate ritual is enjoined.

1. General Rules for the Sacrifices. — Ch. 1-5.

Lev. 1-5. The common term for sacrifices of every kind was Corban (presentation; see at Lev. 1: 2). It is not only applied to the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and slain or peace-offerings, in Lev. 1: 2, 3, 10, 14; 2: 1, 4ff., 3: 1 6, etc., but also to the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings in Lev. 4:23, 28, 32; 5:11, Num. 5:15, etc., as being holy gifts (Exo. 28:38 cf. Num. 18: 9) with which Israel was to appear before the face of the Lord (Exo. 23:15; Deu. 16:16, 17). These sacrificial gifts consisted partly of clean tame animals and birds, and partly of vegetable productions; and hence the division into the two classes of bleeding and bloodless (bloody and unbloody) sacrifices. The animals prescribed in the law are those of *the herd*, and *the flock*, the latter including both sheep and goats (Lev. 1: 2, 3, 10; 22:21; Num. 15: 3), two collective terms, for which ox and sheep, or goat (ox, sheep and goat) were the *nomina usitatis* (Lev. 7:23; 17: 3; 22:19, 27; Num. 15:11; Deu. 14: 4), that is to say, none but tame animals whose flesh was eaten (Lev. 11: 3; Deu. 14: 4); whereas unclean animals, though tame, such as asses, camels, and swine, were inadmissible; and game, though edible, e.g., the hare, the stag, the roebuck, and gazelle (Deu. 14: 5). Both male and female were offered in sacrifice, from the herd as well as the flock (Lev. 3: 1), and young as well as old, though not under eighty days old (Lev. 22:27; Exo. 22:29); so that the ox was offered either as *calf* (Lev. 9: 2; Gen. 15: 9; 1Sa. 16: 2) or as *bullock*, i.e., as young steer or heifer (Lev. 4: 3), or as full-grown cattle. Every sacrificial animal was to be without blemish, i.e., free from bodily faults (Lev. 1: 3, 10; 22:19ff.). The only birds that were offered were turtle-doves and young pigeons (Lev. 1:14), which were presented either by poor people as burnt-offerings, and as a substitute for the larger animals ordinarily required as sin-offerings and trespass-offerings (Lev. 5: 7; 12: 8; 14:22, 31), or as sin and burnt-offerings, for defilements of a less serious kind (Lev. 12: 6, 7; 15:14, 29, 30; Num. 6:10, 11). The vegetable sacrifices consisted of meal, for the most part of fine flour (Lev. 2: 1), of cakes of different kinds (Lev. 2: 4-7), and of toasted ears or grains of corn (Lev. 2:14), to which there were generally added oil and incense, but never leaven or honey (Lev. 2:11); and also of wine for a drink-offering (Num. 15: 5ff.).

The *bleeding sacrifices* were divided into four classes: viz., (1) *burnt-offerings* (Lev. 1), for which a male animal or pigeon only was admissible; (2) *peace-offerings* (slain-offerings of peace, Lev. 3), which were divisible again into praise-offerings, vow-offerings, and freewill-offerings (Lev. 7:12, 16), and consisted of both male and female animals, but never of pigeons; (3) *sin-offerings* (Lev. 4: 1-5:13); and (4) *trespass-offerings* (Lev. 5:14-26). Both male

and female animals might be taken for the sin-offerings; and doves also could be used, sometimes independently, sometimes as substitutes for larger animals; and in cases of extreme poverty meal alone might be used (Lev. 5:11). But for the trespass-offerings either a ram (Lev. 5:15, 18, 25; 19:21) or a lamb had to be sacrificed (Lev. 14:12; Num. 6:12). All the sacrificial animals were to be brought "before Jehovah," i.e., before the altar of burnt-offering, in the court of the tabernacle (Lev. 1: 3, 5, 11; 3: 1, 7, 12; 4: 4). There the offerer was to rest his hand upon the head of the animal (Lev. 1: 4), and then to slaughter it, flay it, cut it in pieces, and prepare it for a sacrificial offering; after which the priest would attend to the sprinkling of the blood and the burning upon the altar fire (Lev. 1: 5-9; 6: 2ff., 21: 6). In the case of the burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, and trespass-offerings, the blood was swung all round against the walls of the altar (Lev. 1: 5, 11; 3: 2, 8, 13; 7: 2); in that of the sin-offerings a portion was placed upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and in certain circumstances it was smeared upon the horns of the altar of incense, or sprinkled upon the ark of the covenant in the most holy place, and the remainder poured out at the foot of the altar of burnt-offering (Lev. 4: 5-7, 16-18, 25, 30). In the case of the burnt-offering, the flesh was all burned upon the altar, together with the head and entrails, the latter having been previously cleansed (Lev. 1: 8, 13); in that of the peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, the fat portions only were burned upon the altar, viz., the larger and smaller caul, the fat upon the entrails and inner muscles of the loins, and the kidneys with their fat (Lev. 3: 9-11, 14-16; 4: 8-10, 19, 26, 31, 35; 7: 3-5). When a peace-offering was presented, the breast piece and right leg were given to Jehovah for the priests, and the rest of the flesh was used and consumed by the offerer in a sacrificial meal (Lev. 7:15-17, 30-34). But the flesh of the trespass-offerings and sin-offerings of the laity was boiled and eaten by the priests in a holy place, i.e., in the court of the tabernacle (Lev. 6:19, 22; 7: 6). In the sin-offerings presented for the high priest and the whole congregation the animal was all burnt in a clean place outside the camp, including even the skin, the entrails, and the ordure (Lev. 4:11, 12, 21). When the sacrifice consisted of pigeons, the priest let the blood flow down the wall of the altar, or sprinkled it against it; and then, if the pigeon was brought as a burnt-offering, he burnt it upon the altar after taking away the crop and *faeces*; but if it was brought for a sin-offering, he probably followed the rule laid down in Lev. 1:15 and 5: 8.

The bloodless gifts were employed as meat and drink-offerings. The meat-offering (*minchah*) was presented sometimes by itself, at other times in connection with burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. The independence of the meat-offering, which has been denied by *Bähr* and *Kurtz* on insufficient grounds, is placed beyond all doubt, not only by the meat-offering of the priests

(Lev. 6:13ff.) and the so-called jealousy-offering (Num. 5:15ff.), but also by the position in which it is placed in the laws of sacrifice, between the burnt and peace-offerings. From the instructions in Num. 15: 1-16, to offer a meat-offering mixed with oil and a drink-offering of wine with every burnt-offering and peace-offering, the quantity to be regulated by the size of the animal, it by no means follows that all the meat-offerings were simply accompaniments to the bleeding sacrifices, and were only to be offered in connection with them. On the contrary, inasmuch as these very instructions prescribe only a meat-offering of meal with oil, together with a drink-offering of wine, as the accompaniment to the burnt and peace-offerings, without mentioning incense at all, they rather prove that the meat-offerings mentioned in Lev. 2, which might consist not only of meal and oil, with which incense had to be used, but also of cakes of different kinds and roasted corn, are to be distinguished from the mere accompaniments mentioned in Num. 15. In addition to this, it is to be observed that pastry, in the form of cakes of different kinds, was offered with the praise-offerings, according to Lev. 7:12ff., and probably with the two other species of peace-offerings as well; so that we should introduce an irreconcilable discrepancy between Num. 15 and Lev. 2, if we were to restrict all the meat-offerings to the accompaniments mentioned in Num. 15, or reduce them to merely dependent additions to the burnt and peace-offerings. Only a portion of the independent meat-offerings was burnt by the priest upon the altar (Lev. 2: 2, 9, 16); the rest was to be baked without leaven, and eaten by the priests in the court, as being most holy (Lev. 6: 8-11): it was only the meat-offering of the priests that was all burned upon the altar (Lev. 6:16). — The law contains no directions as to what was to be done with the drink-offering; but the wine was no doubt poured round the foot of the altar (Ecclus. 1. 15. *Josephus, Ant.* iii. 9, 4).

The great importance of the sacrifices prescribed by the law may be inferred to a great extent, apart from the fact that sacrifice in general was founded upon the dependence of man upon God, and his desire for the restoration of that living fellowship with Him which had been disturbed by sin, from the circumstantiality and care with which both the choice of the sacrifices and the mode of presenting them are most minutely prescribed. But their special meaning and importance in relation to the economy of the Old Covenant are placed beyond all question by the position they assumed in the ritual of the Israelites, forming as they did the centre of all their worship, so that scarcely any sacred action was performed without sacrifice, whilst they were also the medium through which forgiveness of sin and reconciliation with the Lord were obtained, either by each individual Israelite, or by the congregation as a whole. This significance, which was deeply rooted in the spiritual life of Israel, is entirely destroyed by those who lay exclusive stress upon the notion of presentation or gift, and can see nothing more in the sacrifices than a “renunciation of one’s own property,”

for the purpose of “expressing reverence and devotion, love and gratitude to God by such a surrender, and at the same time of earning and securing His favour.”¹⁵ The true significance of the legal sacrifices cannot be correctly and fully deduced from the term *corban*, which was common to them all, or from such names as were used to denote the different varieties of sacrifice, or even from the materials employed and the ritual observed, but only from all these combined, and from an examination of them in connection with the nature and design of the Old Testament economy.

Regarded as offerings or gifts, the sacrifices were only means by which Israel was to seek and sustain communion with its God. These gifts were to be brought by the Israelites from the blessing which God had bestowed upon the labour of their hands (Deu. 16:17), that is to say, from the fruit of their regular occupations, viz., agriculture and the rearing of cattle; in other words, from the cattle they had reared, or the produce of the land they had cultivated, which constituted their principal articles of food (viz., edible animals and pigeons, corn, oil, and wine), in order that in these sacrificial gifts they might consecrate to the Lord their God, not only their property and food, but also the fruit of their ordinary avocations. In this light the sacrifices are frequently called “food (bread) of firing for Jehovah” (Lev. 3:11, 16) and “bread of God” (Lev. 21: 6, 8, 17); by which we are not to suppose that food offered to God for His own nourishment is intended, but food produced by the labour of man, and then caused to ascend as a firing to his God, for an odour of satisfaction (vid., Lev. 3:11). In the clean animals, which he had obtained by his own training and care, and which constituted his ordinary live-stock, and in the produce obtained through the labour of his hands in the field and vineyard, from which he derived his ordinary support, the Israelite offered not his *victus* as a *symbolum vitae*, but the food which he procured in the exercise of his God-appointed calling, as a symbol of the spiritual food which endureth unto everlasting life (Joh. 6:27, cf. Lev. 4:34), and which nourishes both soul and body for imperishable life in fellowship with God, that in these sacrificial gifts he might give up to the Lord, who had adopted him as His own possession, not so much the substance of his life, or that which sustained and preserved it, as the *agens* of his life, or his labour and toil, and all the powers he possessed, and might receive sanctification from the Lord in return. In this way the sacrificial gifts acquire a representative character, and denote the self-surrender of a man, with all his labour and productions, to God. But the idea of representation received a distinct form and sacrificial character for the first time in the animal sacrifice, which was raised by the covenant revelation and the giving of the law into the very centre and soul of the whole institution of sacrifice, and primarily by the simple fact, that in the animal a life, a “living soul,” was given up to death and offered to God, to be the medium of vital fellowship to the man who had been

made a “living soul” by the inspiration of the breath of God; but still more by the fact, that God had appointed the blood of the sacrificial animal, as the vehicle of its soul, to be the medium of expiation for the souls of men (Lev. 17:11).

The verb “to expiate” (כִּפֶּר, from כָּפַר to cover, construed with עַל *objecti*; see Lev. 1: 4) “does not signify to cause a sin not to have occurred, for that is impossible, nor to represent it as not existing, for that would be opposed to the stringency of the law, nor to pay or make compensation for it through the performance of any action; but to cover it over before God, i.e., to take away its power of coming in between God and ourselves” (*Kahnis, Dogmatik*, i. p. 271). But whilst this is perfectly true, the object primarily expiated, or to be expiated, according to the laws of sacrifice, is not the sin, but rather the man, or the soul of the offerer. God gave the Israelites the blood of the sacrifices upon the altar to cover their souls (Lev. 17:11) The end it answered was “to cover him” (the offerer, Lev. 1: 4); and even in the case of the sin-offering the only object was to cover him who had sinned, as concerning his sin (Lev. 4:26, 35, etc.). But the offerer of the sacrifice was covered, on account of his unholiness, from before the holy God, or, speaking more precisely, from the wrath of God and the manifestation of that wrath; that is to say, from the punishment which his sin had deserved, as we may clearly see from Gen. 32:20, and still more clearly from Exo. 32:30. In the former case Jacob’s object is to reconcile (כִּפֶּר) the face of his brother Esau by means of a present, that is to say, to modify the wrath of his brother, which he has drawn upon himself by taking away the blessing of the first-born. In the latter, Moses endeavours by means of his intercession to expiate the sin of the people, over whom the wrath of God is about to burn to destroy them (Exo. 32: 9, 10); in other words, to protect the people from the destruction which threatens them in consequence of the wrath of God (see also Num. 17:11, 12; 25:11-13). The power to make expiation, i.e., to cover an unholy man from before the holy God, or to cover the sinner from the wrath of God, is attributed to the blood of the sacrificial animal, only so far as the soul lives in the blood, and the soul of the animal when sacrificed takes the place of the human soul. This substitution is no doubt incongruous, since the animal and man differ essentially the one from the other; inasmuch as the animal follows an involuntary instinct, and its soul being constrained by the necessities of its nature is not accountable, and it is only in this respect that it can be regarded as sinless; whilst man, on the contrary, is endowed with freedom of will, and his soul, by virtue of the indwelling of his spirit, is not only capable of accountability, but can contract both sin and guilt. When God, therefore, said, “I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls” (Lev. 17:11), and thus attributed to the blood of the sacrificial animals a significance which it could not naturally possess; this was done in

anticipation of the true and perfect sacrifice which Christ, the Son of man and God, would offer in the fulness of time through the holy and eternal Spirit, for the reconciliation of the whole world (Heb. 9:14). This secret of the unfathomable love of the triune God was hidden from the Israelites in the law, but it formed the real background for the divine sanction of the animal sacrifices, whereby they acquired a typical signification, so that they set forth in shadow that reconciliation, which God from all eternity had determined to effect by giving up His only-begotten Son to death, as a sacrifice for the sin of the whole world.

But however firmly the truth is established that the blood of the sacrifice intervened as a third object between the sinful man and the holy God, it was not the blood of the animal in itself which actually took the place of the man, nor was it the shedding of the blood in itself which was able to make expiation for the sinful man, in such a sense that the slaying of the animal had a judicial and penal character and the offering of sacrifice was an act of judgment instead of an ordinance of grace, as the juridical theory maintains. It was simply the blood as the vehicle of the soul, when sprinkled or poured out upon the altar, that is to say, it was the surrender of an innocent life to death, and through death to God, that was the medium of expiation. Even in the sacrifice of Christ it was not by the shedding of blood, or simply by the act of dying, that His death effected reconciliation, but by the surrender of His life to death, in which He not only shed His blood for us, but His body also was broken for us, to redeem us from sin and reconcile us to God. And even the suffering and death of Christ effect our reconciliation not simply by themselves, but as the completion of His sinless, holy life, in which, through doing and suffering, He was obedient even to the death of the cross, and through that obedience fulfilled the law as the holy will of God for us, and bore and suffered the punishment of our transgression. Through His *obedientia activa et passiva* in life and death Christ rendered to the holy justice of God that *satisfactio et poena vicaria*, by virtue of which we receive forgiveness of sin, righteousness before God, reconciliation, grace, salvation, and eternal life. But these blessings of grace and salvation, which we owe to the sacrificial death of Christ, do not really become ours through the simple fact that Christ has procured them for man. We have still to appropriate them in faith, by dying spiritually with Christ, and rising with Him to a new life in God. This was also the case with the sacrifices of the Old Testament. They too only answered their end, when the Israelites, relying upon the word and promise of God, grasped and employed by faith the means of grace afforded them in the animal sacrifices; i.e., when in these sacrifices they offered themselves, or their personal life, as a sacrifice well-pleasing to God. The symbolical meaning of the sacrifices, which is involved in this, is not excluded or destroyed by the idea of representation, or representative mediation

between sinful man and the holy God, which was essential to them. It is rather demanded as their complement, inasmuch as, without this, the sacrificial worship would degenerate into a soulless *opus operatum*, and would even lose its typical character. This symbolical significance is strikingly expressed in the instructions relating to the nature of the sacrificial gifts, and the ritual connected with their presentation; and in the law it comes into the foreground just in proportion as the typical character of the sacrifices was concealed at the time in the wise economy of God, and was only unfolded to the spiritual vision of the prophets (Isa. 43) with the progressive unfolding of the divine plan of salvation.

The leading features of the symbolical and typical meaning of the sacrifices are in their general outline the following. Every animal offered in sacrifice was to be קָדוֹשׁ, ἄμωμος, free from faults; not merely on the ground that only a faultless and perfect gift could be an offering fit for the Holy and Perfect One, but chiefly because moral faults were reflected in those of the body, and to prefigure the sinlessness and holiness of the true sacrifice, and warn the offerer that the sanctification of all his members was indispensable to a self-surrender to God, the Holy One, and to life in fellowship with Him. In connection with the act of sacrifice, it was required that the offerer should bring to the tabernacle the animal appointed for sacrifice, and there present it before Jehovah (Lev. 1: 3), because it was there that Jehovah dwelt among His people, and it was from His holy dwelling that He would reveal Himself to His people as their God. There the offerer was to lay his hand upon the head of the animal, that the sacrifice might be acceptable for him, to make expiation for him (Lev. 1: 4), and then to slay the animal and prepare it for a sacrificial gift. By the laying on of his hand he not only set apart the sacrificial animal for the purpose for which he had come to the sanctuary, but transferred the feelings of his heart, which impelled him to offer the sacrifice, or the intention with which he brought the gift, to the sacrificial animal, so that his own head passed, as it were, to the head of the animal, and the latter became his substitute (see my *Archäologie* i. 206; *Oehler*, p. 267; *Kahn*, i. p. 270). By the slaughter of the animal he gave it up to death, not merely for the double purpose of procuring the blood, in which was the life of the animal, as an expiation for his own soul, and its flesh as fire-food for Jehovah, — for if the act of dying was profoundly significant in the case of the perfect sacrifice, it cannot have been without symbolical significance in the case of the typical sacrifice, — but to devote his own life to God in the death of the sacrificial animal which was appointed as his substitute, and to set forth not only his willingness to die, but the necessity for the old man to die, that he might attain to life in fellowship with God. After this self-surrender the priestly mediation commenced, the priest sprinkling the blood upon the altar, or its horns, and in one instance before Jehovah's throne of grace, and then burning the flesh or fat of the sacrifice upon the altar. The altar was the spot where God

had promised to meet with His people (Exo. 29:42), to reconcile them to Himself, and bestow His grace upon them (see p. 456). Through this act of sprinkling the blood of the animal that had been given up to death upon the altar, the soul of the offerer was covered over before the holy God; and by virtue of this covering it was placed within the sphere of divine grace, which forgave the sin and filled the soul with power for new life. Fire was constantly burning upon the altar, which was prepared and kept up by the priest (Lev. 6: 5). Fire, from its inherent power to annihilate what is perishable, ignoble, and corrupt, is a symbol in the Scriptures, sometimes of purification, and sometimes of torment and destruction. That which has an imperishable kernel within it is purified by the fire, the perishable materials which have adhered to it or penetrated within it being burned out and destroyed, and the imperishable and nobler substance being thereby purified from all dross; whilst, on the other hand, in cases where the imperishable is completely swallowed up in the perishable, no purification ensues, but total destruction by the fire (1Co. 3:12, 13). Hence fire is employed as a symbol and vehicle of the Holy Spirit (Act. 2: 3, 4), and the fire burning upon the altar was a symbolical representation of the working of the purifying Spirit of God; so that the burning of the flesh of the sacrifice upon the altar “represented the purification of the man, who had been reconciled to God, through the fire of the Holy Spirit, which consumes what is flesh, to pervade what is spirit with light and life, and thus to transmute it into the blessedness of fellowship with God” (*Kahnis*, p. 272).

It follows from this, that the relation which the sprinkling of the blood and the burning of the flesh of the sacrifice upon the altar bore to one another was that of justification and sanctification, those two indispensable conditions, without which sinful man could not attain to reconciliation with God and life in God. But as the sinner could neither justify himself before God nor sanctify himself by his own power, the sprinkling of blood and the burning of the portions of the sacrifice upon the altar were to be effected, not by the offerer himself, but only by the priest, as the mediator whom God had chosen and sanctified, not only that the soul which had been covered by the sacrificial blood might thereby be brought to God and received into His favour, but also that the bodily members, of which the flesh of the sacrifice was a symbol, might be given up to the fire of the Holy Spirit, to be purified and sanctified from the dross of sin, and raised in a glorified state to God; just as the sacrificial gift was consumed in the altar fire, so that, whilst its earthly perishable elements were turned into ashes and left behind, its true essence ascended towards heaven, where God is enthroned, in the most ethereal and glorified of material forms, as a sweet-smelling savour, i.e., as an acceptable offering. These two priestly acts, however, were variously modified according to the different objects of the several kinds of sacrifice. In

the *sin-offering* the expiation of the sinner is brought into the greatest prominence; in the *burnt-offering* this falls into the background behind the idea of the self-surrender of a man to God for the sanctification of all his members, through the grace of God; and lastly, the *peace-offering* culminated in the peace of living communion with the Lord. (See the explanation of the several laws.)

The materials and ritual of the bloodless sacrifices, and also their meaning and purpose, are much more simple. The meat and drink-offerings were not means of expiation, nor did they include the idea of representation. They were simply gifts, in which the Israelites offered bread, oil, and wine, as fruits of the labour of their hands in the field and vineyard of the inheritance they had received from the Lord, and embodied in these earthly gifts the fruits of their spiritual labour in the kingdom of God (see at Lev. 2).

Lev. 1. The BURNT-OFFERING. —

V. 2. “If any one of you present an offering to Jehovah of cattle, ye shall present your offering from the herd and from the flock.”

קָרְבָּן (*Corban*, from קָרַב to cause to draw near, to bring near, or present, an offering) is applied not only to the sacrifices, which were burned either in whole or in part upon the altar (Lev. 7:38; Num. 18: 9; 28: 2, etc.), but to the first-fruits (Lev. 2:12), and dedicatory offerings, which were presented to the Lord for His sanctuary and His service without being laid upon the altar (Num. 7: 3, 10ff., 31:50). The word is only used in Leviticus and Numbers, and two passages in Ezekiel (Eze. 20:28; 40:43), where it is taken from the books of Moses, and is invariably rendered δῶρον in the LXX (cf. Mar. 7:11 “*Corban*, that is to say a gift”). מִן הַבְּהֵמָה (*from the cattle*) belongs to the first clause, though it is separated from it by the Athnach; and the apodosis begins with מִן הַבְּרֵייתִּים (*from the herd*). The actual antithesis to “the cattle” is “the fowl” in v. 14; though grammatically the latter is connected with v. 10, rather than v. 2. The fowls (pigeons) cannot be included in the *behemah*, for this is used to denote, not domesticated animals generally, but the larger domesticated quadrupeds, or tame cattle (cf. Gen. 1:25).

Lev. 1: 3-9. Ceremonial connected with the offering of an ox as a burnt-offering. עֹלָה (vid., Gen. 8:20) is generally rendered by the LXX ὀλοκαύτωμα or ὀλοκαύτωσις, sometimes ὀλοκάρπωμα or ὀλοκάρπωσις, in the *Vulgate holocaustum*, because the animal was all consumed upon the altar. The ox was to be a male without blemish (ἄμωμος, *integer*; i.e., free from bodily faults, see Lev. 22:19-25), and to be presented “at the door of the tabernacle,” — i.e., near to the altar of burnt-offering (Exo. 40: 6), where all the offerings were to be presented (Lev. 17: 8, 9), — “for good pleasure for him (the offerer) before

Jehovah,” i.e., that the sacrifice might secure to him the good pleasure of God (Exo. 28:38).

Lev. 1: 4. “he (the offerer) shall lay his hand upon the head of the burnt-offering.” The laying on of hands, by which, to judge from the verb **סָמַךְ** to lean upon, we are to understand a forcible pressure of the hand upon the head of the victim, took place in connection with all the slain-offerings (the offering of pigeons perhaps excepted), and is expressly enjoined in the laws for the burnt-offerings, the peace-offerings (Lev. 3: 2, 7, 13), and the sin-offerings (Lev. 4: 4, 15, 24, 29, 33), that is to say, in every case in which the details of the ceremonial are minutely described. But if the description is condensed, then no allusion is made to it: e.g., in the burnt-offering of sheep and goats (v. 11), the sin-offering (Lev. 5: 6), and the trespass-offering (Lev. 5:15, 18, 25). This ceremony was not a sign of the removal of something from his own power and possession, or the surrender and dedication of it to God, as *Rosenmüller* and *Knobel*¹⁶ affirm; nor an indication of ownership and of a readiness to give up his own to Jehovah, as *Bähr* maintains; nor a symbol of the imputation of sin, as *Kurtz* supposes:¹⁷ but the symbol of a transfer of the feelings and intentions by which the offerer was actuated in presenting his sacrifice, whereby he set apart the animal as a sacrifice, representing his own person in one particular aspect (see p. 508). Now, so far as the burnt-offering expressed the intention of the offerer to consecrate his life and labour to the Lord, and his desire to obtain the expiation of the sin which still clung to all his works and desires, in order that they might become well-pleasing to God, he transferred the consciousness of his sinfulness to the victim by the laying on of hands, even in the case of the burnt-offering. But this was not all: he also transferred the desire to walk before God in holiness and righteousness, which he could not do without the grace of God. This, and no more than this, is contained in the words, “that it may become well-pleasing to him, to make atonement for him.” **כִּפֶּר** with Seghol (Ges. § 52), to expiate (from the Kal **כִּפֶּר**, which is not met with in Hebrew, the word in Gen. 6:14 being merely a *denom.* verb, but which signifies *textit* in Arabic), is generally construed with **עַל** like verbs of covering, and in the laws of sacrifice with the person as the object (“for *him*,” Lev. 4:26, 31, 35; 5: 6, 10ff., 14:20, 29, etc.; “for *them*,” Lev. 4:20; 10:17; “for *her*,” Lev. 12: 7; for a *soul*, Lev. 17:11; Exo. 30:15, cf. Num. 8:12), and in the case of the sin-offerings with a second object governed either by **עַל** or **מִן** **עָלָיו עַל הַטְּאֵתוֹ** Lev. 4:35; 5:13, 18, or **עָלָיו מִהַטְּאֵתוֹ** Lev. 4:26; 5: 6, etc., to expiate him over or on account of his sin); also, though not so frequently, with **בְּעַד** *pers.*, **ἐξιλάσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ** (Lev. 16: 6, 24; 2Ch. 30:18), and **בְּעַד הַטְּאֵת**, **ἐξιλάσθαι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας** (Exo. 32:30), and with **לְ** *pers.*, to permit expiation to be made (Deu. 21: 8; Eze. 16:63); also with the accusative of the

object, though in prose only in connection with the expiation of inanimate objects defiled by sin (Lev. 16:33).

The expiation was always made or completed by the priest, as the sanctified mediator between Jehovah and the people, or, previous to the institution of the Aaronic priesthood, by Moses, the chosen mediator of the covenant, not by "Jehovah from whom the expiation proceeded," as *Bähr* supposes. For although all expiation has its ultimate foundation in the grace of God, which desires not the death of the sinner, but his redemption and salvation, and to this end has opened a way of salvation, and sanctified sacrifice as the means of expiation and mercy; it is not Jehovah who makes the expiation, but this is invariably the office or work of a mediator, who intervenes between the holy God and sinful man, and by means of expiation averts the wrath of God from the sinner, and brings the grace of God to bear upon him. It is only in cases where the word is used in the secondary sense of pardoning sin, or showing mercy, that God is mentioned as the subject (e.g., Deu. 21: 8; Psa. 65: 4; 78:38; Jer. 17:23).¹⁸

The medium of expiation in the case of the sacrifice was chiefly the blood of the sacrificial animal that was sprinkled upon the altar (Lev. 17:11); in addition to which, the eating of the flesh of the sin-offering by the priests is also called bearing the iniquity of the congregation to make atonement for them (Lev. 10:17). In other cases it was the intercession of Moses (Exo. 32:30); also the fumigation with holy incense, which was a symbol of priestly intercession (Num. 17:11). On one occasion it was the zeal of Phinehas, when he stabbed the Israelite with a spear for committing fornication with a Midianite (Num. 25: 8, 13). In the case of a murder committed by an unknown hand, it was the slaying of an animal in the place of the murderer who remained undiscovered (Deu. 21: 1-9); whereas in other cases blood-guiltiness (murder) could not be expiated in any other way than by the blood of the person by whom it had been shed (Num. 35:33). In Isa. 27: 9, a divine judgment, by which the nation was punished, is so described, as serving to avert the complete destruction which threatened it. And lastly, it was in some cases a **כִּפָּר**, such, for example, as the atonement-money paid at the numbering of the people (Exo. 30:12ff.), and the payment made in the case referred to in Exo. 21:30.

If, therefore, the idea of satisfaction unquestionably lay at the foundation of the atonement that was made, in all those cases in which it was effected by a penal judgment, or judicial *poena*; the intercession of the priest, or the fumigation which embodied it, cannot possibly be regarded as a satisfaction rendered to the justice of God, so that we cannot attribute the idea of satisfaction to every kind of sacrificial expiation. Still less can it be discerned in the slaying of the animal, when simply regarded as the shedding of blood. To this we may add, that in the

laws for the sin-offering there is no reference at all to expiation; and in the case of the burnt-offering, the laying on of hands is described as the act by which it was to become well-pleasing to God, and to expiate the offerer. Now, if the laying on of hands was accompanied with a prayer, as the Jewish tradition affirms, and as we may most certainly infer from Deu. 26:13, apart altogether from Lev. 16:21, although no prayer is expressly enjoined; then in the case of the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, it is in this prayer, or the imposition of hands which symbolized it, and by which the offerer substituted the sacrifice for himself and penetrated it with his spirit, that we must seek for the condition upon which the well-pleased acceptance of the sacrifice on the part of God depended, and in consequence of which it became an atonement for him; in other words, was fitted to cover him in the presence of the holiness of God.

Lev. 1: 5-9. The laying on of hands was followed by the slaughtering (שָׁחַט, never הִמִּית to put to death), which was performed by the offerer himself in the case of the private sacrifices, and by the priests and Levites in that of the national and festal offerings (2Ch. 29:22, 24, 34). The slaughtering took place “before Jehovah” (see v. 3), or, according to the more precise account in v. 11, on the side of the altar northward, for which the expression “before the door of the tabernacle” is sometimes used (Lev. 3: 2, 8, 13, etc.). בֶּן בָּקָר (a young ox) is applied to a calf (עֵגֶל) in Lev. 9: 2, and a mature young bull (פָּר) in Lev. 4: 3, 14. But the animal of one year old is called עֵגֶל in Lev. 9: 2, and the mature ox of seven years old is called פָּר in Jud. 6:25. At the slaughtering the blood was caught by the priests (2Ch. 29:22), and sprinkled upon the altar. When the sacrifices were very numerous, as at the yearly feasts, the Levites helped to catch the blood (2Ch. 30:16); but the sprinkling upon the altar was always performed by the priests alone. In the case of the burnt-offerings, the blood was swung “against the altar round about,” i.e., against all four sides (walls) of the altar (not “over the surface of the altar”); i.e., it was poured out of the vessel against the walls of the altar with a swinging motion. This was also done when peace-offerings (Lev. 3: 2, 8, 13; 9:18) and trespass-offerings (Lev. 7: 2) were sacrificed; but it was not so with the sin-offering (see at Lev. 4: 5).

Lev. 1: 6ff. The offerer was then to flay the slaughtered animal, to cut it (נָתַח generally rendered μελίζειν in the LXX) into its pieces, — i.e., to cut it up into the different pieces, into which an animal that has been killed is generally divided, namely, according to the separate joints, or “according to the bones” (Jud. 19:29), — that he might boil its flesh in pots (Eze. 24: 4, 6). He was also to wash its intestines and the lower part of its legs (v. 9). קִרְבָּ, the inner part of the body, or the contents of the inner part of the body, signifies the viscera; not

including those of the breast, however, such as the lungs, heart, and liver, to which the term is also applied in other cases (for in the case of the peace-offerings, when the fat which envelopes the intestines, the kidneys, and the liver-lobes was to be placed upon the altar, there is no washing spoken of), but the intestines of the abdomen or belly, such as the stomach and bowels, which would necessarily have to be thoroughly cleansed, even when they were about to be used as food. **בְּרָעִים**, which is only found in the dual, and always in connection either with oxen and sheep, or with the springing legs of locusts (Lev. 11:21), denotes the shin, or calf below the knee, or the leg from the knee down to the foot.

Lev. 1: 7, 8. It was the duty of the sons of Aaron, i.e., of the priests, to offer the sacrifice upon the altar. To this end they were to “*put fire upon the altar*” (of course this only applies to the first burnt-offering presented after the erection of the altar, as the fire was to be constantly burning upon the altar after that, without being allowed to go out, 6: 6), and to lay “*wood in order upon the fire*” (**עָרַךְ** to lay in regular order), and then to “*lay the parts, the head and the fat, in order upon the wood on the fire,*” and thus to cause the whole to ascend in smoke. **פָּדָר**, which is only used in connection with the burnt-offering (vv. 8, 12, and Lev. 8:20), signifies, according to the ancient versions (LXX **στάειν**) and the rabbinical writers, *the fat*, probably those portions of fat which were separated from the entrails and taken out to wash. *Bochart's* explanation is *adepts a carne sejunctus*. The head and fat are specially mentioned along with the pieces of flesh, partly because they are both separated from the flesh when animals are slaughtered, and partly also to point out distinctly that the whole of the animal (“*all,*” v. 9) was to be burned upon the altar, with the exception of the skin, which was given to the officiating priest (Lev. 7: 8), and the contents of the intestines. **הִקְטִיר**, to cause to ascend in smoke and steam (Exo. 30: 7), which is frequently construed with **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** towards the altar (**ה** local, so used as to include position in a place; vid., vv. 13, 15, 17, Lev. 2: 2, 9, etc.), or with **הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** (Lev. 6: 8), or **עַל-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ** (Lev. 9:13, 17), was the technical expression for burning the sacrifice upon the altar, and showed that the intention was not simply to burn those portions of the sacrifice which were placed in the fire, i.e., to destroy, or turn them into ashes, but by this process of burning to cause the odour which was eliminated to ascend to heaven as the ethereal essence of the sacrifice, for a “*firing of a sweet savour unto Jehovah.*” **אִשָּׁה**, *firing* (“an offering made by fire,” Eng. Ver.), is the general expression used to denote the sacrifices, which ascended in fire upon the altar, whether animal or vegetable (Lev. 2: 2, 11, 16), and is also applied to the incense laid upon the shew-bread (Lev. 24: 7); and hence the shew-bread itself (Lev. 24: 7), and even those portions of the sacrifices which Jehovah assigned to the priests

for them to eat (Deu. 18: 1 cf. Jos. 13:14), came also to be included in the firings for Jehovah. The word does not occur out of the Pentateuch, except in Jos. 13:14 and 1Sa. 2:28. In the laws of sacrifice it is generally associated with the expression, “a sweet savour unto Jehovah” (ὄσμη εὐωδίας: LXX): an anthropomorphic description of the divine satisfaction with the sacrifices offered, or the gracious acceptance of them on the part of God (see Gen. 8:21), which is used in connection with all the sacrifices, even the expiatory or sin-offerings (Lev. 4:31), and with the drink-offering also (Num. 15: 7, 10).

Lev. 1:10-13. With regard to the mode of sacrificing, the instructions already given for the oxen applied to the flock (i.e., to the sheep and goats) as well, so that the leading points are repeated here, together with a more precise description of the place for slaughtering, viz., “*by the side of the altar towards the north,*” i.e., on the north side of the altar. This was the rule with all the slain-offerings; although it is only in connection with the burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings (Lev. 4:24, 29, 33; 6:18; 7: 2; 14:13) that it is expressly mentioned, whilst the indefinite expression “*at the door (in front) of the tabernacle*” is applied to the peace-offerings in Lev. 3: 2, 8, 13, as it is to the trespass-offerings in Lev. 4: 4, from which the Rabbins have inferred, though hardly upon good ground, that the peace-offerings could be slaughtered in any part of the court. The northern side of the altar was appointed as the place of slaughtering, however, not from the idea that the Deity dwelt in the north (*Ewald*), for such an idea is altogether foreign to Mosaism, but, as *Knobel* supposes, probably because the table of shew-bread, with the continual meat-offering, stood on the north side in the holy place. Moreover, the eastern side of the altar in the court was the place for the refuse, or heap of ashes (v. 16); the ascent to the altar was probably on the south side, as *Josephus* affirms that it was in the second temple (*J. de bell. jud.* v. 5, 6); and the western side, or the space between the altar and the entrance to the holy place, would unquestionably have been the most unsuitable of all for the slaughtering. In v. 12 וְאֶת־רֹאשׁוֹ וְגִוֹ is to be connected *per zeugma* with לְנִתְחָיו, “*let him cut it up according to its parts, and (sever) its head and its fat.*”

Lev. 1:14-17. The burnt-offering of *fowls* was to consist of turtle-doves or young pigeons. The Israelites have reared pigeons and kept dovecots from time immemorial (Isa. 60: 8, cf. 2Ki. 6:25); and the rearing of pigeons continued to be a favourite pursuit with the later Jews (*Josephus, de bell. jud.* v. 4, 4), so that they might very well be reckoned among the domesticated animals. There are also turtle-doves and wild pigeons in Palestine in such abundance, that they could easily furnish the ordinary animal food of the poorer classes, and serve as sacrifices in the place of the larger animals. The directions for sacrificing these, were that the priest was to bring the bird to the altar, to hip off its head, and

cause it to ascend in smoke upon the altar. מִלֵּק, which only occurs in v. 15 and Lev. 5: 8, signifies undoubtedly to pinch off, and not merely to pinch; for otherwise the words in Lev. 5: 8, “and shall not divide it asunder,” would be superfluous. We have therefore to think of it as a severance of the head, as the LXX (ἀποκνίθειν) and Rabbins have done, and not merely a wringing of the neck and incision in the skin by which the head was left hanging to the body; partly because the words, “and not divide it asunder,” are wanting here, and partly also because of the words, “and burn it upon the altar,” which immediately follow, and which must refer to the head, and can only mean that, after the head had been pinched off, it was to be put at once into the burning altar-fire. For it is obviously unnatural to regard these words as anticipatory, and refer them to the burning of the whole dove; not only from the construction itself, but still more on account of the clause which follows: “and the blood thereof shall be pressed out against the wall of the altar.” The small quantity that there was of the blood prevented it from being caught in a vessel, and swung from it against the altar.

Lev. 1:16, 17. He then took out אֶת־מִרְאָתוֹ בְּנִצָּתָהּ, i.e., according to the probable explanation of these obscure words, “its crop in (with) the foeces thereof,”¹⁹ and threw it “at the side of the altar eastwards,” i.e., on the eastern side of the altar, “on the ash-place,” where the ashes were thrown when taken from the altar (Lev. 6: 3). He then made an incision in the wings of the pigeon, but without severing them, and burned them on the altar-fire (v. 17, cf. v. 9).

The burnt-offerings all culminated in the presentation of the whole sacrifice upon the altar, that it might ascend to heaven, transformed into smoke and fragrance. Hence it is not only called עֹלָה, the ascending (see Gen. 8:20), but בָּלִיל, a whole-offering (Deu. 33:10; Psa. 51:21; 1Sa. 7: 9). If the burning and sending up in the altar-fire shadowed forth the self-surrender of the offerer to the purifying fire of the Holy Ghost (p. 509); the burnt-offering was an embodiment of the idea of the consecration and self-surrender of the whole man to the Lord, to be pervaded by the refining and sanctifying power of divine grace. This self-surrender was to be vigorous and energetic in its character; and this was embodied in the instructions to choose male animals for the burnt-offering, the male sex being stronger and more vigorous than the female. To render the self-sacrifice perfect, it was necessary that the offerer should spiritually die, and that through the mediator of his salvation he should put his soul into a living fellowship with the Lord by sinking it as it were into the death of the sacrifice that had died for him, and should also bring his bodily members within the operations of the gracious Spirit of God, that thus he might be renewed and sanctified both body and soul, and enter into union with God.

Lev. 2: 2. THE MEAT-OFFERING. — The burnt-offerings are followed immediately by the meat-offerings, not only because they were offered along with them from the very first (Gen. 4: 3), but because they stood nearest to them in their general signification. The usual epithet applied to them is *minchah*, lit., a present with which any one sought to obtain the favour or goodwill of a superior (Gen. 32:21, 22; 43:11, 15, etc.), then the gift offered to God as a sign of grateful acknowledgment that the offerer owed everything to Him, as well as of a desire to secure His favour and blessing. This epithet was used at first for animal sacrifices as well as offerings of fruit (Gen. 4: 4, 5). But in the Mosaic law it was restricted to bloodless offerings, i.e., to the meat-offerings, whether presented independently, or in connection with the animal sacrifices (*zebachim*). The full term is *korban minchah*, offering of a gift: δῶρον θυσία or προσφορά, also θυσία alone (LXX). The meat-offerings consisted of fine wheaten flour (vv. 1-3), or cakes of such flour (vv. 4-6), or roasted grains as an offering of first-fruits (vv. 14-16). To all of them there were added oil (vv. 1, 4-7, 15) and salt (v. 13); and to those which consisted of flour and grains, incense also (vv. 1 and 15). Only a handful of each kind was burnt upon the altar; the rest was handed over to the priests, as “a thing most holy” (v. 3).

Lev. 2: 1-3. The *first* kind consisted of *soleth*, probably from סֶלֶה = סָלָה to swing, swung flour, like πάλη from πάλλω, i.e., fine flour; and for this no doubt wheaten flour was always used, even when חֲטִיִּים is not added, as in Exo. 29: 2, to distinguish it from קֶמַח, or ordinary meal (σεμίδαλις: 1Ki. 5: 2). The suffix in קָרְבָּנוֹ (his offering) refers to נִפְשׁוֹ, which is frequently construed as both masculine and feminine (Lev. 4: 2, 27, 28, v. 1, etc.), or as masculine only (Num. 31:28) in the sense of person, any one. “And let him pour oil upon it, and put incense thereon (or add incense to it).” This was not spread upon the flour, on which oil had been poured, but added in such a way, that it could be lifted from the *minchah* and burned upon the altar (v. 2). The priest was then to take a handful of the gift that had been presented, and cause the *azcarah* of it to evaporate above (together with) all the incense. מְלֵא קַמְצוֹ: the filling of his closed hand, i.e., as much as he could hold with his hand full, not merely with three fingers, as the Rabbins affirm. *Azcarah* (from זָכַר, formed like אֲשַׁמְרָה from שָׁמַר) is only applied to Jehovah’s portion, which was burned upon the altar in the case of the meat-offering (vv. 9, 16, and Lev. 6: 8), the sin-offering of flour (Lev. 5:12), and the jealousy-offering (Num. 5:26), and to the incense added to the shew-bread (Lev. 24: 7). It does not mean the prize portion, i.e., the portion offered for the glory of God, as *De Dieu* and *Rosenmüller* maintain, still less the fragrance-offering (*Ewald*), but the memorial, or remembrance-portion, μνημόσυνον or ἀνάμνησις (Lev. 24: 7, LXX), *memoriale* (*Vulg.*), inasmuch as that part of the *minchah* which was placed upon the altar ascended

in the smoke of the fire “on behalf of the giver, as a practical *mememto* (‘remember me’) to Jehovah:” though there is no necessity that we should trace the word to the *Hiphil* in consequence. The rest of the *minchah* was to belong to Aaron and his sons, i.e., to the priesthood, as a most holy thing of the firings of Jehovah. The term “most holy” is applied to all the sacrificial gifts that were consecrated to Jehovah, in this sense, that such portions as were not burned upon the altar were to be eaten by the priests alone in a holy place; the laity, and even such of the Levites as were not priests, being prohibited from partaking of them (see at Exo. 26:33 and 30:10). Thus the independent meat-offerings, which were not entirely consumed upon the altar (vv. 3, 10, 6:10; 10:12), the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, the flesh of which was not burned outside the camp (Lev. 6:18, 22; 7: 1, 6; 10:17; 14:13, Num. 18: 9), the shew-bread (Lev. 24: 9), and even objects put under the ban and devoted to the Lord, whether men, cattle, or property of other kinds (Lev. 27:28), as well as the holy incense (Exo. 30:36), — in fact, all the holy sacrificial gifts, in which there was any fear lest a portion should be perverted to other objects, — were called most holy; whereas the burnt-offerings, the priestly meat-offerings (Lev. 6:12-16) and other sacrifices, which were quite as holy, were not called most holy, because the command to burn them entirely precluded the possibility of their being devoted to any of the ordinary purposes of life.

Lev. 2: 4-11. The *second* kind consisted of pastry of fine flour and oil prepared in different forms. The *first* was *maapheh tannur*, oven-baking: by תַּנּוּר we are not to understand a baker’s oven (Hos. 7: 4, 6), but a large pot in the room, such as are used for baking cakes in the East even to the present day (see my Archäol. § 99, 4). The oven-baking might consist either of “*cakes of unleavened meal mixed (made) with oil,*” or of “*pancakes of unleavened meal anointed (smeared) with oil.*” *Challoth*: probably from חָלַל to pierce, perforated cakes, of a thicker kind. *Rekkim*: from רָקַק to be beaten out thin; hence cakes or pancakes. As the latter were to be smeared with oil, we cannot understand בָּלִיל as signifying merely the pouring of oil upon the baked cakes, but must take it in the sense of mingled, mixed, i.e., kneaded with oil (πεφυραμένους [LXX], or according to *Hesychius*, μεμιγμένους).

Lev. 2: 5, 6. Secondly, if the *minchah* was an offering upon the pan, it was also to be made of fine flour mixed with oil and unleavened. *Machabath* is a pan, made, according to Eze. 4: 3, of iron, — no doubt a large iron plate, such as the Arabs still use for baking unleavened bread in large round cakes made flat and thin (*Robinson*, Palestine i. 50, ii. 180). These girdles or flat pans are still in use among the Turcomans of Syria and the Armenians (see *Burckhardt*, Syr. p. 1003; *Tavernier*, *Reise* 1, p. 280), whilst the Berbians and Cabyles of Africa use shallow iron frying-pans for the purpose, and call them *tajen*, — the same

name, no doubt, as **תִּיגֵל־מִנְחָה**, with which the LXX have rendered *machabath*. These cakes were to be broken in pieces for the *minchah*, and oil to be poured upon them (the inf. abs. as in Exo. 13: 3; 20: 8, vid., Ges. § 131, 4); just as the Bedouins break the cakes which they bake in the hot ashes into small pieces, and prepare them for eating by pouring butter or oil upon them.

Lev. 2: 7. Thirdly, “If thy oblation be a *tigel-minchah*, it shall be made of fine flour with oil.” *Marchesheth* is not a gridiron (**ἔσχαρα**, LXX); but, as it is derived from **הִרְשָׁה**, *ebullivit*, it must apply to a vessel in which food was boiled. We have therefore to think of cakes boiled in oil.

Lev. 2: 8-10. The presentation of the *minchah* “made of these things,” i.e., of the different kinds of pastry mentioned in vv. 4-7, resembled in the main that described in vv. 1-3. The **הִרְשָׁה מִן** in v. 9 corresponds to the **קָמִיץ מִן** in v. 2, and does not denote any special ceremony of heaving, as is supposed by the Rabbins and many archaeological writers, who understand by it a solemn movement up and down. This will be evident from a comparison of Lev. 3: 3 with Lev. 4: 8, 31, 35, and 7: 3. In the place of **יָרִים מִמֶּנּוּ** in Lev. 4: 8 we find **הִקְרִיב מִזְבַּח** in Lev. 4:10, **בְּאֵשׁ הַזֹּסֵר חֲלֵב** in Lev. 4:31 and 35; so that **מִן הִרְשָׁה** evidently denotes simply the lifting off or removal of those parts which were to be burned upon the altar from the rest of the sacrifice (cf. *Bähr*, ii. 357, and my *Archäologie* i. p. 244-5). — In vv. 11-13 there follow two laws which were applicable to all the meat-offerings: viz., to offer nothing leavened (v. 11), and to salt every meat-offering, and in fact every sacrifice, with salt (v. 13). Every *minchah* was to be prepared without leaven: “for all leaven, and all honey, ye shall not burn a firing of it for Jehovah. As an offering of first-fruits ye may offer them (leaven and honey, i.e., pastry made with them) to Jehovah, but they shall not come upon the altar.” Leaven and honey are mentioned together as things which produce fermentation. Honey has also an acidifying or fermenting quality, and was even used for the preparation of vinegar (Plin. h. n. 11, 15; 21, 14). In rabbinical writings, therefore, **הִרְבִּישׁ** signifies not only *dulcedinem admittere*, but *corrumpsi, fermentari, fermentescere* (vid., *Buxtorf, lex. chald. talm. et rabb.* p. 500). By “honey” we are to understand not grape-honey, the *dibs* of the Arabs, as *Rashi* and *Bähr* do, but the honey of bees; for, according to 2Ch. 31: 5, this alone was offered as an offering of first-fruits along with corn, new wine, and oil; and in fact, as a rule, this was the only honey used by the ancients in sacrifice (see *Bochart, Hieroz.* iii. pp. 393ff.). The loaves of first-fruits at the feast of Weeks were leavened; but they were assigned to the priests, and not burned upon the altar (Lev. 23:17, 20). So also were the cakes offered with the vow-offerings, which were applied to the sacrificial meal (Lev. 7:13); but not the shew-bread, as *Knobel* maintains (see at

Lev. 24: 5ff.). Whilst leaven and honey were forbidden to be used with any kind of *minchah*, because of their producing fermentation and corruption, salt on the other hand was not to be omitted from any sacrificial offering. “*Thou shalt not let the salt of the covenant of thy God cease from thy meat-offering,*” i.e., thou shalt never offer a meat-offering without salt. The meaning which the salt, with its power to strengthen food and preserve it from putrefaction and corruption, imparted to the sacrifice, was the unbending truthfulness of that self-surrender to the Lord embodied in the sacrifice, by which all impurity and hypocrisy were repelled. The salt of the sacrifice is called the salt of the covenant, because in common life salt was the symbol of covenant; treaties being concluded and rendered firm and inviolable, according to a well-known custom of the ancient Greeks (see *Eustathius ad Iliad.* i. 449) which is still retained among the Arabs, by the parties to an alliance eating bread and salt together, as a sign of the treaty which they had made. As a covenant of this kind was called a “covenant of salt,” equivalent to an indissoluble covenant (Num. 18:19; 2Ch. 13: 5), so here the salt added to the sacrifice is designated as salt of the covenant of God, because of its imparting strength and purity to the sacrifice, by which Israel was strengthened and fortified in covenant fellowship with Jehovah. The following clause, “upon (with) every sacrificial gift of thine shalt thou offer salt,” is not to be restricted to the meat-offering, as *Knobel* supposes, nor to be understood as meaning that the salt was only to be added to the sacrifice externally, to be offered with or beside it; in which case the strewing of salt upon the different portions of the sacrifice (Eze. 43:24; Mar. 9:49) would have been a departure from the ancient law. For *korban* without any further definition denotes the sacrificial offerings generally, the bleeding quite as much as the bloodless, and the closer definition of **הִקְרִיב עֵל** (offer upon) is contained in the first clause of the verse, “season with salt.” The words contain a supplementary rule which was applicable to every sacrifice (bleeding and bloodless), and was so understood from time immemorial by the Jews themselves (cf. *Josephus, Ant.* iii. 9, 1).¹¹⁰

Lev. 2:14-16. The *third* kind was the meat-offering of first-fruits, i.e., of the first ripening corn. This was to be offered in the form of “*ears parched or roasted by the fire*; in other words, to be made from ears which had been roasted at the fire. To this is added the further definition **גָּרַשׁ בְּרֵמֶל** “rubbed out of field-fruit.” **גָּרַשׁ**, from **גָּרַם** = **גָּרַם**, to rub to pieces, that which is rubbed to pieces; it only occurs here and in vv. 14 and 16. **בְּרֵמֶל** is applied generally to a corn-field, in Isa. 29:17 and 32:16 to cultivated ground, as distinguished from desert; here, and in Lev. 23:14 and 2Ki. 4:42, it is used metonymically for field-fruit, and denotes early or the first-ripe corn. Corn roasted by the fire, particularly grains of wheat, is still a very favourite food in Palestine, Syria, and

Egypt. The ears are either burnt along with the stalks before they are quite ripe, and then rubbed out in a sieve; or stalks of wheat are bound up in small bundles and roasted at a bright fire, and then the grains are eaten (*Seetzen*, i. p. 94, iii. p. 221; *Robinson*, *Biblical Researches*, p. 393). Corn roasted in this manner is not so agreeable as when (as is frequently the case in harvest, *Rut.* 2:14) the grains of wheat are taken before they are quite dry and hard, and parched in a pan or upon an iron plate, and then eaten either along with or in the place of bread (*Robinson*, *Pal.* ii. 394). The *minchah* mentioned here was prepared in the first way, viz., of roasted ears of corn, which were afterwards rubbed to obtain the grains: it consisted, therefore, not of crushed corn or groats, but only of toasted grains. In the place of אֲבִיב קִלְיִי we find קִלְיִי (Lev. 23:14), or קִלְיִי (Jos. 5:11), afterwards employed. Oil and incense were to be added, and the same course adopted with the offering as in the case of the offering of flour (vv. 2, 3).

If therefore, all the meat-offerings consisted either of flour and oil, — the most important ingredients in the vegetable food of the Israelites, — or of food already prepared for eating, there can be no doubt that in them the Israelite offered his daily bread to the Lord, though in a manner which made an essential difference between them and the merely dedicatory offerings of the first-fruits of corn and bread. For whilst the loaves of first-fruits were leavened, and, as in the case of the sheaf of first-fruits, no part of them was burnt upon the altar (Lev. 23:10, 11; 17:20), every independent meat-offering was to be prepared without leaven, and a portion given to the Lord as fire-food, for a savour of satisfaction upon the altar; and the rest was to be scrupulously kept from being used by the offerer, as *a most holy thing*, and to be eaten at the holy place by the sanctified priests alone, as the servants of Jehovah, and the mediators between Him and the nation. On account of this peculiarity, the meat-offerings cannot have denoted merely the sanctification of earthly food, but were symbols of the spiritual food prepared and enjoyed by the congregation of the Lord. If even the earthly life is not sustained and nourished merely by the daily bread which a man procures and enjoys, but by the power of divine grace, which strengthens and blesses the food as means of preserving life; much less can the spiritual life be nourished by earthly food, but only by the spiritual food which a man prepares and partakes of, by the power of the Spirit of God, from the true bread of life, or the word of God. Now, as oil in the Scriptures is invariably a symbol of the Spirit of God as the principle of all spiritual *vis vitae* (see p. 435), so bread-flour and bread, procured from the seed of the field, are symbols of the word of God (Deu. 8: 3; Luk. 8:11). As God gives man corn and oil to feed and nourish his bodily life, so He gives His people His word and Spirit, that they may draw food from these for the spiritual life of the inner man. The work of sanctification consists in the operation of this spiritual food, through the right

use of the means of grace for growth in pious conversation and good works (Mat. 5:16; 1 Pet. 2:12). The enjoyment of this food fills the inner man with peace, joy, and blessedness in God. This fruit of the spiritual life is shadowed forth in the meat-offerings. They were to be kept free, therefore, both from the leaven of hypocrisy (Luk. 12: 1) and of malice and wickedness (1Co. 5: 8), and also from the honey of the *deliciae carnis*, because both are destructive of spiritual life; whilst, on the other hand, the salt of the covenant of God (i.e., the purifying, strengthening, and quickening power of the covenant, by which moral corruption was averted) and the incense of prayer were both to be added, in order that the fruits of the spiritual life might become well-pleasing to the Lord. It was upon this signification that the most holy character of the meat-offerings was founded.

Lev. 3. THE PEACE-OFFERINGS. — The third kind of sacrifice is called **שְׁלָמִים** **זֶבַח**, commonly rendered thank-offering, but more correctly a saving-offering (*Heilsopfer*: *Angl.* peace-offering). Besides this fuller form, which is the one most commonly employed in Leviticus, we meet with the abbreviated forms **זֶבַח** and **שְׁלָמִים**: e.g., **זֶבַח** in Lev. 7:16, 17; 23:37, more especially in combination with **עֹלָה**, Lev. 17: 8 cf. Exo. 10:25; 18:12; Num. 15: 3, 5; Deu. 12:27; Jos. 22:27; 1Sa. 6:15; 15:22; 2Ki. 5:17; 10:24; Isa. 56: 7; Jer. 6:20; 7:21; 17:26, etc., — and **שְׁלָמִים** in Lev. 9:22; Exo. 20:24; 32: 6, Deu. 27: 7; Jos. 8:31; Jud. 20:26; 21: 4; 1Sa. 13: 9; 2Sa. 6:17, 18; 24:25; 1Ki. 3:15, etc. **זֶבַח** is derived from **זָבַח**, which is not applied to slaughtering generally (**שָׁחַת**), but, with the exception of Deu. 12:15, where the use of **זֶבַח** for slaughtering is occasioned by the retrospective reference to Lev. 17: 3, 4, is always used for slaying as a sacrifice, or sacrificing; and even in 1Sa. 28:24, Eze. 34: 3 and 39:17, it is only used in a figurative sense. The real meaning, therefore, is sacrificial slaughtering, or slaughtered sacrifice. It is sometimes used in a wider sense, and applied to every kind of bleeding sacrifice (1Sa. 1:21; 2:19), especially in connection with *minchah* (1Sa. 2:29; Psa. 40: 7; Isa. 19:21; Dan. 9:27, etc.); but it is mostly used in a more restricted sense, and applied to the peace-offerings, or slain offerings, which culminated in a sacrificial meal, as distinguished from the burnt and sin-offerings, in which case it is synonymous with **שְׁלָמִים** or **זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים**. The word *shelamim*, the singular of which (*Shelem*) is only met with in Amo. 5:22, is applied exclusively to these sacrifices, and is derived from **שָׁלַם** to be whole, uninjured. It does not mean “compensation or restitution,” for which we find the nouns **שָׁלַם** (Deu. 32:35), **שְׁלוּם** (Hos. 9: 7), and **שְׁלָמָה** (Psa. 91: 8), formed from the *Piel* **שָׁלַם**, but *integritas completa, pacifica, beata*, answering to the *Sept.* rendering **σωτήριον**. The plural denotes the entire round of blessings and powers, by

which the salvation or integrity of man in his relation to God is established and secured. The object of the *shelamim* was invariably salvation: sometimes they were offered as an embodiment of thanksgiving for salvation already received, sometimes as a prayer for the salvation desired; so that they embraced both supplicatory offerings and thank-offerings, and were offered even in times of misfortune, or on the day on which supplication was offered for the help of God (Jud. 20:26; 21: 4; 1Sa. 13: 9; 2Sa. 24:25).¹¹ The law distinguishes three different kinds: praise-offerings, vow-offerings, and freewill-offerings (Lev. 7:12, 16). They were all restricted to oxen, sheep, and goats, either male or female, pigeons not being allowed, as they were always accompanied with a common sacrificial meal, for which a pair of pigeons did not suffice.

Lev. 3: 1-5. In the act of sacrificing, the presentation of the animal before Jehovah, the laying on of hands, the slaughtering, and the sprinkling of the blood were the same as in the case of the burnt-offering (Lev. 1: 3-5). It was in the application of the flesh that the difference first appeared.

Lev. 3: 3. The person presenting the sacrifice was to offer as a firing for Jehovah, *first*, “the fat which covered the entrails” (Lev. 1: 9), i.e., the large net which stretches from the stomach over the bowels and completely envelopes the latter, and which is only met with in the case of men and the mammalia generally, and in the ruminant animals abounds with fat; *secondly*, “all the fat on the entrails,” i.e., the fat attached to the intestines, which could easily be peeled off; *thirdly*, “the two kidneys, and the fat upon them (and) that upon the loins (הַכֶּסְלִים), i.e., upon the inner muscles of the loins, or in the region of the kidneys; and *fourthly*, “the net upon the liver.” The net (הַיִּתְרָת) upon (עַל) vv. 4, 10, 15, Lev. 4: 9; 7: 4; Exo. 29:13), or from (מִן) Lev. 9:10), or of the liver (Lev. 8:16, 25; 9:19; Exo. 29:22), cannot be the large lobe of the liver, ὁ λοβὸς τοῦ ἥπατος (LXX), because this is part of the liver itself, and does not lie עַל-הַכֶּבֶד over (upon) the liver; nor is it simply a portion of fat, but the small net (*omentum minus*), the liver-net, or stomach-net (*recticulum jecoris*; *Vulg., Luth., De Wette, and Knobel*), which commences at the division between the right and left lobes of the liver, and stretches on the one side across the stomach, and on the other to the region of the kidneys. Hence the clause, “on the kidneys (i.e., by them, as far as it reaches) shall he take it away.” This smaller net is delicate, but not so fat as the larger net; though it still forms part of the fat portions. The word יִתְרָת, which only occurs in the passages quoted, is to be explained from the Arabic and Ethiopic (to stretch over, to stretch out), whence also the words יִתְרָת a cord (Jud. 16: 7; Psa. 11: 2), and מִיִּתְרָת the bow-string (Psa. 21:13) or extended tent-ropes (Exo. 35:18), are derived. The four portions mentioned comprehended all the separable fat in the inside of the

sacrificial animal. Hence they were also designated “all the fat” of the sacrifice (v. 16, Lev. 4: 8, 19, 26, 31, 35; 7: 3), or briefly “the fat” (הַחֵלֶב v. 9, Lev. 7:33; 16:25; 17: 6; Num. 18:17), “the fat portions” (הַחֵלְבִים Lev. 6: 5; 8:26; 9:19, 20, 24; 10:15).

Lev. 3: 5. This fat the priests were to burn upon the altar, over the burnt sacrifice, on the pieces of wood upon the fire. **עַל-הָעֹלָה** does not mean “in the manner or style of the burnt-offering” (*Knobel*), but “upon (over) the burnt-offering.” For apart from the fact that **עַל** cannot be shown to have this meaning, the peace-offering was preceded as a rule by the burnt-offering. At any rate it was always preceded by the daily burnt-offering, which burned, if not all day, at all events the whole of the forenoon, until it was quite consumed; so that the fat portions of the peace-offerings were to be laid upon the burnt-offering which was burning already. That this is the meaning of **עַל-הָעֹלָה** is placed beyond all doubt, both by Lev. 6: 5, where the priest is directed to burn wood every morning upon the fire of the altar, and then to place the burnt-offering upon it (**עָלֶיָּהּ**), and upon that to cause the fat portions of the peace-offerings to evaporate in smoke, and also by Lev. 9:14, where Aaron is said first of all to have burned the flesh and head of the burnt-offering upon the altar, then to have washed the entrails and legs of the animal, and burned them on the altar, **עַל הָעֹלָה**, i.e., upon (over) the portions of the burnt-offering that were burning already.

Lev. 3: 6-16. The same rules apply to the peace-offerings of sheep and goats, except that, in addition to the fat portions, which were to be burned upon the altar in the case of the oxen (vv. 3, 4) and goats (vv. 14, 15), the *fat tail* of the sheep was to be consumed as well. **הָאֵלֶיָּהּ תְּמִימָה**: “*the fat tail whole*” (v. 9), *cauda ovilla vel arietina eaque crassa et adiposa*; the same in Arabic (*Ges. thes.* p. 102). The fat tails which the sheep have in Northern Africa and Egypt, also in Arabia, especially Southern Arabia, and Syria, often weigh 15 lbs. or more, and small carriages on wheels are sometimes placed under them to bear their weight (*Sonnini*, R. ii. p. 358; *Bochart, Hieroz.* i. pp. 556ff.). It consists of something between marrow and fat. Ordinary sheep are also found in Arabia and Syria; but in modern Palestine all the sheep are “of the broad-tailed species.” The broad part of the tail is an excrescence of fat, from which the true tail hangs down (*Robinson*, Pal. ii. 166). “*Near the rump-bone shall he* (the offerer) *take it* (the fat tail) *away*,” i.e., separate it from the body. **עָצָם**, **ἀπ.** **λεγ.**, is, according to *Saad.*, *os caudae s. coccygis*, i.e., the rump or tail-bone, which passes over into the vertebrae of the tail (cf. *Bochart*, i. pp. 560-1). In vv. 11 and 16 the fat portions which were burned are called “food of the firing for Jehovah,” or “food of the firing for a sweet savour,” i.e., food which served

as a firing for Jehovah, or reached Jehovah by being burned; cf. Num. 28:24, “food of the firing of a sweet savour for Jehovah.” Hence not only are the daily burnt-offerings and the burnt and sin-offerings of the different feasts called “food of Jehovah” (“My bread,” Num. 28: 2); but the sacrifices generally are described as “the food of God” (“the bread of their God,” Lev. 21: 6, 8, 17, 21, 22, and 22:25), as food, that is, which Israel produced and caused to ascend to its God in fire as a sweet smelling savour. — Nothing is determined here with regard to the appropriation of the flesh of the peace-offerings, as their destination for a sacrificial meal was already known from traditional custom. The more minute directions for the meal itself are given in Lev. 7:11-36, where the meaning of these sacrifices is more fully explained. — In v. 17 (v. 16) the general rule is added, “*all fat belongs to Jehovah,*” and the law, “*eat neither fat nor blood,*” is enforced as “*an eternal statute*” for the generations of Israel (see at Exo. 12:14, 24) in all their dwelling-places (see Exo. 10:23 and 12:20).

Lev. 4, 5. The Expiatory Sacrifices. — The sacrifices treated of in Lev. 1-3 are introduced by their names, as though already known, for the purpose of giving them a legal sanction. But in Lev. 4 and 5 sacrifices are appointed for different offences, which receive their names for the first time from the objects to which they apply, i.e., from the sin, or the trespass, or debt to be expiated by them: viz., **חַטָּאת** *sin*, i.e., *sin-offering* (Lev. 4: 3, 8, 14, 19, etc.), and **אֲשָׁף** *debt*, i.e., *debt-offering* (Lev. 5:15, 16, 19, 25); — a clear proof that the sin and debt-offerings were introduced at the same time as the Mosaic law. The laws which follow are distinguished from the preceding ones by the new introductory formula in Lev. 4: 1, 2, which is repeated in Lev. 5:14. This repetition proves that Lev. 4: 2-5:13 treats of the sin-offerings, and Lev. 5:14-26 of the trespass-offerings; and this is confirmed by the substance of the two series of laws.

Lev. 4: 2-5:13. THE SIN-OFFERINGS. — The ritual prescribed for these differed, with regard to the animals sacrificed, the sprinkling of the blood, and the course adopted with the flesh, according to the position which the person presenting them happened to occupy in the kingdom of God. The classification of persons was as follows: (1) the anointed priest (Lev. 4: 2-12); (2) the whole congregation of Israel (vv. 13-21); (3) the prince (vv. 22-26); (4) the common people (v. 27-5:13). In the case of the last, regard was also paid to their circumstances; so that the sin-offerings could be regulated according to the ability of the offerer, especially for the lighter forms of sin (Lev. 5: 1-13).

Lev. 4: 2. “If a soul sin in wandering from any (**מִכֹּל** in a partitive sense) of the commandments of Jehovah, which ought not to be done, and do any one of them” (**מִאֲחַת** with **מִן** partitive, cf. vv. 13, 22, 27, lit., anything of one). This sentence, which stands at the head of the laws for the sin-offerings, shows that

the sin-offerings did not relate to sin or sinfulness in general, but to particular manifestations of sin, to certain distinct actions performed by individuals, or by the whole congregation. The distinguishing characteristic of the sin is expressed by the term **בְּשִׁגְגָה** (in error). No sins but those committed **בְּשִׁגְגָה** could be expiated by sin-offerings; whilst those committed with a high hand were to be punished by the extermination of the sinner (Num. 15:27-31). **שָׁגָג**, from **שָׁגַג** = **שָׁגָה** to wander or go wrong, signifies mistake, error, oversight. But sinning “in error” is not merely sinning through ignorance (vv. 13, 22, 27, 5:18), hurry, want of consideration, or carelessness (Lev. 5: 1, 4, 15), but also sinning unintentionally (Num. 35:11, 15, 22, 23); hence all such sins as spring from the weakness of flesh and blood, as distinguished from sins committed with a high (elevated) hand, or in haughty, defiant rebellion against God and His commandments.

Lev. 4: 3-12. *The sin of the high priest.* — The high priest is here called the “anointed priest” (vv. 3, 5, 16, 6:15) on account of the completeness of the anointing with which he was consecrated to his office (Lev. 8:12); in other places he is called the great (or high) priest (Lev. 21:10; Num. 35:25, etc.), and by later writers **בִּיהַן הָרֹאשׁ**, the priest the head, or head priest (2Ki. 25:18; 2Ch. 19:11). If he sinned **לְאַשְׁמַת הָעָם**, “to the sinning of the nation,” i.e., in his official position as representative of the nation before the Lord, and not merely in his own personal relation to God, he was to offer for a sin-offering because of his sin an ox without blemish, the largest of all the sacrificial animals, because he filled the highest post in Israel.

Lev. 4: 4. The presentation, laying on of hands, and slaughtering, were the same as in the case of the other sacrifices (Lev. 1: 3-5). The first peculiarity occurs in connection with the blood (vv. 5-7). The anointed priest was to take (a part) of the blood and carry it into the tabernacle, and having dipped his finger in it, to sprinkle some of it seven times before Jehovah “in the face of the vail of the Holy” (Exo. 26:31), i.e., in the direction towards the curtain; after that, he was to put (**נָתַן**) some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, and then to pour out the great mass of the blood, of which only a small portion had been used for sprinkling and smearing upon the horns of the altar, at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering. A sevenfold sprinkling “in the face of the vail” also took place in connection with the sin-offering for the whole congregation, as well as with the ox and he-goat which the high priest offered as sin-offerings on the day of atonement for himself, the priesthood, and the congregation, when the blood was sprinkled seven times before (**לְפָנָי**) the capporeth (Lev. 16:14), and seven times upon the horns of the altar (Lev. 16:18, 19). So too the blood of the red cow, that was slaughtered as a

sin-offering outside the camp, was sprinkled seven times in the direction towards the tabernacle (Num. 19: 4). The sevenfold sprinkling at the feast of atonement had respect to the purification of the sanctuary from the blemishes caused by the sins of the people, with which they had been defiled in the course of the year (see at Lev. 16), and did not take place till after the blood had been sprinkled once “against (? upon) the capporeth in front” for the expiation of the sin of the priesthood and people, and the horns of the altar had been smeared with the blood (Lev. 16:14, 18); whereas in the sin-offerings mentioned in this chapter, the sevenfold sprinkling preceded the application of the blood to the horns of the altar. This difference in the order of succession of the two manipulations with the blood leads to the conclusion, that in the case before us the sevenfold sprinkling had a different signification from that which it had on the day atonement, and served as a preliminary and introduction to the expiation. The blood also was not sprinkled upon the altar of the holy place, but only before Jehovah, against the curtain behind which Jehovah was enthroned, that is to say, only into the neighbourhood of the gracious presence of God; and this act was repeated seven times, that in the number seven, as the stamp of the covenant, the covenant relation, which sin had loosened, might be restored. It was not till after this had been done, that the expiatory blood of the sacrifice was put upon the horns of the altar, — not merely sprinkled or swung against the wall of the altar, but smeared upon the horns of the altar; not, however, that the blood might thereby be brought more prominently before the eyes of God, or lifted up into His more immediate presence, as *Hofmann* and *Knobel* suppose, but because the significance of the altar, as the scene of the manifestation of the divine grace and salvation, culminated in the horns, as the symbols of power and might (see p. 445f.). In the case of the sin-offerings for the high priest and the congregation, the altar upon which this took place was not the altar of burnt-offering in the court, but the altar of incense in the holy place; because both the anointed priest, by virtue of his calling and consecration as the mediator between the nation and the Lord, and the whole congregation, by virtue of its election as a kingdom of priests (Exo. 19: 6), were to maintain communion with the covenant God in the holy place, the front division of the dwelling-place of Jehovah, and were thus received into a closer relation of fellowship with Jehovah than the individual members of the nation, for whom the court with its altar was the divinely appointed place of communion with the covenant God. The remainder of the blood, which had not been used in the act of expiation, was poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering, as the holy place to which all the sacrificial blood was to be brought, that it might be received into the earth.

Lev. 4: 8-10. The priest was to lift off “all the fat” from the sacrificial animal, i.e., the same fat portions as in the peace-offering (Lev. 3: 3, 4, בֶּלֶיִלֶיב is the subject to וַיִּרֶם in v. 10), and burn it upon the altar of burnt-offering.

Lev. 4:11, 12. The skin of the bullock, and all the flesh, together with the head and the shank and the entrails (Lev. 1: 9) and the foeces, in fact the whole bullock, was to be carried out by him (the sacrificing priest) to a clean place before the camp, to which the ashes of the sacrifices were carried from the ash-heap (Lev. 1:16), and there burnt on the wood with fire. (On the construction of vv. 11 and 12 see *Ges.* § 145, 2).

The different course, adopted with the blood and flesh of the sin-offerings, from that prescribed in the ritual of the other sacrifices, was founded upon the special signification of these offerings. As they were presented to effect the expiation of sins, the offerer transferred the consciousness of sin and the desire for forgiveness to the head of the animal that had been brought in his stead, by the laying on of his hand; and after this the animal was slaughtered, and suffered death for him as the wages of sin. But as sin is not wiped out by the death of the sinner, unless it be forgiven by the grace of God, so devoting to death an animal laden with sin rendered neither a real nor symbolical satisfaction or payment for sin, by which the guilt of it could be wiped away; but the death which it endured in the sinner’s stead represented merely the fruit and effect of sin. To cover the sinner from the holiness of God because of his sin, some of the blood of the sacrifice was sprinkled seven times before Jehovah in the holy place; and the covenant fellowship, which had been endangered, was thereby restored. After this, however, the soul, which was covered in the sacrificial blood, was given up to the grace of God that prevailed in the altar, by means of the sprinkling of the blood upon the horns of the altar of incense, that it might receive the forgiveness of sins and reconciliation with God, and the full enjoyment of the blessings of the covenant be ensured to it once more. But the sin, that had been laid upon the animal of the sin-offering, lay upon it still. The next thing done, therefore, was to burn the fat portions of its inside upon the altar of burnt-offering. Now, if the flesh of the victim represented the body of the offerer as the organ of his soul, the fat portions inside the body, together with the kidneys, which were regarded as the seat of the tenderest and deepest emotions, can only have set forth the better part or inmost kernel of the man, the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος (Rom. 7:22; Eph. 3:16). By burning the fat portions upon the altar, the better part of human nature was given up in symbol to the purifying fire of the Holy Spirit of God, that it might be purified from the dross of sin, and ascend in its glorified essence to heaven, for a sweet savour unto the Lord (v. 31). The flesh of the sin-offering, however, or “the whole bullock,” was then burned in a clean place outside the camp, though not merely that it might be thereby destroyed in

a clean way, like the flesh provided for the sacrificial meals, which had not been consumed at the time fixed by the law (Lev. 7:17; 8:32; 19: 6; Exo. 12:10; 29:34), or the flesh of the sacrifices, which had been defiled by contact with unclean objects (Lev. 7:19); for if the disposal of the flesh formed an integral part of the sacrificial ceremony in the case of all the other sacrifices, and if, in the case of the sin-offerings, the blood of which was not brought into the interior of the sanctuary, the priests were to eat the flesh in a holy place, and that not “as a portion assigned to them by God as an honourable payment,” but, according to the express declaration of Moses, “to bear and take away (לָשֹׂאת) the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them” (Lev. 10:17), the burning of the flesh of the sin-offerings, i.e., of the animal itself, the blood of which was not brought into the holy place, cannot have been without significance, or simply the means adopted to dispose of it in a fitting manner, but must also have formed one factor in the ceremony of expiation. The burning outside the camp was rendered necessary, because the sacrifice had respect to the expiation of the priesthood, and the flesh or body of the bullock, which had been made חַטָּאת by the laying on of the hand, could not be eaten by the priests as the body of sin, that by the holiness of their official character they might bear and expiate the sin imputed to the sacrifice (see at Lev. 10:17). In this case it was necessary that it should be given up to the effect of sin, viz., to death or destruction by fire, and that outside the camp; in other words, outside the kingdom of God, from which everything dead was removed. But, inasmuch as it was sacrificial flesh, and therefore most holy by virtue of its destination; in order that it might not be made an abomination, it was not to be burned in an unclean place, where carrion and other abominations were thrown (Lev. 14:40, 45), but in the clean place, outside the camp, to which the ashes of the altar of burnt-offering were removed, as being the earthly sediment and remains of the sacrifices that had ascended to God in the purifying flames of the altar-fire. ⁿ²

Lev. 4:13-21. Sin of the whole congregation. — This is still further defined, as consisting in the fact that the thing was hid (נִסְתָּר) ⁿ³ from the eyes of the congregation, i.e., that it was a sin which was not known to be such, an act which really violated a commandment of God, though it was not looked upon as sin. Every transgression of a divine command, whether it took place consciously or unconsciously, brought guilt, and demanded a sin-offering for its expiation; and this was to be presented as soon as the sin was known. The sin-offering, which the elders had to offer in the name of the congregation, was to consist of a young ox, and was to be treated like that of the high priest (vv. 14-23 compared with vv. 3-12), inasmuch as “the whole congregation” included the priesthood, or at any rate was on an equality with the priesthood by virtue of its calling in relation to the Lord. חַטָּאת with עַל signifies to incur guilt upon

(on the foundation of) sin (Lev. 5: 5, etc.); it is usually construed with an accusative (vv. 3, 28, Lev. 5: 6, 10, etc.), or with בָּ, to sin with a sin (v. 23; Gen. 42:22). The subject of וְשֹׁהֵט (v. 15) is one of the elders. “*The bullock for a sin-offering:*” sc., the one which the anointed priest offered for his sin, or as it is briefly and clearly designated in v. 21, “the former bullock” (v. 12).

Lev. 4:20. “*And let the priest make an atonement for them, that it may be forgiven them,*” or, “so will they be forgiven.” This formula recurs with all the sin-offerings (with the exception of the one for the high priest), viz., vv. 26, 31, 35, 5:10, 13; Num. 15:25, 26, 28; also with the trespass-offerings, Lev. 5:16, 18, 26; 19:22, — the only difference being, that in the sin-offerings presented for defilements cleansing is mentioned, instead of forgiveness, as the effect of the atoning sacrifice (Lev. 12: 7, 8; 13:20, 53; Num. 8:21).

Lev. 4:22-26. The sin of a ruler. — V. 22. אֲשֶׁר: ὅτε, when. נָשִׂיא is the head of a tribe, or of a division of a tribe (Num. 3:24, 30, 35).

Lev. 4:23. “If (אוֹ, see Ges. § 155, 2) his sin is made known to him,” i.e., if any one called his attention to the fact that he had transgressed a commandment of God, he was to bring a he-goat without blemish, and, having laid his hand upon it, to slay it at the place of burnt-offering; after which the priest was to put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and pour out the rest of the blood at the foot of the altar, and then to burn the whole of the fat upon the altar, as in the case of the peace-offering (see Lev. 3: 3, 4), and thus to make atonement for the prince on account of his sin. שְׂעִיר עִזִּים, or שְׂעִיר alone (lit., hairy, shaggy, Gen. 27:11), is the buck-goat, which is frequently mentioned as the animal sacrificed as a sin-offering: e.g., that of the tribe-princes (Num. 7:16ff., 15:24), and that of the nation at the yearly festivals (Lev. 16: 9, 15; 23:19; Num. 28:15, 22, 30; 29: 5, 16ff.) and at the consecration of the tabernacle (Lev. 9: 3, 15; 10:16). It is distinguished in Num. 7:16ff. from the *attudim*, which were offered as peace-offerings, and frequently occur in connection with oxen, rams, and lambs as burnt-offerings and thank-offerings (Psa. 50: 9, 13; 66:15; Isa. 1:11; 34: 6; Eze. 39:18). According to *Knobel*, עִזִּים שְׂעִיר, or שְׂעִיר, was an old he-goat, the hair of which grew longer with age, particularly about the neck and back, and שְׂעִירַת עִזִּים (v. 28, Lev. 5:16) an old she-goat; whilst עֲתוּד was the younger he-goat, which leaped upon the does (Gen. 31:10, 12), and served for slaughtering like lambs, sheep, and goats (Deu. 32:14; Jer. 51:40). But as the שְׂעִיר עִזִּים was also slaughtered for food (Gen. 37:31), and the skins of quite young he-goats are called שְׂעִירַת (Gen. 27:23), the difference between שְׂעִיר and עֲתוּד is hardly to be sought in the age, but more probably, as *Bochart* supposes, in some variety of species, in

which case *seir* and *seirak* might denote the rough-haired, shaggy kind of goat, and *attud* the buck-goat of stately appearance.

Lev. 4:27-35. In the case of the *sin of a common Israelite* (“of the people of the land,” i.e., of the rural population, Gen. 23: 7), that is to say, of an Israelite belonging to the people, as distinguished from the chiefs who ruled over the people (2Ki. 11:18, 19; 16:15), the sin-offering was to consist of a shaggy she-goat without blemish, or a ewe-sheep (v. 32). The ceremonial in both cases was the same as with the he-goat (vv. 23ff.). — “According to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord” (v. 35): see at Lev. 3: 5.

Lev. 5: 1-13. There follow here three special examples of sin on the part of the common Israelite, all sins of omission and rashness of a lighter kind than the cases mentioned in Lev. 4:27ff.; in which, therefore, if the person for whom expiation was to be made was in needy circumstances, instead of a goat or ewe-sheep, a pair of doves could be received as a sacrificial gift, or, in cases of still greater poverty, the tenth of an ephah of fine flour. The following were the cases. The *first* (v. 1), when any one had heard the voice of an oath (an oath spoken aloud) and was a witness, i.e., was in a condition to give evidence, whether he had seen what took place or had learned it, that is to say, had come to the knowledge of it in some other way. In this case, if he did not make it known, he was to bear his offence, i.e., to bear the guilt, which he had contracted by omitting to make it known, with all its consequences. אָלָה does not mean a curse in general, but an oath, as an imprecation upon one’s self (= the “oath of cursing” in Num. 5:21); and the sin referred to did not consist in the fact that a person heard a curse, imprecation, or blasphemy, and gave no evidence of it (for neither the expression “and is a witness,” nor the words “hath seen or known of it,” are in harmony with this), but in the fact that one who knew of another’s crime, whether he had seen it, or had come to the certain knowledge of it in any other way, and was therefore qualified to appear in court as a witness for the conviction of the criminal, neglected to do so, and did not state what he had seen or learned, when he heard the solemn adjuration of the judge at the public investigation of the crime, by which all persons present, who knew anything of the matter, were urged to come forward as witnesses (vid., *Oehler* in *Herzog’s Cycl.*). נִשָּׂא עֵוֹן, to bear the offence or sin, i.e., to take away and endure its consequences (see Gen. 4:13), whether they consisted in chastisements and judgments, by which God punished the sin (Lev. 7:18; 17:16; 19:17), such as diseases or distress (Num. 5:31; 14:33, 34), childlessness (Lev. 20:20), death (Lev. 22: 9), or extermination (Lev. 19: 8; 20:17; Num. 9:13), or in punishment inflicted by men (Lev. 24:15), or whether they could be expiated by sin-offerings (as in this passage and v. 17) and other kinds

of atonement. In this sense נִשְׂאָה חַטָּאת is also sometimes used (see at Lev. 19:17).

Lev. 5: 2, 3. The *second* was, if any one had touched the carcase of an unclean beast, or cattle, or creeping thing, or the uncleanness of a man of any kind whatever (“with regard to all his uncleanness, with which he defiles himself,” i.e., any kind of defilement to which a man is exposed), and “*it is hidden from him,*” sc., the uncleanness or defilement; that is to say, if he had unconsciously defiled himself by touching unclean objects, and had consequently neglected the purification prescribed for such cases. In this case, if he found it out afterwards, he had contracted guilt which needed expiation.

Lev. 5: 4. The *third* was, if any one should “*swear to prate with the lips,*” i.e., swear in idle, empty words of the lips, — “*to do good or evil,*” i.e., that he would do anything whatever (Num. 24:13; Isa. 41:23), — “*with regard to all that he speaks idly with an oath,*” i.e., if it related to something which a man had affirmed with an oath in thoughtless conversation, — “*and it is hidden from him,*” i.e., if he did not reflect that he might commit sin by such thoughtless swearing, and if he perceived it afterwards and discovered his sin, and had incurred guilt with regard to one of the things which he had thoughtlessly sworn.

Lev. 5: 5, 6. If any one therefore (the three cases enumerated are comprehended under the one expression וְנִדְּחָה כִּי, for the purpose of introducing the apodosis) had contracted guilt with reference to one of these (the things named in vv. 1-4), and confessed in what he had sinned, he was to offer as his guilt (trespass) to the Lord, for the sin which he had sinned, a female from the flock — for a sin-offering, that the priest might make atonement for him on account of his sin. אֲשָׁם (v. 6) does not mean either guilt-offering or *debitum* (Knobel), but *culpa, delictum, reatus*, as in v. 7: “as his guilt,” i.e., for the expiation of his guilt, which he had brought upon himself.

Lev. 5: 7-10. “*But if his hand does not reach what is sufficient for a sheep,*” i.e., if he could not afford enough to sacrifice a sheep (“his hand” is put for what his hand acquires), he was to bring two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, one for the sin-offering, the other for the burnt-offering. The pigeon intended for the sin, i.e., for the sin-offering, he was to bring first of all to the priest, who was to offer it in the following manner. The head was to be pinched off from opposite to its neck, i.e., in the nape just below the head, though without entirely severing it, that is to say, it was to be pinched off sufficiently to kill the bird and allow the blood to flow out. He was then to sprinkle of the blood upon the wall of the altar, which could be effected by swinging the bleeding pigeon, and to squeeze out the rest of the blood against the wall of the

altar, because it was a sin-offering; for in the burnt-offering he let all the blood flow out against the wall of the altar (Lev. 1:15). What more was done with the pigeon is not stated. Hence it cannot be decided with certainty, whether, after the crop and its contents were removed and thrown upon the ash-heap, the whole of the bird was burned upon the altar, or whether it fell to the priest, as the *Mishnah* affirms (Seb. vi. 4), so that none of it was placed upon the altar. One circumstance which seems to favour the statement in the Talmud is the fact, that in the sin-offering of pigeons, a second pigeon was to be offered as a burnt-offering, and, according to v. 10, for the purpose of making an atonement; probably for no other purpose than to burn it upon the altar, as the dove of the sin-offering was not burned, and the sacrifice was incomplete without some offering upon the altar. In the case of sin-offerings of quadrupeds, the fat portions were laid upon the altar, and the flesh could be eaten by the priest by virtue of his office; but in that of pigeons, it was not possible to separate fat portions from the flesh for the purpose of burning upon the altar by themselves, and it would not do to divide the bird in half, and let one half be burned and the other eaten by the priest, as this would have associated the idea of halfness or incompleteness with the sacrifice. A second pigeon was therefore to be sacrificed as a burnt-offering, כַּבִּישָׁפֶט, according to the right laid down in Lev. 1:14ff., that the priest might make atonement for the offerer on account of his sin, whereas in the sin-offering of a quadruped one sacrificial animal was sufficient to complete the expiation. ¹¹⁴

Lev. 5:11-13. But if any one could not afford even two pigeons, he was to offer the tenth of an ephah of fine flour as a sin-offering. תָּגִיעַ יָדוֹ for תִּשְׁיג יָדוֹ (v. 7): his hand reaches to anything, is able to raise it, or with an accusative, obtains, gets anything (used in the same sense in Lev. 14:30 31), or else absolutely, acquires, or gets rich (Lev. 25:26, 47). But it was to be offered without oil and incense, because it was a sin-offering, that is to say, “because it was not to have the character of a *minchah*” (*Oehler*). But the reason why it was not to have this character was, that only those who were in a state of grace could offer a *minchah*, and not a man who had fallen from grace through sin. As such a man could not offer to the Lord the fruits of the Spirit of God and of prayer, he was not allowed to add oil and incense, as symbols of the Spirit and praise of God, to the sacrifice with which he sought the forgiveness of sin. The priest was to take a handful of the meal offered, and burn it upon the altar as a memorial, and thus make atonement for the sinner on account of his sin. — On “*his handful*” and “*a memorial*” (*Azcarah*), see Lev. 2: 2. “*In one of these*” (v. 13 as in v. 5): cf. Lev. 4: 2. “*And let it (the remainder of the meal offered) belong to the priest like the meat-offering:*” i.e., as being most holy (Lev. 2: 3).

Lev. 5:14-26. (Ch. 5:14-6: 7).ⁿ⁵ THE TRESPASS-OFFERINGS. — These were presented for special sins, by which a person had contracted guilt, and therefore they are not included in the general festal sacrifices. Three kinds of offences are mentioned in this section as requiring trespass-offerings. The *first* is, “*if a soul commit a breach of trust, and sin in going wrong in the holy gifts of Jehovah.*” מַעַל, lit., to cover, hence מַעִיל the cloak, over-coat, signifies to act secretly, unfaithfully, especially against Jehovah, either by falling away from Him into idolatry, by which the fitting honour was withheld from Jehovah (Lev. 26:40; Deu. 32:51; Jos. 22:16), or by infringing upon His rights, abstracting something that rightfully belonged to Him. Thus in Jos. 7: 1; 22:20, it is applied to fraud in relation to that which had been put under the ban; and in Num. 5:12, 27, it is also applied to a married woman’s unfaithfulness to her husband: so that sin was called מַעַל, when regarded as a violation of existing rights. “*The holy things of Jehovah*” were the holy gifts, sacrifices, first-fruits, tithes, etc., which were to be offered to Jehovah, and were assigned by Him to the priests for their revenue (see Lev. 21:22). חָטָא with מִן is *constructio praegnans*: to sin in anything by taking away from Jehovah that which belonged to Him. בְּשִׁגְגָה, in error (see Lev. 4: 2): i.e., in a forgetful or negligent way. Whoever sinned in this way was to offer to the Lord as his guilt (see v. 6) a ram from the flock without blemish for a trespass-offering (lit., *guilt-offering*), according to the estimate of Moses, whose place was afterwards taken by the officiating priest (Lev. 27:12; Num. 18:16). בְּסֵפֶר שֶׁקֶלִים “*money of shekels,*” i.e., several shekels in amount, which *Abenezra* and others have explained, no doubt correctly, as meaning that the ram was to be worth more than one shekel, two shekels at least. The expression is probably kept indefinite, for the purpose of leaving some margin for the valuation, so that there might be a certain proportion between the value of the ram and the magnitude of the trespass committed (see *Oehler ut sup.* p. 645). “*In the holy shekel.*” see Exo. 30:13. At the same time, the culprit was to make compensation for the fraud committed in the holy thing, and add a fifth (of the value) over, as in the case of the redemption of the first-born, of the vegetable tithe, or of what had been vowed to God (Lev. 27:27, 31, and 27:13, 15, 19). The ceremony to be observed in the offering of the ram is described in Lev. 7: 1ff. It was the same as that of the sin-offerings, whose blood was not brought into the holy place, except with regard to the sprinkling of the blood, and in this the trespass-offering resembled the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings.

The *second* case (vv. 17-19), from its very position between the other two, which both refer to the violation of rights, must belong to the same category; although the sin is introduced with the formula used in Lev. 4:27 in connection with those sins which were to be expiated by a sin-offering. But the violation of

right can only have consisted in an invasion of Jehovah's rights with regard to Israel, and not, as *Knobel* supposes, in an invasion of the rights of private Israelites, as distinguished from the priests; an antithesis of which there is not the slightest indication. This is evident from the fact, that the case before us is linked on to the previous one without anything intervening; whereas the next case, which treats of the violation of the rights of a neighbour, is separated by a special introductory formula. The expression, "*and wist it not,*" refers to ignorance of the sin, and not of the divine commands; as may be clearly seen from v. 18: "the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his error, which he committed without knowing it." The trespass-offering was the same as in the former case, and was also to be valued by the priest; but no compensation is mentioned, probably because the violation of right, which consisted in the transgression of one of the commands of God, was of such a kind as not to allow of material compensation. The *third* case (Lev. 6: 1-7, or vv. 20-26) is distinguished from the other two by a new introductory formula. The sin and unfaithfulness to Jehovah are manifested in this case in a violation of the rights of a neighbour. "*If a man deny to his neighbour* (כַּחֵשׁ with a double כ *obj.*, to deny a thing to a person) *a pikkadon* (i.e., a deposit, a thing entrusted to him to keep, Gen. 41:36), *or תְּשׂוּמַת יָד*, "*a thing placed in his hand*" (handed over to him as a pledge) "*or גְּזוּל*, *a thing robbed*" (i.e., the property of a neighbour unjustly appropriated, whether a well, a field, or cattle, Gen. 21:25; Mic. 2: 2; Job. 24: 2), "*or if he have oppressed his neighbour*" (i.e., forced something from him or withheld it unjustly, Lev. 19:13; Deu. 24:14; Jos. 12: 8; Mal. 3: 5), "*or have found a lost thing and denies it, and thereby swears to his lie*" (i.e., rests his oath upon a lie), "*on account of one of all that a man is accustomed to do to sin therewith:*" the false swearing here refers not merely to a denial of what is found, but to all the crimes mentioned, which originated in avarice and selfishness, but through the false swearing became frauds against Jehovah, adding guilt towards God to the injustice done to the neighbour, and requiring, therefore, not only that a material restitution should be made to the neighbour, but that compensation should be made to God as well. Whatever had been robbed, or taken by force, or entrusted or found, and anything about which a man had sworn falsely (vv. 23, 24), was to be restored "*according to its sum*" (cf. Exo. 30:12, Num. 1: 2, etc.), i.e., in its full value; beside which, he was to "*add its fifths*" (on the plural, see *Ges.* § 87, 2; *Ew.* § 186 e), i.e., in every one of the things abstracted or withheld unjustly the fifth part of the value was to be added to the full amount (as in v. 16). "*To him to whom it* (belongs), *shall he give it*" אֲשַׁמְתּוּ אֲשֶׁמְתוּ: in the day when he makes atonement for his trespass, i.e., offers his trespass-offering. The trespass (guilt) against Jehovah was to be taken away by the trespass-offering according to the valuation of the priest, as in vv. 15, 16,

and 18, that he might receive expiation and forgiveness on account of what he had done.

If now, in order to obtain a clear view of the much canvassed difference between the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings,^{f16} we look at once at the other cases, for which trespass-offerings were commanded in the law; we find in Num. 5: 5-8 not only a trespass against Jehovah, but an unjust withdrawal of the property of a neighbour, clearly mentioned as a crime, for which material compensation was to be made with the addition of a fifth of its value, just as in vv. 2-7 of the present chapter. So also the guilt of a man who had lain with the slave of another (Lev. 19:20-22) did not come into the ordinary category of adultery, but into that of an unjust invasion of the domain of another's property; though in this case, as the crime could not be estimated in money, instead of material compensation being made, a civil punishment (viz., bodily scourging) was to be inflicted; and for the same reason nothing is said about the valuation of the sacrificial ram. Lastly, in the trespass-offerings for the cleansing of a leper (Lev. 14:12ff.), or of a Nazarite who had been defiled by a corpse (Num. 6:12), it is true we cannot show in what definite way the rights of Jehovah were violated (see the explanation of these passages), but the sacrifices themselves served to procure the restoration of the persons in question to certain covenant rights which they had lost; so that even here the trespass-offering, for which moreover only a male sheep was demanded, was to be regarded as a compensation or equivalent for the rights to be restored. From all these cases it is perfectly evident, that the idea of satisfaction for a right, which had been violated but was about to be restored or recovered, lay at the foundation of the trespass-offering,^{f17} and the ritual also points to this. The animal sacrificed was always a ram, except in the cases mentioned in Lev. 14:12ff. and Num. 6:12. This fact alone clearly distinguishes the trespass-offerings from the sin-offerings, for which all kinds of sacrifices were offered from an ox to a pigeon, the choice of the animal being regulated by the position of the sinner and the magnitude of his sin. But they are distinguished still more by the fact, that in the case of all the sin-offerings the blood was to be put upon the horns of the altar, or even taken into the sanctuary itself, whereas the blood of the trespass-offerings, like that of the burnt and peace-offerings, was merely swung against the wall of the altar (Lev. 7: 2). Lastly, they were also distinguished by the fact, that in the trespass-offering the ram was in most instances to be valued by the priest, not for the purpose of determining its actual value, which could not vary very materially in rams of the same kind, but to fix upon it symbolically the value of the trespass for which compensation was required. Hence there can be no doubt, that as the idea of the expiation of sin, which was embodied in the sprinkling of the blood, was most prominent in the sin-offering; so the idea of satisfaction for the restoration of rights that had been violated or disturbed

came into the foreground in the trespass-offering. This satisfaction was to be actually made, wherever the guilt admitted of a material valuation, by means of payment or penance; and in addition to this, the animal was raised by the priestly valuation into the authorized bearer of the satisfaction to be rendered to the rights of God, through the sacrifice of which the culprit could obtain the expiation of his guilt.

2. Special Instructions concerning the Sacrifices for the Priests. — Ch. 6 and 7.

Lev. 6-7. The instructions contained in these two chapters were made known to “*Aaron and his sons*” (Lev. 6: 9, 20, 25), i.e., to the priests, and relate to the duties and rights which devolved upon, and pertained to, the priests in relation to the sacrifices. Although many of the instructions are necessarily repeated from the general regulations, as to the different kinds of sacrifice and the mode of presenting them; most of them are new, and of great importance in relation to the institution of sacrifice generally.

Lev. 6: 8-13 (Heb. vv. 1-6). The Law of the Burnt-Offering commences the series, and special reference is made to the daily burnt-offering (Exo. 29:38-42).

Lev. 6: 2. “*It, the burnt-offering, shall (burn) upon the hearth upon the altar the whole night till the morning, and the fire of the altar be kept burning with it.*” The verb **וַיִּבְרַח** is wanting in the first clause, and only introduced in the second; but it belongs to the first clause as well. The pronoun **אֵלָיו** at the opening of the sentence cannot stand for the verb *to be* in the imperative. The passages, which *Knobel* adduces in support of this, are of a totally different kind. The instructions apply primarily to the burnt-offering, which was offered every evening, and furnished the basis for all the burnt-offerings (Exo. 29:38, 39; Num. 33: 3, 4).

Lev. 6: 3, 4. In the morning of every day the priest was to put on his linen dress (see Exo. 28:42) and the white drawers, and lift off, i.e., clear away, the ashes to which the fire had consumed the burnt-offering upon the altar (**אֶשֶׁר** is construed with a double accusative, to consume the sacrifice to ashes), and pour them down beside the altar (see Lev. 1:16). The **ו** in **וַיִּבְרַח** is not to be regarded as the old form of the connecting vowel, as in Gen. 1:24 (*Ewald*, § 211 *b*; see *Ges.* § 90, 3*b*), but as the suffix, as in 2Sa. 20: 8, although the use of the suffix with the governing noun in the construct state can only be found in other cases in the poetical writings (cf. *Ges.* § 121 *b*; *Ewald*, 291 *b*). He was then to take off his official dress, and having put on other (ordinary) clothes, to take away the ashes from the court, and carry them out of the camp to a clean

place. The priest was only allowed to approach the altar in his official dress; but he could not go out of the camp with this.

Lev. 6:12. The fire of the altar was also to be kept burning “with it” (בָּר, viz., the burnt-offering) the whole day through without going out. For this purpose the priest was to burn wood upon it (the altar-fire), and lay the burnt-offering in order upon it, and cause the fat portions of the peace-offerings to ascend in smoke, — that is to say, whenever peace-offerings were brought, for they were not prescribed for every day.

Lev. 6:13. Fire was to be kept constantly burning upon the altar without going out, not in order that the heavenly fire, which proceeded from Jehovah when Aaron and his sons first entered upon the service of the altar after their consecration, and consumed the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, might never be extinguished (see at Lev. 9:24); but that the burnt-offering might never go out, because this was the divinely appointed symbol and visible sign of the uninterrupted worship of Jehovah, which the covenant nation could never suspend either day or night, without being unfaithful to its calling. For the same reason other nations also kept perpetual fire burning upon the altars of their principal gods. (For proofs, see *Rosenmüller* and *Knobel ad h. l.*)

Lev. 6:14-18. The Law of the Meat-Offering. — The regulations in vv. 14, 15, are merely a repetition of Lev. 2: 2 and 3; but in vv. 16-18 the new instructions are introduced with regard to what was left and had not been burned upon the altar. The priests were to eat this as unleavened, i.e., to bake it without leaven, and to eat it in a holy place, viz., in the court of the tabernacle. מִצּוֹת הַאֵשׁ בֶּל in v. 16 is explained by “it shall not be baken with leaven” in v. 17. It was the priests’ share of the firings of Jehovah (see Lev. 1: 9), and as such it was most holy (see Lev. 2: 3), like the sin-offering and trespass-offering (vv. 25, 26, Lev. 7: 6), and only to be eaten by the male members of the families of the priests. This was to be maintained as a statute for ever (see at Lev. 3:17). *Every one that touches them* (the most holy offerings) *becomes holy.* יִקְדָּשׁ does not mean he shall be holy, or shall sanctify himself (LXX, *Vulg.*, *Luth.*, a *Lap.*, etc.), nor he is consecrated to the sanctuary and is to perform service there (*Theodor.*, *Knobel*, and others). In this provision, which was equally applicable to the sin-offering (v. 27), to the altar of the burnt-offering (Exo. 29:37), and to the most holy vessels of the tabernacle (Exo. 30:29), the word is not to be interpreted by Num. 17: 2, 3, or Deu. 22: 9, or by the expression “shall be holy” in Lev. 27:10, 21, and Num. 18:10, but by Isa. 65: 5, “touch me not, for I am holy.” The idea is this, every layman who touched these most holy things became holy through the contact, so that henceforth he had to guard against defilement in the same manner as the sanctified priests

(Lev. 21: 1-8), though without sharing the priestly rights and prerogatives. This necessarily placed him in a position which would involve many inconveniences in connection with ordinary life.

Lev. 6:19-23. The Meat-Offering of the Priests is introduced, as a new law, with a special formula, and is inserted here in its proper place in the sacrificial instructions given for the priests, as it would have been altogether out of place among the general laws for the laity. In “*the day of his anointing*” (הַמִּשְׁחָה, construed as a passive with the accusative as in Gen. 4:18), Aaron and his sons were to offer a *corban* as “*a perpetual meat-offering*” (*minchah*, in the absolute instead of the construct state: cf. Exo. 29:42, Num. 28: 6; see *Ges.* § 116, 6, Note *b*); and this was to be done in all future time by “*the priest who was anointed of his sons in his stead,*” that is to say, by every high priest at the time of his consecration. “*In the day of his anointing:*” when the anointing was finished, the seven were designated as “*the day,*” like the seven days of creation in Gen. 2: 4. This *minchah* was not offered during the seven days of the anointing itself, but after the consecration was finished, i.e., in all probability, as the Jewish tradition assumes, at the beginning of the eighth day, when the high priest entered upon his office, viz., along with the daily morning sacrifices (Exo. 29:38, 39), and before the offering described in Lev. 9. It then continued to be offered, as “*a perpetual minchah,*” every morning and evening during the whole term of his office, according to the testimony of the Book of Wisdom (ch. 45:14, where we cannot suppose the daily burnt-offering to be intended) and also of *Josephus* (Ant. 3:10, 7).¹¹⁸

It was to consist of the tenth of an ephah of fine flour, one half of which was to be presented in the morning, the other in the evening; — not as flour, however, but made in a pan with oil, “*roasted*” and תְּפִינֵי מִנְחַת פִּתִּים (“*broken pieces of a minchah of crumbs*”), i.e., in broken pieces, like a *minchah* composed of crumbs. מֶרֶבֶכֶת (v. 14 and 1Ch. 23:29) is no doubt synonymous with מֶרֶבֶכֶת סֶלֶת, and to be understood as denoting fine flour sufficiently burned or roasted in oil; the meaning mixed or mingled does not harmonise with Lev. 7:12, where the mixing or kneading with oil is expressed by בְּלוּלַת בֶּשֶׂמֶן. The *hapax legomenon* תְּפִינֵי signifies either broken or baked, according as we suppose the word to be derived from the Arabic ‘*afana* diminuit, or, as *Gesenius* and the Rabbins do, from אָפָה to bake, a point which can hardly be decided with certainty. This *minchah*, which was also instituted as a perpetual ordinance, was to be burnt entirely upon the altar, like every meat-offering presented by a priest, because it belonged to the category of the burnt-offerings, and of these meat-offerings the offerer himself had no share (Lev. 2: 3, 10). *Origen* observes in his *homil. iv. in Levit.: In caeteris quidem praeceptis pontifex in offerendis*

sacrificiis populo praebet officium, in hoc vero mandato quae propria sunt curat et quod ad se spectat exequitur. It is also to be observed that the high priest was to offer only a bloodless *minchah* for himself, and not a bleeding sacrifice, which would have pointed to expiation. As the sanctified of the Lord, he was to draw near to the Lord every day with a sacrificial gift, which shadowed forth the fruits of sanctification.

Lev. 6:24-30. The Law of the Sin-Offering, which is introduced with a new introductory formula on account of the interpolation of vv. 19-23, gives more precise instructions, though chiefly with regard to the sin-offerings of the laity, first as to the place of slaughtering, as in Lev. 4:24, and then as to the most holy character of the flesh and blood of the sacrifices. The flesh of these sin-offerings was to be eaten by the priest who officiated at a holy place, in the fore-court (see v. 16). Whoever touched it became holy (see at v. 18); and if any one sprinkled any of the blood upon his clothes, whatever the blood was sprinkled upon was to be washed in a holy place, in order that the most holy blood might not be carried out of the sanctuary into common life along with the sprinkled clothes, and thereby be profaned. The words “*thou shalt wash*” in v. 20 are addressed to the priest.

Lev. 6:28. The flesh was equally holy. The vessel, in which it was boiled for the priests to eat, was to be broken in pieces if it were of earthenware, and scoured (פֹּרַק *Pual*) and overflowed with water, i.e., thoroughly rinsed out, if it were of copper, lest any of the most holy flesh should adhere to the vessel, and be desecrated by its being used in the preparation of common food, or for other earthly purposes. It was possible to prevent this desecration in the case of copper vessels by a thorough cleansing; but not so with earthen vessels, which absorb the fat, so that it cannot be removed by washing. The latter therefore were to be broken in pieces, i.e., thoroughly destroyed. On the other hand, earthen vessels that had been defiled were also ordered to be broken to pieces, though for the very opposite reason (see Lev. 11:33, 35).

Lev. 6:29, 30. The flesh of the sin-offering was to be eaten after it had been boiled, like the meat-offering (vv. 16 and 18), by the males among the priests alone. But this only applied to the sin-offerings the laity (Lev. 4:22-5:13). The flesh of the sin-offerings for the high priest and the whole congregation (Lev. 4: 1-21), the blood of which was brought into the tabernacle “to make atonement in the sanctuary,” i.e., that the expiation with the blood might be completed there, was not to be eaten, but to be burned with fire (Lev. 4:12, 21). — On the signification of this act of eating the flesh of the sin-offering, see at Lev. 10:17.

Lev. 7: 1-10. The Law of the Trespass-Offering embraces first of all the regulations as to the ceremonial connected with the presentation.

Lev. 7: 2. The slaughtering and sprinkling of the blood were the same as in the case of the burnt-offering (Lev. 1: 5); and therefore, no doubt, the signification was the same.

Lev. 7: 3-5. The fat portions only were to be burned upon the altar, viz., the same as in the sin and peace-offerings (see Lev. 4: 8 and 3: 9); but the flesh was to be eaten by the priests, as in the sin-offering (Lev. 6:22), inasmuch as there was the same law in this respect for both the sin-offering and trespass-offering; and these parts of the sacrificial service must therefore have had the same meaning, every trespass being a sin (see Lev. 6:26). — Certain analogous instructions respecting the burnt-offering and meat-offering are appended in vv. 8-10 by way of supplement, as they ought properly to have been given in Lev. 6, in the laws relating to the sacrifices in question.

Lev. 7: 8. In the case of the burnt-offering, the skin of the animal was to fall to the lot of the officiating priest, viz., as payment for his services. **הַפֶּהֱיֹן** is construed absolutely: “*as for the priest, who offereth — the skin of the burnt-offering which he offereth shall belong to the priest*” (for “to him”). This was probably the case also with the trespass-offerings and sin-offerings of the laity; whereas the skin of the peace-offerings belonged to the owner of the animal (see *Mishnah, Sebach.* 12, 3). — In vv. 9, 10, the following law is laid down with reference to the meat-offering, that everything baked in the oven, and everything prepared in a pot or pan, was to belong to the priest, who burned a portion of it upon the altar; and that everything mixed with oil and everything dry was to belong to all the sons of Aaron, i.e., to all the priests, to one as much as another, so that they were all to receive an equal share. The reason for this distinction is not very clear. That all the meat-offerings described in Lev. 2 should fall to the sons of Aaron (i.e., to the priests), with the exception of that portion which was burned upon the altar as an *azcarah*, followed from the fact that they were most holy (see at Lev. 2: 3). As the meat-offerings, which consisted of pastry, and were offered in the form of prepared food (v. 9), are the same as those described in Lev. 2: 4-8, it is evident that by those mentioned in v. 10 we are to understand the kinds described in Lev. 2: 1-3 and 14-16, and by the “dry,” primarily the **אֲבִיב קָלוֹי**, which consisted of dried grains, to which oil was to be added (**נָתַן** Lev. 2:15), though not poured upon it, as in the case of the offering of flour (Lev. 2: 1), and probably also in that of the sin-offerings and jealousy-offerings (Lev. 5:11, and Num. 5:15), which consisted simply of flour (without oil). The reason therefore why those which consisted of cake and pastry fell to the lot of the officiating priest, and those which consisted

of flour mixed with oil, of dry corn, or of simple flour, were divided among all the priests, was probably simply this, that the former were for the most part offered only under special circumstances, and then merely in small quantities, whereas the latter were the ordinary forms in which the meat-offerings were presented, and amounted to more than the officiating priests could possibly consume, or dispose of by themselves.

Lev. 7:11-36. The Law of the Peace-Offerings, “*which he shall offer to Jehovah*” (the subject is to be supplied from the verb), contains instructions, (1) as to the bloodless accompaniment to these sacrifices (vv. 12-14), (2) as to the eating of the flesh of the sacrifices (vv. 15-21), with the prohibition against eating fat and blood (vv. 22-27), and (3) as to Jehovah’s share of these sacrifices (vv. 28-36). — In vv. 12 and 16 three classes of *shelamim* are mentioned, which differ according to their occasion and design, viz., whether they were brought על-תודה, upon the ground of praise, i.e., to praise God for blessings received or desired, or as vow-offerings, or thirdly, as freewill-offerings (v. 16). To (lit., upon, in addition to) the sacrifice of thanksgiving (v. 12, “sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace-offerings,” vv. 13 and 15) they were to present “*unleavened cakes kneaded with oil, and flat cakes anointed with oil* (see at Lev. 2: 4), *and roasted fine flour* (see 6:14) *mixed as cakes with oil,*” i.e., cakes made of fine flour roasted with oil, and thoroughly kneaded with oil (on the construction, see Ges. § 139, 2; Ewald § 284 a). This last kind of cakes kneaded with oil is also called oil-bread-cake (“a cake of oiled bread,” Lev. 8:26; Exo. 29:23), or “cake unleavened, kneaded with oil” (Exo. 29: 2), and probably differed from the former simply in the fact that it was more thoroughly saturated with oil, inasmuch as it was not only made of flour that had been mixed with oil in the kneading, but the flour itself was first of all roasted in oil, and then the dough was moistened still further with oil in the process of kneading.

Lev. 7:13, 14. This sacrificial gift the offerer was to present upon, or along with, cakes of leavened bread (round, leavened bread-cakes), and to offer “*thereof one out of the whole oblation,*” namely, one cake of each of the three kinds mentioned in v. 12, as a heave-offering for Jehovah, which was to fall to the priest who sprinkled the blood of the peace-offering. According to Lev. 2: 9, an *azcarah* of the unleavened pastry was burned upon the altar, although this is not specially mentioned here any more than at vv. 9 and 10; whereas none of the leavened bread-cake was placed upon the altar (Lev. 2:12), but it was simply used as bread for the sacrificial meal. There is nothing here to suggest an allusion to the custom of offering unleavened sacrificial cakes upon a plate of leavened dough, as *J. D. Michaelis, Winer*, and others suppose.

Lev. 7:15-18. The flesh of the praise-offering was to be eaten on the day of presentation, and none of it was to be left till the next morning (cf. Lev. 22:29, 30); but that of the vow and freewill-offerings might be eaten on both the first and second days. Whatever remained after that was to be burnt on the third day, i.e., to be destroyed by burning. If any was eaten on the third day, it was not well-pleasing (רְצֵדָה “good pleasure,” see Lev. 1: 4), and was “not reckoned to the offerer,” sc., as a sacrifice well-pleasing to God; it was “an abomination.” פְּגוּל, an abomination, is only applied to the flesh of the sacrifices (Lev. 19: 7; Eze. 4:14; Isa. 65: 4), and signifies properly a stench; — compare the talmudic word פִּגְלֵי faetidum reddere. Whoever ate thereof would bear his sin (see Lev. 5: 1). “The soul that eateth” is not to be restricted, as *Knobel* supposes, to the other participators in the sacrificial meal, but applies to the offerer also, in fact to every one who partook of such flesh. The burning on the third day was commanded, not to compel the offerer to invite the poor to share in the meal (*Theodoret, Clericus*, etc.), but to guard against the danger of a desecration of the meal. The sacrificial flesh was holy (Exo. 29:34); and in Lev. 19: 8, where this command is repeated,¹⁹ eating it on the third day is called a profanation of that which was holy to Jehovah, and ordered to be punished with extermination. It became a desecration of what was holy, through the fact that in warm countries, if flesh is not most carefully preserved by artificial means, it begins to putrefy, or becomes offensive (פְּגוּל) on the third day. But to eat flesh that was putrid or stinking, would be like eating unclean carrion, or the נִבְלָה with which putrid flesh is associated in Eze. 4:14. It was for this reason that burning was commanded, as *Philo (de vict. p. 842)* and *Maimonides (More Neboch iii. 46)* admit; though the former also associates with this the purpose mentioned above, which we decidedly reject (cf. *Outram l.c. p. 185 seq.*, and *Bähr, ii. pp. 375-6*).

Lev. 7:19-21. In the same way all sacrificial flesh that had come into contact with what was unclean, and been defiled in consequence, was to be burned and not eaten. V. 19b, which is not found in the Septuagint and Vulgate, reads thus: “and as for the flesh, every clean person shall eat flesh,” i.e., take part in the sacrificial meal.

Lev. 7:20. On the other hand, “the soul which eats flesh of the peace-offering, and his uncleanness is upon him” (for “whilst uncleanness is upon him,” the suffix is to be understood as referring to נֶפֶשׁ construed as a masculine, see Lev. 2: 1), “shall be cut off” (see Gen. 17:14). This was to be done, whether the uncleanness arose from contact with an unclean object (any unclean thing), or from the uncleanness of man (cf. Lev. 12-15), or from an unclean beast (see at Lev. 11: 4-8), or from any other unclean abomination.

אָפְשֵׁי, abomination, includes the unclean fishes, birds, and smaller animals, to which this expression is applied in Lev. 11:10-42 (cf. Eze. 8:10 and Isa. 66:17). Moreover contact with animals that were pronounced unclean so far as eating was concerned, did not produce uncleanness so long as they were alive, or if they had been put to death by man; but contact with animals that had died a natural death, whether they belonged to the edible animals or not, that is to say, with carrion (see at Lev. 11: 8).

There is appended to these regulations, as being substantially connected with them, the prohibition of fat and blood as articles of food (vv. 22-27). By “*the fat of ox, or of sheep, or of goat,*” i.e., the three kinds of animals used in sacrifice, or “*the fat of the beast of which men offer a firing to Jehovah*” (v. 25), we are to understand only those portions of fat which are mentioned in Lev. 3: 3, 4, 9; not fat which grows in with the flesh, nor the fat portions of other animals, which were clean but not allowed as sacrifices, such as the stag, the antelope, and other kinds of game.

Lev. 7:24. The fat of cattle that had fallen (נִבְלָה), or been torn to pieces (viz., by beasts of prey), was not to be eaten, because it was unclean and defiled the eater (Lev. 17:15; 22: 8); but it might be applied “*to all kinds of uses,*” i.e., to the common purposes of ordinary life. *Knobel* observes on this, that “in the case of oxen, sheep, and goats slain in the regular way, this was evidently not allowable. But the law does not say what was to be done with the fat of these animals.” Certainly it does not *disertis verbis*; but indirectly it does so clearly enough. According to Lev. 17: 3ff., during the journey through the desert any one who wanted to slaughter an ox, sheep, or goat was to bring the animal to the tabernacle as a sacrificial gift, that the blood might be sprinkled against the altar, and the fat burned upon it. By this regulation every ordinary slaughtering was raised into a sacrifice, and the law determined what was to be done with the fat. Now if afterwards, when the people dwelt in Canaan, cattle were allowed to be slaughtered in any place, and the only prohibition repeated was that against eating blood (Deu. 12:15, 16, 21ff.), whilst the law against eating fat was not renewed; it follows as a matter of course, that when the custom of slaughtering at the tabernacle was restricted to actual sacrifices, the prohibition against eating the fat portions came to an end, so far as those animals were concerned with were slain for consumption and not as sacrifices. The reason for prohibiting fat from being eaten was simply this, that so long as every slaughtering was a sacrifice, the fat portions, which were to be handed over to Jehovah and burned upon the altar, were not to be devoted to earthly purposes, because they were gifts sanctified to God. The eating of the fat, therefore, was neither prohibited on sanitary or social grounds, viz., because fat was injurious to health, as *Maimonides* and other Rabbins maintain, nor for the purpose of

promoting the cultivation of olives, as *Michaelis* supposes, nor to prevent its being put into the unclean mouth of man, as *Knobel* imagines; but as being an illegal appropriation of what was sanctified to God, a wicked invasion of the rights of Jehovah, which was to be punished with extermination according to the analogy of Num. 15:30, 31. The prohibition of blood in vv. 26, 27, extends to birds and cattle; fishes not being mentioned, because the little blood which they possess is not generally eaten. This prohibition Israel was to observe in all its dwelling-places (Exo. 12:20, cf. ch. 10:23), not only so long as all the slaughterings had the character of sacrifices, but for all ages, because the blood was regarded as the soul of the animal, which God had sanctified as the medium of atonement for the soul of man (Lev. 17:11), whereby the blood acquired a much higher degree of holiness than the fat.

Lev. 7:28-36. Jehovah's share of the peace-offerings. — V. 29. The offerer of the sacrifice was to bring his gift (*corban*) to Jehovah, i.e., to bring to the altar the portion which belonged to Jehovah.

Lev. 7:30, 31. His hands were to bring the firings of Jehovah, i.e., the portions to be burned upon the altar (Lev. 1: 9), viz., “*the fat* (the fat portions, Lev. 3: 3, 4) *with the breast*,” — the former to be burned upon the altar, the latter “*to wave as a wave-offering before Jehovah.*” וַיַּזְזֵהוּ, τὸ στηθύνιον (LXX), i.e., according to *Pollux*, τῶν στηθῶν τὸ μέσον, *pectusculum* or *pectus* (*Vulg.* cf. Lev. 9:20, 21; 10:15), signifies the breast, the breast-piece of the sacrificial animals,¹²⁰ the brisket, which consists for the most part of cartilaginous fat in the case of oxen, sheep, and goats, and is one of the most savoury parts; so that at the family festivities of the ancients, according to *Athen. Deipnos.* ii. 70, ix. 10, στηθύνια παχέων ἀρνίων were dainty bits. The breast-piece was presented to the Lord as a wave-offering (*tenuphah*), and transferred by Him to Aaron and his sons (the priests). תְּנוּפָה, from נָוַף, נָוַף, to swing, to move to and fro (see Exo. 35:22), is the name applied to a ceremony peculiar to the peace-offerings and the consecration-offerings: the priest laid the object to be waved upon the hands of the offerer, and then placed his own hands underneath, and moved the hands of the offerer backwards and forwards in a horizontal direction, to indicate by the movement forwards, i.e., in the direction towards the altar, the presentation of the sacrifice, or the symbolical transference of it to God, and by the movement backwards, the reception of it back again, as a present which God handed over to His servants the priests.¹²¹ In the peace-offerings the waving was performed with the breast-piece, which was called the “*wave-breast*” in consequence (v. 34, Lev. 10:14, 15; Num. 6:20; 18:18; Exo. 29:27). At the consecration of the priests it was performed with the fat portions, the right leg, and with some cakes, as well as with the breast of the fill-offering (Lev. 8:25-29; Exo. 29:22-26). The ceremony

of waving was also carried out with the sheaf of first-fruits at the feast of Passover; with the loaves of the first-fruits, and thank-offering lambs, at the feast of Pentecost (Lev. 23:11, 20); with the shoulder and meat-offering of the Nazarite (Num. 6:20); with the trespass-offering of the leper (Lev. 14:12, 24); with the jealousy-offering (Num. 5:25); and lastly with the Levites, at their consecration (Num. 8:11ff.). In the case of all these sacrifices, the object waved, after it had been offered symbolically to the Lord by means of the waving, became the property of the priests. But of the lambs, which were waved at the feast of Pentecost before they were slaughtered, and of the lamb which was brought as a trespass-offering by the leper, the blood and fat were given up to the altar-fire; of the jealousy-offering, only an *azcarah*; and of the fill-offering, for special reasons, the fat portions and leg, as well as the cakes. Even the Levites were given by Jehovah to the priests to be their own (Num. 8:19). The *waving*, therefore, had nothing in common with the *porricere* of the Romans, as the portions of the sacrifices which were called *porriciae* were precisely those which were not only given up to the gods, but burned upon the altars. In addition to the wave-breast, which the Lord gave up to His servants as their share of the peace-offerings, the officiating priest was also to receive for his portion the right leg as a *terumah*, or heave-offering, or lifting off. שׂוֹק is the thigh in the case of a man (Isa. 47: 2; Son. 5:15), and therefore in the case of an animal it is not the fore-leg, or shoulder (βραχίον, *armus*), which is called זָרַע, or the arm (Num. 6:19; Deu. 18: 3), but the hind-leg, or rather the upper part of it or ham, which is mentioned in 1Sa. 9:24 as a peculiarly choice portion (*Knobel*). As a portion lifted off from the sacrificial gifts, it is often called “the *heave-leg*” (v. 34, Lev. 10:14, 15; Num. 6:20; Exo. 29:27), because it was lifted or heaved off from the sacrificial animal, as a gift of honour for the officiating priest, but without being waved like the breast-piece, — though the more general phrase, “to wave a wave-offering before Jehovah” (Lev. 10:15), includes the offering of the heave-leg (see my *Archaeologie* i. pp. 244-5).

Lev. 7:34. The wave-breast and heave-leg Jehovah had taken of the children of Israel, from off the sacrifices of their peace-offerings: i.e., had imposed it upon them as tribute, and had given them to Aaron and his sons, i.e., to the priests, “as a statute for ever,” — in other words, as a right which they could claim of the Israelites for all ages (cf. Exo. 27:21). — With vv. 35, 36, the instructions concerning the peace-offerings are brought to a close. “*This* (the wave-breast and heave-leg) *is the share of Aaron and his sons from the firings of Jehovah in the day* (i.e., which Jehovah assigned to them in the day) *when He caused them to draw near to become priests to Jehovah,*” i.e., according to the explanation in v. 36, “*in the day of their anointing.*” The word מִשְׁחָה in v.

35, like מִשָּׁחָה in Num. 18: 8, signifies not “*anointing*,” but share, *portio*, literally a measuring off, as in Aramaean and Arabic, from מָשַׁח to stroke the hand over anything, to measure, or measure off.

The fulness with which every point in the sacrificial meal is laid down, helps to confirm the significance of the peace-offerings, as already implied in the name זָבַח sacrificial slaughtering, slain-offering, viz., as indicating that they were intended for, and culminated in a liturgical meal. By placing his hand upon the head of the animal, which had been brought to the altar of Jehovah for the purpose, the offerer signified that with this gift, which served to nourish and strengthen his own life, he gave up the substance of his life to the Lord, that he might thereby be strengthened both body and soul for a holy walk and conversation. To this end he slaughtered the victim and had the blood sprinkled by the priest against the altar, and the fat portions burned upon it, that in these altar-gifts his soul and his inner man might be grounded afresh in the gracious fellowship of the Lord. He then handed over the breast-piece by the process of waving, also the right leg, and a sacrificial cake of each kind, as a heave-offering from the whole to the Lord, who transferred these portions to the priests as His servants, that they might take part as His representatives in the sacrificial meal. In consequence of this participation of the priests, the feast, which the offerer of the sacrifice prepared for himself and his family from the rest of the flesh, became a holy covenant meal, a meal of love and joy, which represented domestic fellowship with the Lord, and thus shadowed forth, on the one hand, rejoicing before the Lord (Deu. 12:12, 18), and on the other, the blessedness of eating and drinking in the kingdom of God (Luk. 13:15; 22:30). Through the fact that one portion was given up to the Lord, the earthly food was sanctified as a symbol of the true spiritual food, with which the Lord satisfies and refreshes the citizens of His kingdom. This religious aspect of the sacrificial meal will explain the instructions given, viz., that not only the flesh itself, but those who took part in the meal, were all to be clean, and that whatever remained of the flesh was to be burned, on the second or third day respectively, that it might not pass into a state of decomposition. The burning took place a day earlier in the case of the praise-offering than in that of the vow and freewill-offerings, of which the offerer was allowed a longer enjoyment, because they were the products of his own spontaneity, which covered any defect that might attach to the gift itself.

Lev. 7:37, 38. With vv. 37 and 38 the whole of the sacrificial law (Lev. 1-7) is brought to a close. Among the sacrifices appointed, the fill-offering (הַמְלֵאִים) is also mentioned here; though it is not first instituted in these chapters, but in Exo. 29:19, 20 (vv. 22, 26, 27, 31). The name may be explained from the phrase to “*fill the hand*,” which is not used in the sense of installing a

man, or giving him authority, like **נָתַן בְּיָד** “commit into his hand” in Isa. 22:21 (*Knobel*), but was applied primarily to the ceremony of consecrating the priests, as described in Lev. 8:25ff., and was restricted to the idea of investiture with the *priesthood* (cf. Lev. 8:33; 16:32; Exo. 28:41; 29: 9, 29, 33, 35; Num. 3: 3; Jud. 17: 5, 12). This gave rise to the expression “to fill the hand for Jehovah,” i.e., to provide something to offer to Jehovah (1Ch. 29: 5; 2Ch. 29:31, cf. Exo. 32:29). Hence **מְלוֹאִים** denotes the filling of the hand with sacrificial gifts to be offered to Jehovah, and as used *primarily* of the particular sacrifice through which the priests were symbolically invested at their consecration with the gifts they were to offer, and were empowered, by virtue of this investiture, to officiate at the sacrifices; and *secondly*, in a less restricted sense, of priestly consecration generally (Lev. 8:33, “the days of your consecration”). The allusion to the place in v. 38, viz., “*in the wilderness of Sinai,*” points on the one hand back to Exo. 19: 1, and on the other hand forward to Num. 26:63, 64, and 36:13, “*in the plains of Moab*” (cf. Num. 1: 1, 19, etc.).

The sacrificial law, therefore, with the five species of sacrifices which it enjoins, embraces every aspect in which Israel was to manifest its true relation to the Lord its God. Whilst the sanctification of the whole man in self-surrender to the Lord was shadowed forth in the burnt-offerings, the fruits of this sanctification in the meat-offerings, and the blessedness of the possession and enjoyment of saving grace in the peace-offerings, the expiatory sacrifices furnished the means of removing the barrier which sins and trespasses had set up between the sinner and the holy God, and procured the forgiveness of sin and guilt, so that the sinner could attain once more to the unrestricted enjoyment of the covenant grace. For, provided only that the people of God drew near to their God with sacrificial gifts, in obedience to His commandments and in firm reliance upon His word, which had connected the forgiveness of sin, strength for sanctification, and the peace of fellowship with Him, with these manifestations of their piety, the offerers would receive in truth the blessings promised them by the Lord. Nevertheless these sacrifices could not make those who drew near to God with them and in them “perfect as pertaining to the conscience” (Heb. 9: 9; 10: 1), because the blood of bulls and of goats could not possibly take away sin (Heb. 10: 4). The forgiveness of sin which the atoning sacrifices procured, was only a **πάρεσις** of past sins through the forbearance of God (Rom. 3:25, 26), in anticipation of the true sacrifice of Christ, of which the animal sacrifices were only a type, and by which the justice of God is satisfied, and the way opened fore the full forgiveness of sin and complete reconciliation with God. So also the sanctification and fellowship set forth by the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings, were simply a sanctification of the fellowship already established by the covenant of the law between Israel and its covenant God, which pointed forward to the true sanctification and blessedness that grow out of the

righteousness of faith, and expand through the operation of the Holy Spirit into the true righteousness and blessedness of the divine peace of reconciliation. The effect of the sacrifices was in harmony with the nature of the old covenant. The fellowship with God, established by this covenant, was simply a faint copy of that true and living fellowship with God, which consists in God's dwelling in our hearts through His Spirit, transforming our spirit, soul, and body more and more into His own image and His divine nature, and making us partakers of the glory and blessedness of His divine life. However intimately the infinite and holy God connected Himself with His people in the earthly sanctuary of the tabernacle and the altar of burnt-offering, yet so long as this sanctuary stood, the God who was enthroned in the most holy place was separated by the veil from His people, who could only appear before Him in the fore-court, as a proof that the sin which separates unholy man from the holy God had not yet been taken out of the way. Just as the old covenant generally was not intended to secure redemption from sin, but the law was designed to produce the knowledge of sin; so the desire for reconciliation with God was not to be truly satisfied by its sacrificial ordinances, but a desire was to be awakened for that true sacrifice which cleanses from all sins, and the way to be prepared for the appearing of the Son of God, who would exalt the shadows of the Mosaic sacrifices into a substantial reality by giving up His own life as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, and thus through the one offering of His own holy body would perfect all the manifold sacrifices of the Old Testament economy.

Induction of Aaron and his Sons into the Priestly Office. — Ch. 8-10.

Lev. 8-10. To the law of sacrifice there is appended first of all an account of the fulfilment of the divine command to sanctify Aaron and his sons as priests, which Moses had received upon the mount along with the laws concerning the erection of the sanctuary of the tabernacle (Exo. 28 and 29). This command could not properly be carried out till after the appointment and regulation of the institution of sacrifice, because most of the laws of sacrifice had some bearing upon this act. The sanctification of the persons, whom God had called to be His priests, consisted in a solemn consecration of these persons to their office by investiture, anointing, and sacrifice (Lev. 8), — their solemn entrance upon their office by sacrifices for themselves and the people (Lev. 9), — the sanctification of their priesthood by the judgment of God upon the eldest sons of Aaron, when about to offer strange fire, — and certain instructions, occasioned by this occurrence, concerning the conduct of the priests in the performance of their service (Lev. 10).

Lev. 8. Consecration of the Priests and the Sanctuary (cf. Exo. 29: 1-37). — The consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests was carried out by Moses according to the instructions in Exo. 29: 1-36; 40:12-15; and the anointing of the tabernacle, with the altar and its furniture, as prescribed in Exo. 29:37; 30:26-29, and 40: 9-11, was connected with it (vv. 10, 11).

Lev. 8: 1-5. Vv. 1-5 contain an account of the preparations for this holy act, the performance of which was enjoined upon Moses by Jehovah after the publication of the laws of sacrifice (v. 1). Moses brought the persons to be consecrated, the official costume that had been made for them (Exo. 28), the anointing oil (Exo. 30:23ff.), and the requisite sacrificial offerings (Exo. 29: 1-3), to the door of the tabernacle (i.e., into the court, near the altar of burnt-offering), and then gathered “the whole congregation” — that is to say, the nation in the persons of its elders — there also (see my *Archäologie* ii. p. 221). The definite article before the objects enumerated in v. 2 may be explained on the ground that they had all been previously and more minutely described. The “basket of the unleavened” contained, according to Exo. 29: 2, 3, (1) unleavened bread, which is called **חֶלֶב** in v. 26, i.e., round flat bread-cakes, and **כֶּבֶד לֶחֶם** (loaf of bread) in Exo. 29:23, and was baked for the purpose of the consecration (see at vv. 31, 32); (2) unleavened oil-cakes; and (3) unleavened flat cakes covered with oil (see at Lev. 2: 4 and 7:12).

Lev. 8: 5. When the congregation was assembled, Moses said, “*This is the word which Jehovah commanded you to do.*” His meaning was, the substance or essential part of the instructions in Exo. 28: 1 and 29: 1-37, which he had published to the assembled congregation before the commencement of the act of consecration, and which are not repeated here as being already known from those chapters. The congregation had been summoned to perform this act, because Aaron and his sons were to be consecrated as priests for them, as standing mediators between them and the Lord.

Lev. 8: 6-9. After this the act of consecration commenced. It consisted of two parts: first, the consecration of the persons themselves to the office of the priesthood, by washing, clothing, and anointing (vv. 6-13); and secondly, the sacrificial rites, by which the persons appointed to the priestly office were inducted into the functions and prerogatives of priests (vv. 16-36).

Lev. 8: 6-13. The *washing, clothing, and anointing.* — V. 6. “*Moses brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water;*” i.e., directed them to wash themselves, no doubt all over, and not merely their hands and feet. This cleansing from bodily uncleanness was a symbol of the putting away of the filth of sin; the washing of the body, therefore, was a symbol of spiritual cleansing,

without which no one could draw near to God, and least of all those who were to perform the duties of reconciliation.

Lev. 8: 7-9. Then followed the clothing of Aaron. Moses put upon him the body-coat (Exo. 28:39) and girdle (Exo. 28:39 and 39:22), then clothes him with the **מְעִיל** (Exo. 28:31-35) and ephod (Exo. 28: 6-14), and the *choshen* with the Urim and Thummim (Exo. 28:15-30), and put the cap (Exo. 28:39) upon his head, with the golden diadem over his forehead (Exo. 28:36-38). This investiture, regarded as the putting on of an important official dress, was a symbol of his endowment with the character required for the discharge of the duties of his office, the official costume being the outward sign of installation in the office which he was to fill.

Lev. 8:10-12. According to the directions in Exo. 30:26-30 (cf. ch. 40: 9-11), the anointing was performed first of all upon “*the tabernacle and everything in it,*” i.e., the ark of the covenant, the altar of incense, the candlestick, and table of shew-bread, and their furniture; and then upon the altar of burnt-offering and its furniture, and upon the laver and its pedestal; and after this, upon Aaron himself, by the pouring of the holy oil upon his head. This was followed by the robing and anointing of Aaron’s sons, the former only of which is recorded in v. 13 (according to Exo. 28:40), the anointing not being expressly mentioned, although it had not only been commanded, in Exo. 28:41 and 40:15, but the performance of it is taken for granted in Lev. 7:36; 10: 7, and Num. 3: 3. According to the Jewish tradition, the anointing of Aaron (the high priest) was different from that of the sons of Aaron (the ordinary priests), the oil being *poured* upon the head of the former, whilst it was merely smeared with the finger upon the forehead in the case of the latter (cf. *Relandi Antiqq.* ss. ii. 1, 5, and 7, and *Selden, de succ. in pontif.* ii. 2). There appears to be some foundation for this, as a distinction is assumed between the anointing of the high priest and that of the ordinary priests, not only in the expression, “he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron’s head” (v. 12, cf. Exo. 29: 7; Psa. 133: 2), which is applied to Aaron only, but also in Lev. 21:10, 12; although the further statement of the later Talmudists and Rabbins, that Aaron was also marked upon the forehead with the sign of a Hebrew **כ** (the initial letter of **כהן**), has no support in the law (vid., *Selden*, ii. 9; *Vitringa, observv.* ss. ii. c. 15, 9). — On the mode in which the tabernacle and its furniture were anointed, all that is stated is, that the altar of burnt-offering was anointed by being sprinkled seven times with the anointing oil; from which we may safely conclude, that the other portions and vessels of the sanctuary were anointed in the same way, but that the sprinkling was not performed more than once in their case. The reason why the altar was sprinkled seven times with the holy anointing oil, is to be sought for in its signification as the place of worship. The anointing, both of the sacred

things and also of the priests, is called קִדַּשׁ “to sanctify,” in vv. 10-12, as well as in Exo. 40: 9-11 and 13; and in Exo. 40:10 the following stipulation is added with regard to the altar of burnt-offering: “*and it shall be most holy,*” — a stipulation which is not extended to the dwelling and its furniture, although those portions of the sanctuary were most holy also, that the altar of burnt-offering, which was the holiest object in the court by virtue of its appointment as the place of expiation, might be specially guarded from being touched by unholy hands (see at Exo. 40:16). To impress upon it this highest grade of holiness, it was sprinkled even times with anointing oil; and in the number seven, the covenant number, the seal of the holiness of the covenant of reconciliation, to which it was to be subservient, was impressed upon it. To sanctify is not merely to separate to holy purposes, but to endow or fill with the powers of the sanctifying Spirit of God. Oil was a fitting symbol of the Spirit, or spiritual principle of life, by virtue of its power to sustain and fortify the vital energy; and the anointing oil, which was prepared according to divine instructions, was therefore a symbol of the Spirit of God, as the principle of spiritual life which proceeds from God and fills the natural being of the creature with the powers of divine life. The anointing with oil, therefore, was a symbol of endowment with the Spirit of God (1Sa. 10: 1, 6; 16:13, 14; Isa. 61: 1) for the duties of the office to which a person was consecrated. The holy vessels also were not only consecrated, through the anointing, for the holy purposes to which they were to be devoted (*Knobel*), but were also furnished in a symbolical sense with powers of the divine Spirit, which were to pass from them to the people who came to the sanctuary. The anointing was not only to sanctify the priests as organs and mediators of the Spirit of God, but the vessels of the sanctuary also, as channels and vessels of the blessings of grace and salvation, which God as the Holy One would bestow upon His people, through the service of His priests, and in the holy vessels appointed by Him. On these grounds the consecration of the holy things was associated with the consecration of the priests. The notion that even vessels, and in fact inanimate things in general, can be endowed with divine and spiritual powers, was very widely spread in antiquity. We meet with it in the anointing of memorial stones (Gen. 28:17; 35:14), and it occurs again in the instructions concerning the expiation of the sanctuary on the annual day of atonement (Lev. 16). It contains more truth than some modern views of the universe, which refuse to admit that any influence is exerted by the divine Spirit except upon animated beings, and thus leave a hopeless abyss between spirit and matter. According to Exo. 29: 9, the clothing and anointing of Aaron and his sons were to be “*a priesthood to them for a perpetual statute,*” i.e., to secure the priesthood to them for all ages; for the same thought is expressed thus in Exo. 40:15: “*their anointing shall surely be an everlasting priesthood throughout their generations.*” When the Talmudists refer these words to the sons of Aaron or the ordinary priests, to the

exclusion of Aaron or the high priest, this is opposed to the distinct context, according to which the sons of Aaron were to be anointed like their father Aaron. The utter want of foundation for the rabbinical assumption, that the anointing of the sons of Aaron, performed by Moses, availed not only for themselves, but for their successors also, and therefore for the priests of every age, is also the more indisputable, because the Talmudists themselves infer from Lev. 6:15 (cf. Exo. 29:29), where the installation of Aaron's successor in his office is expressly designated an anointing, the necessity for every successor of Aaron in the high-priesthood to be anointed. The meaning of the words in question is no doubt the following: the anointing of Aaron and his sons was to stand as a perpetual statute for the priesthood, and to guarantee it to the sons of Aaron for all time; it being assumed as self-evident, according to Lev. 6:15, that as every fresh generation entered upon office, the anointing would be repeated or renewed.

Lev. 8:14-32. The *sacrificial ceremony* with which the consecration was concluded, consisted of a threefold sacrifice, the materials for which were not supplied by the persons about to be installed, but were no doubt provided by Moses at the expense of the congregation, for which the priesthood was instituted. Moses officiated as the mediator of the covenant, through whose service Aaron and his sons were to be consecrated as priests of Jehovah, and performed every part of the sacrificial rite, — the slaughtering, sprinkling of the blood, and burning of the altar gifts, — just as the priests afterwards did at the public daily and festal sacrifices, the persons to be consecrated simply laying their hands upon the sacrificial animals, to set them apart as their representatives.

Lev. 8:14-17. The first sacrifice was a sin-offering, for which a young ox was taken (Exo. 29: 1), as in the case of the sin-offerings for the high priest and the whole congregation (Lev. 4: 3, 14): the highest kind of sacrificial animal, which corresponded to the position to be occupied by the priests in the Israelitish kingdom of God, as the *ἐκλογή* of the covenant nation. Moses put some of the blood with his finger upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and poured the rest at the foot of the altar. The fat portions (see Lev. 3: 3, 4) he burned upon the altar; but the flesh of the ox, as well as the hide and dung, he burned outside the camp. According to the general rule of the sin-offerings, whose flesh was burnt outside the camp, the blood was brought into the sanctuary itself (Lev. 6:23); but here it was only put upon the altar of burnt-offering to make this sin-offering a consecration-sacrifice. Moses was to take the blood to “purify (שׂוּף) and sanctify the altar, to expiate it.” As the altar had been sanctified immediately before by the anointing with holy oil (v. 11), the object of the cleansing or sanctification of it through the blood of the sacrifice cannot

have been to purify it a second time from uncleanness, that still adhered to it, or was inherent in it; but just as the purification or expiation of the vessels or worship generally applied only to the sins of the nation, by which these vessels had been defiled (Lev. 16:16, 19), so here the purification of the altar with the blood of the sin-offering, upon which the priests had laid their hands, had reference simply to pollutions, with which the priests defiled the altar when officiating at it, through the uncleanness of their sinful nature. As the priests could not be installed in the functions of the priesthood, notwithstanding the holiness communicated to them through the anointing, without a sin-offering to awaken the consciousness in both themselves and the nation that the sinfulness which lay at the root of human nature was not removed by the anointing, but only covered in the presence of the holy God, and that sin still clung to man, and polluted all his doings and designs; so that altar, upon which they were henceforth to offer sacrifices, still required to be purified through the blood of the bullock, that had been slaughtered as a sin-offering for the expiation of their sins, to sanctify it for the service of the priests, i.e., to cover up the sins by which they would defile it when performing their service. For this sanctification the blood of the sin-offering, that had been slaughtered for them, was taken, to indicate the fellowship which was henceforth to exist between them and the altar, and to impress upon them the fact, that the blood, by which they were purified, was also to serve as the means of purifying the altar from the sins attaching to their service. Although none of the blood of this sin-offering was carried into the holy place, because only the anointed priests were to be thereby inducted into the fellowship of the altar, the flesh of the animal could only be burnt outside the camp, because the sacrifice served to purify the priesthood (see Lev. 4:11, 12). For the rest, the remarks made on p. 524 are also applicable to the symbolical meaning of this sacrifice.

Lev. 8:18-21. The sin-offering, through which the priests and the altar had been expiated, and every disturbance of the fellowship existing between the holy God and His servants at the altar, in consequence of the sin of those who were to be consecrated, had been taken away, was followed by a burnt-offering, consisting of a ram, which was offered according to the ordinary ritual of the burnt-offering (Lev. 1: 3-9), and served to set forth the priests, who had appointed it as their substitute through the laying on of hands, as a living, holy, and well-pleasing sacrifice to the Lord, and to sanctify them to the Lord with all the faculties of both body and soul.

Lev. 8:22-29. This was followed by the presentation of a peace-offering, which also consisted of a ram, called "*the ram of the filling,*" or "*of the fill-offering,*" from the peculiar ceremony performed with the flesh, by which this sacrifice became a consecration-offering, inducting the persons consecrated into the possession and enjoyment of the privileges of the priesthood. A ram was

offered as a peace-offering, by the nation as a whole (Lev. 9: 4, 18), the tribe-princes (Num. 7:17ff.), and a Nazarite (Num. 6:14, 17), who also occupied a higher position in the congregation (Amo. 2:11, 12); but it was never brought by a private Israelite for a peace-offering. The offering described here differed from the rest of the peace-offerings, first of all, in the ceremony performed with the blood (vv. 23 and 24, cf. Exo. 29:20, 21). Before sprinkling the blood upon the altar, Moses put some of it upon the tip of the right ear, upon the right thumb, and upon the great toe of the right foot of Aaron and his sons. Thus he touched the extreme points, which represented the whole, of the ear, hand, and foot on the right, or more important and principal side: the *ear*, because the priest was always to hearken to the word and commandment of God; the *hand*, because he was to discharge the priestly functions properly; and the *foot*, because he was to walk correctly in the sanctuary. Through this manipulation the three organs employed in the priestly service were placed, by means of their tips, *en rapport* with the sacrificial blood; whilst through the subsequent sprinkling of the blood upon the altar they were introduced symbolically within the sphere of the divine grace, by virtue of the sacrificial blood, which represented the soul as the principle of life, and covered it in the presence of the holiness of God, to be sanctified by that grace to the rendering of willing and righteous service to the Lord. The sanctification was at length completed by Moses' taking some of the anointing oil and some of the blood upon the altar, and sprinkling Aaron and his sons, and also their clothes; that is to say, by his sprinkling the persons themselves, as bearers of the priesthood, and their clothes, as the insignia of the priesthood, with a mixture of holy anointing oil and sacrificial blood taken from the altar (v. 30). The blood taken from the altar shadowed forth the soul as united with God through the medium of the atonement, and filled with powers of grace. The holy anointing oil was a symbol of the Spirit of God. Consequently, through this sprinkling the priests were endowed, both soul and spirit, with the higher powers of the divine life. The sprinkling, however, was performed, not upon the persons alone, but also upon their official dress. For it had reference to the priests, not in their personal or individual relation to the Lord, but in their official position, and with regard to their official work in the congregation of the Lord. ¹²²

In addition to this, the following appointment is contained in Exo. 29:29, 30: "The holy garments of Aaron shall be his sons' after him," i.e., pass to his successors in the high-priesthood, "to anoint them therein and fill their hands therein. Seven days shall the priest of his sons in his stead put them on (לְבָשָׁם) with the suffix ׀ָ as in Gen. 19:19), who shall go into the tabernacle to serve in the sanctuary." Accordingly, at Aaron's death his successor Eleazar was dressed in his robes (Num. 20:26-28). It by no means follows from this, that a formal priestly consecration was repeated solely in the case of the high priest as

the head of the priesthood, and that with the common priests the first anointing by Moses sufficed for all time. We have already observed at p. 545 that this is not involved in Exo. 40:15; and the fact that it is only the official costume of the high priest which is expressly said to have passed to his successor, may be explained on the simple ground, that as his dress was only worn when he was discharging certain special functions before Jehovah, it would not be worn out so soon as the dress of the ordinary priests, which was worn in the daily service, and therefore would hardly last long enough to be handed down from father to son. ¹²³

The ceremony performed with the flesh of this sacrifice was also peculiarly significant (vv. 25-29). Moses took the fat portions, which were separated from the flesh in the case of the ordinary peace-offerings and burned upon the altar, and the right leg, which was usually assigned to the officiating priest, and then laid by the pieces of flesh (or upon them) another cake of each of the three kinds of pastry, which fell to the portion of the priest in other cases, as a heave-offering for Jehovah, and put all this into the hands of Aaron and his sons, and waved it as a wave-offering for Jehovah, after which he took it from their hands and burned it upon the altar, “*as a filling (מלאים) for a savour of satisfaction, as a firing for Jehovah.*” These last words, which are attached to the preceding without a conjunction, and, as the וה and הוה show, form independent clauses (lit., “*filling are they...a firing is it for Jehovah*”), contain the reason for this unusual proceeding, so that *Luther’s* explanation is quite correct, “for it is a fill-offering,” etc. The ceremony of handing the portions mentioned to Aaron and his sons denoted the filling of their hands with the sacrificial gifts, which they were afterwards to offer to the Lord in the case of the peace-offerings, viz., the fat portions as a firing upon the altar, the right leg along with the bread-cake as a wave-offering, which the Lord then relinquished to them as His own servants. The filling of their hands with these sacrificial gifts, from which the offering received the name of fill-offering, signified on the one hand the communication of the right belonging to the priest to offer the fat portions to the Lord upon the altar, and on the other hand the enfeoffment of the priests with gifts, which they were to receive in future for their service. This symbolical signification of the act in question serves to explain the circumstance, that both the fat portions, which were to be burned upon the altar, and also the right leg with the bread-cakes which formed the priests’ share of the peace-offerings, were merely placed in the priests’ hands in this instance, and presented symbolically to the Lord by waving, and then burned by Moses upon the altar. For Aaron and his sons were not only to be enfeoffed with what they were to burn unto the Lord, but also with what they would receive for their service. And as even the latter was a prerogative bestowed upon them by the Lord, it was right that at their consecration they should offer it *symbolically* to the Lord by waving, and

actually by burning upon the altar. But as the right leg was devoted to another purpose in this case, Moses received the breast-piece, which was presented to the Lord by waving (v. 29), and which afterwards fell to the lot of the priests, as his portion for the sacrificial meal, which formed the conclusion of this dedicatory offering, as it did of all the peace-offerings. In Exo. 29:27, 28, we also find the command, that the wave-breast of the ram of the fill-offering, and the heave-leg which had been lifted off, should afterwards belong to Aaron and his sons on the part of the children of Israel, as a perpetual statute, i.e., as a law for all time; and the following reason is assigned: “*for it is a heave-offering (terumah, a lifting off), and shall be a heave-offering on the part of the children of Israel of their peace-offerings, their heave-offering for Jehovah,*” i.e., which they were to give to the Lord from their peace-offerings for the good of His servants. The application of the word *terumah* to both kinds of offering, the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder, may be explained on the simple ground, that the gift to be waved had to be lifted off from the sacrificial animal before the waving could be performed.

Lev. 8:31, 32. For the sacrificial meal, the priests were to boil the flesh in front of the door of the tabernacle, or, according to Exo. 29:31, “at the holy place,” i.e., in the court, and eat it with the bread in the fill-offering basket; and no stranger (i.e., layman or non-priest) was to take part in the meal, because the flesh and bread were holy (Exo. 29:33), that is to say, had served to make atonement for the priests, to fill their hands and sanctify them. Atoning virtue is attributed to this sacrifice in the same sense as to the burnt-offering in Lev. 1:4. Whatever was left of the flesh and bread until the following day, that is to say, was not eaten on the day of sacrifice, was to be burned with fire, for the reason explained at Lev. 7:17. The exclusion of laymen from participating in this sacrificial meal is to be accounted for in the same way as the prohibition of unleavened bread, which was offered and eaten in the case of the ordinary peace-offerings along with the unleavened sacrificial cakes (see at Lev. 7:13). The meal brought the consecration of the priests to a close, as Aaron and his sons were thereby received into that special, priestly covenant with the Lord, the blessings and privileges of which were to be enjoyed by the consecrated priests alone. At this meal the priests were not allowed to eat leavened bread, any more than the nation generally at the feast of Passover (Exo. 12: 8ff.).

Lev. 8:33-36. (cf. Exo. 29:35-37). The consecration was to last seven days, during which time the persons to be consecrated were not to go away from the door of the tabernacle, but to remain there day and night, and watch the watch of the Lord that they might not die. “*For the Lord will fill your hand seven days. As they have done on this (the first) day, so has Jehovah commanded to do to make atonement for you*” (v. 34). That is to say, the rite of consecration

which has been performed upon you to-day, Jehovah has commanded to be performed or repeated for seven days. These words clearly imply that the whole ceremony, in all its details, was to be repeated for seven days; and in Exo. 29:36, 37, besides the filling of the hand which was to be continued seven days, and which presupposes the daily repetition of the consecration-offering, the preparation of the sin-offering for reconciliation and the expiation or purification and anointing of the altar are expressly commanded for each of the seven days. This repetition of the act of consecration is to be regarded as intensifying the consecration itself; and the limitation of it to seven days is to be accounted for from the signification and holiness of the number seven as the sign of the completion of the works of God. The commandment not to leave the court of the tabernacle during the whole seven days, is of course not to be understood literally (as it is by some of the Rabbins), as meaning that the persons to be consecrated were not even to go away from the spot for the necessities of nature (cf. *Lund. jüd. Heiligh.* p. 448); but when taken in connection with the clause which follows, “*and keep the charge of the Lord,*” it can only be understood as signifying that during these days they were not to leave the sanctuary to attend to any earthly avocation whatever, but uninterruptedly to observe the charge of the Lord, i.e., the consecration commanded by the Lord. **שָׁמַר מִשְׁמֶרֶת**, lit., to watch the watch of a person or thing, i.e., to attend to them, to do whatever was required for noticing or attending to them (cf. Gen. 26: 5, and *Hengstenberg, Christology*).

Lev. 9. Entrance of Aaron and his Sons upon their Office. — Vv. 1-7. On the eighth day, i.e., on the day after the seven days’ consecration, Aaron and his sons entered upon their duties with a solemn sacrifice for themselves and the nation, to which the Lord had made Himself known by a special revelation of His glory, to bear solemn witness before the whole nation that their service at the altar was acceptable to Him, and to impress the divine seal of confirmation upon the consecration they had received. To this end Aaron and his sons were to bring to the front of the tabernacle a young calf as a sin-offering for themselves, and a ram for a burnt-offering; and the people were to bring through their elders a he-goat for a sin-offering, a yearling calf and yearling sheep for a burnt-offering, and an ox and ram for a peace-offering, together with a meat-offering of meal mixed with oil; and the congregation (in the persons of its elders) was to stand there before Jehovah, i.e., to assemble together at the sanctuary for the solemn transaction (vv. 1-5). If, according to this, even after the manifold expiation and consecration, which Aaron had received through Moses during the seven days, he had still to enter upon his service with a sin-offering and burnt-offering, this fact clearly showed that the offerings of the law could not ensure perfection (Heb. 10: 1ff.). It is true that on this occasion a young calf was sufficient for a sin-offering for the priests, not a

mature ox as in Lev. 8:14 and 4: 3; and so also for the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings of the people smaller sacrifices sufficed, either smaller in kind or fewer in number than at the leading feasts (Num. 28:11ff.). Nevertheless, not one of the three sacrifices could be omitted; and if no special peace-offering was required of Aaron, this may be accounted for from the fact, that the whole of the sacrificial ceremony terminated with a national peace-offering, in which the priests took part, uniting in this instance with the rest of the nation in the celebration of a common sacrificial meal, to make known their oneness with them.

Lev. 9: 6, 7. After everything had been prepared for the solemn ceremony, Moses made known to the assembled people what Jehovah had commanded them to do in order that His glory might appear (see at Exo. 16:10). Aaron was to offer the sacrifices that had been brought for the reconciliation of himself and the nation.

Lev. 9: 8-21. Accordingly, he offered first of all the sin-offering and burnt-offering for himself, and then (vv. 15-21) the offerings of the people. The sin-offering always went first, because it served to remove the estrangement of man from the holy God arising from sin, by means of the expiation of the sinner, and to clear away the hindrances to his approach to God. Then followed the burnt-offering, as an expression of the complete surrender of the person expiated to the Lord; and lastly the peace-offering, on the one hand as the utterance of thanksgiving for mercy received, and prayer for its further continuance, and on the other hand, as a seal of covenant fellowship with the Lord in the sacrificial meal. But when Moses says in v. 7, that Aaron is to make atonement for himself and the nation with his sin-offering and burnt-offering, the atoning virtue which Aaron's sacrifice was to have for the nation also, referred not to sins which the people had committed, but to the guilt which the high priest, as the head of the whole congregation, had brought upon the nation by his sin (Lev. 4: 3). In offering the sacrifices, Aaron was supported by his sons, who handed him the blood to sprinkle, and the sacrificial portions to burn upon the altar. The same course was adopted with Aaron's sin-offering (vv. 8-11) as Moses had pursued with the sin-offering at the consecration of the priests (Lev. 8:14-17). The blood was not taken into the sanctuary, but only applied to the horns of the altar of burnt-offering; because the object was not to expiate some particular sin of Aaron's, but to take away the sin which might make his service on behalf of the congregation displeasing to God; and the communion of the congregation with the Lord was carried on at the altar of burnt-offering. The flesh and skin of the animal were burnt outside the camp, as in the case of all the sin-offerings for the priesthood (Lev. 4:11, 12).

Lev. 9:12-14. The burnt-offering was presented according to the general rule (Lev. 1: 3-9), as in Lev. 8:18-21. **הַמְצִיאַ** (v. 12): to cause to attain; here, and in v. 18, to present, hand over. **לְנִתְחִיָּה**, according to its pieces, into which the burnt-offering was divided (Lev. 1: 6), and which they offered to Aaron one by one. No meat-offering was connected with Aaron's burnt-offerings, partly because the law contained in Num. 15: 2ff. had not yet been given, but more especially because Aaron had to bring the special meat-offering commanded in Lev. 6:13, and had offered this in connection with the morning burnt-offering mentioned in v. 17; though this offering, as being a constant one, and not connected with the offerings especially belonging to the consecration of the priests, is not expressly mentioned.

Lev. 9:15ff. Of the sacrifices of the nation, Aaron presented the sin-offering in the same manner as the first, i.e., the one offered for himself (vv. 8ff.). The blood of this sin-offering, which was presented for the congregation, was not brought into the holy place according to the rule laid down in Lev. 7:16ff., but only applied to the horns of the altar of burnt-offering; for the same reason as in the previous case (vv. 8ff.), viz., because the object was not to expiate any particular sin, or the sins of the congregation that had been committed in the course of time and remained unatoned for, but simply to place the sacrificial service of the congregation in its proper relation to the Lord. Aaron was reproved by Moses, however, for having burned the flesh (Lev. 10:16ff.), but was able to justify it (see at Lev. 10:16-20). The sin-offering (v. 16) was also offered "*according to the right*" (as in Lev. 5:10). Then followed the meat-offering (v. 17), of which Aaron burned a handful upon the altar (according to the rule in Lev. 2: 1, 2). He offered this in addition to the morning burnt-offering (Exo. 29:39), to which a meat-offering also belonged (Exo. 29:40), and with which, according to Lev. 6:12ff., the special meat-offering of the priests was associated. Last of all (vv. 18-21) there followed the peace-offering, which was also carried out according to the general rule. In **הַמְכַסֶּה**, "*the covering*" (v. 19), the two fat portions mentioned in Lev. 3: 3 are included. The fat portions were laid upon the breast-pieces by the sons of Aaron, and then handed by them to Aaron, the fat to be burned upon the altar, the breast to be waved along with the right leg, according to the instructions in Lev. 7:30-36. The meat-offering of pastry, which belonged to the peace-offering according to Lev. 7:12, 13, is not specially mentioned.

Lev. 9:22-24. When the sacrificial ceremony was over, Aaron blessed the people from the altar with uplifted hands (cf. Num. 6:22ff.), and then came down: sc., from the bank surrounding the altar, upon which he had stood while offering the sacrifice (see at Exo. 27: 4, 5).

Lev. 9:23. After this Moses went with him into the tabernacle, to introduce him into the sanctuary, in which he was henceforth to serve the Lord, and to present him to the Lord: not to offer incense, which would undoubtedly have been mentioned; nor yet for the special purpose of praying for the manifestation of the glory of Jehovah, although there can be no doubt that they offered prayer in the sanctuary, and prayed for the blessing of the Lord for the right discharge of the office entrusted to them in a manner well-pleasing to Him. On coming out again they united in bestowing that blessing upon the people which they had solicited for them in the sanctuary.

“Then the glory of Jehovah appeared to all the people, and fire came out from before the face of Jehovah and consumed the burnt-offering and fat portions upon the altar”

(i.e., the sin and peace-offerings, not the thank-offerings merely, as *Knobel* supposes, according to his mistaken theory). The appearance of the glory of Jehovah is probably to be regarded in this instance, and also in Num. 16:19; 17: 7, and 20: 6, as the sudden flash of a miraculous light, which proceeded from the cloud that covered the tabernacle, probably also from the cloud in the most holy place, or as a sudden though very momentary change of the cloud, which enveloped the glory of the Lord, into a bright light, from which the fire proceeded in this instance in the form of lightning, and consumed the sacrifices upon the altar. The fire issued “from before the face of Jehovah,” i.e., from the visible manifestation of Jehovah. It did not come down from heaven, like the fire of Jehovah, which consumed the sacrifices of David and Solomon (1Ch. 21:26; 2Ch. 7: 1).

The Rabbins believe that this divine fire was miraculously sustained upon the altar until the building of Solomon’s temple, at the dedication of which it fell from heaven afresh, and then continued until the restoration of the temple-worship under Manasseh (2Ch. 33:16; cf. *Buxtorf exercitatt. ad histor. ignis sacri*, c. 2); and the majority of them maintain still further, that it continued side by side with the ordinary altar-fire, which was kindled by the priests (Lev. 1: 7), and, according to Lev. 6: 6, kept constantly burning by them. The earlier Christian expositors are for the most part of opinion, that the heavenly fire, which proceeded miraculously from God and burned the first sacrifices of Aaron, was afterwards maintained by the priests by natural means (see *J. Marckii sylloge diss. philol. theol. ex. vi. ad Lev. 6:13*). But there is no foundation in the Scriptures for either of these views. There is not a syllable about any miraculous preservation of the heavenly fire by the side of the fire which the priests kept burning by natural means. And even the modified opinion of the Christian theologians, that the heavenly fire was preserved by natural means, rests upon the assumption, which there is nothing to justify, that the

sacrifices offered by Aaron were first burned by the fire which issued from Jehovah, and therefore that the statements in the text, with reference to the burning of the fat portions and burnt-offerings, or causing them to ascend in smoke (vv. 10, 13, 17, and 20), are to be regarded as anticipations (*per anticipationem accipienda*, *C. a Lap.*), i.e., are to be understood as simply meaning, that when Aaron officiated at the different sacrifices, he merely laid upon the altar the pieces intended for it, but without setting them on fire. The fallacy of this is proved, not only by the verb **הִקְטִיר** but by the fact implied in v. 17, that the offering of these sacrifices, with which Aaron entered upon his office, was preceded by the daily morning burnt-offering, and consequently that at the time when Aaron began to carry out the special sacrifices of this day there was fire already burning upon the altar, and in fact a continual fire, that was never to be allowed to go out (Lev. 6: 6). Even, therefore, if we left out of view the fire of the daily morning and evening sacrifice, which had been offered from the first day on which the tabernacle was erected (Exo. 40:29), there were sacrifices presented every day during the seven days of the consecration of the priests (Lev. 8); and according to Lev. 1: 7, Moses must necessarily have prepared the fire for these. If it had been the intention of God, therefore, to originate the altar-fire by supernatural means, this would no doubt have taken place immediately after the erection of the tabernacle, or at least at the consecration of the altar, which was connected with that of the priests, and immediately after it had been anointed (Lev. 8:11). But as God did not do this, the burning of the altar-sacrifices by a fire which proceeded from Jehovah, as related in this verse, cannot have been intended to give a sanction to the altar-fire as having proceeded from God Himself, which was to be kept constantly burning, either by miraculous preservation, or by being fed in a natural way. The legends of the heathen, therefore, about altar-fires which had been kindled by the gods themselves present no analogy to the fact before us (cf. *Serv. ad Aen.* xii. 200; *Solin.* v. 23; *Pausan.* v. 27, 3; *Bochart, Hieroz.* lib. ii. c. 35, pp. 378ff.; *Dougtaei analect. ss.* pp. 79ff.).

The miracle recorded in this verse did not consist in the fact that the sacrificial offerings placed upon the altar were burned by fire which proceeded from Jehovah, but in the fact that the sacrifices, which were already on fire, were suddenly consumed by it. For although the verb **הִאֲכַל** admits of both meanings, setting on fire and burning up (see Jud. 6:21, and 1Ki. 18:38), the word literally denotes consuming or burning up, and must be taken in the stricter and more literal sense in the case before us, inasmuch as there was already fire upon the altar when the sacrifices were placed upon it. God caused this miracle, not to generate a supernatural altar-fire, but *ut ordinem sacerdotalem legis veteris a se institutum et suas de sacrificio leges hoc miraculo confirmaret et quasi obsignaret* (*C. a Lap.*), or to express it bore

briefly, to give a divine consecration to the altar, or sacrificial service of Aaron and his sons, through which a way was to be opened for the people to His throne of grace, and whereby, moreover, the altar-fire was consecrated *eo ipso* into a divine, i.e., divinely appointed, means of reconciliation to the community. The whole nation rejoiced at this glorious manifestation of the satisfaction of God with this the first sacrifice of the consecrated priests, and fell down upon their faces to give thanks to the Lord for His mercy.

Lev. 10. THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE PRIESTHOOD BY BOTH THE ACT AND WORD OF GOD. — Vv. 1-3. The Lord had only just confirmed and sanctified the sacrificial service of Aaron and his sons by a miracle, when He was obliged to sanctify Himself by a judgment upon Nadab and Abihu, the eldest sons of Aaron (Exo. 6:23), on account of their abusing the office they had received, and to vindicate Himself before the congregation, as one who would not suffer His commandments to be broken with impunity.

Lev. 10: 1. Nadab and Abihu took their censers (*machtah*, Exo. 25:38), and having put fire in them, placed incense thereon, and brought strange fire before Jehovah, which He had not commanded them. It is not very clear what the offence of which they were guilty actually was. The majority of expositors suppose the sin to have consisted in the fact, that they did not take the fire for the incense from the altar-fire. But this had not yet been commanded by God; and in fact it is never commanded at all, except with regard to the incense-offering, with which the high priest entered the most holy place on the day of atonement (Lev. 16:12), though we may certainly infer from this, that it was also the rule for the daily incense-offering. By the fire which they offered before Jehovah, we are no doubt to understand the firing of the incense-offering. This might be called “strange fire” if it was not offered in the manner prescribed in the law, just as in Exo. 30: 9 incense not prepared according to the direction of God is called “strange incense.” The supposition that they presented an incense-offering that was not commanded in the law, and apart from the time of the morning and evening sacrifice, and that this constituted their sin, is supported by the time at which their illegal act took place. It is perfectly obvious from vv. 12ff. and 16ff. that it occurred in the interval between the sacrificial transaction in Lev. 9 and the sacrificial meal which followed it, and therefore upon the day of their inauguration. For in v. 12 Moses commands Aaron and his remaining sons Eleazar and Ithamar to eat the meat-offering that was left from the firings of Jehovah, and inquires in v. 16 for the goat of the sin-offering, which the priests were to have eaten in a holy place. *Knobel's* opinion is not an improbable one, therefore, that Nadab and Abihu intended to accompany the shouts of the people with an incense-offering to the praise and glory of God, and presented an incense-offering not only at an improper time, but not

prepared from the altar-fire, and committed such a sin by this will-worship, that they were smitten by the fire which came forth from Jehovah, even before their entrance into the holy place, and so died “before Jehovah.” The expression “before Jehovah” is applied to the presence of God, both in the dwelling (viz., the holy place and the holy of holies, e.g., Lev. 4: 6, 7; 16:13) and also in the court (e.g., Lev. 1: 5, etc.). It is in the latter sense that it is to be taken here, as is evident from v. 4, where the persons slain are said to have lain “before the sanctuary of the dwelling,” i.e., in the court of the tabernacle. The fire of the holy God (Exo. 19:18), which had just sanctified the service of Aaron as well-pleasing to God, brought destruction upon his two eldest sons, because they had not sanctified Jehovah in their hearts, but had taken upon themselves a self-willed service; just as the same gospel is to one a savour of life unto life, and to another a savour of death unto death (2Co. 2:16). — In v. 3 Moses explains this judgment to Aaron: “*This is it that Jehovah spake, saying, I will sanctify Myself in him that is nigh to Me, and will glorify Myself in the face of all the people.*” אֲפָכַדְתִּי is unquestionably to be taken in the same sense as in

Exo. 14: 4, 17; consequently אֲקַדֵּשׁ is to be taken in a reflective and not in a passive sense, in the Eze. 38:16. The imperfects are used as aorists, in the sense of what God does at all times. But these words of Moses are no “reproof to Aaron, who had not restrained the untimely zeal of his sons” (*Knobel*), nor a reproach which made Aaron responsible for the conduct of his sons, but a simple explanation of the judgment of God, which should be taken to heart by every one, and involved an admonition to all who heard it, not to Aaron only but to the whole nation, to sanctify God continually in the proper way.

Moreover Jehovah had not communicated to Moses by revelation the words which he spoke here, but had made the fact known by the position assigned to Aaron and his sons through their election to the priesthood. By this act Jehovah had brought them near to Himself (Num. 16: 5), made them לִיְהוָה = קְרִבִי “persons standing near to Jehovah” (Eze. 42:13; 43:19), and sanctified them to Himself by anointing (Lev. 8:10, 12; Exo. 29: 1, 44; 40:13, 15), that they might sanctify Him in their office and life. If they neglected this sanctification, He sanctified Himself in them by a penal judgment (Eze. 38:16), and thereby glorified Himself as the Holy One, who is not to be mocked. “*And Aaron held his peace.*” He was obliged to acknowledge the righteousness of the holy God.

Lev. 10: 4-7. Moses then commanded Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel Aaron’s paternal uncle, Aaron’s cousins therefore, to carry their brethren (relations) who had been slain from before the sanctuary out of the camp, and, as must naturally be supplied, to bury them there. The expression, “before the sanctuary” (equivalent to “before the tabernacle of the congregation” in

Lev. 9: 5), shows that they had been slain in front of the entrance to the holy place. They were carried out in their priests' body-coats, since they had also been defiled by the judgment. It follows from this, too, that the fire of Jehovah had not burned them up, but had simply killed them as with a flash of lightning.

Lev. 10: 6ff. Moses prohibited Aaron and his remaining sons from showing any sign of mourning on account of this fatal calamity. “*Uncover not your heads,*” i.e., do not go about with your hair dishevelled, or flowing free and in disorder (Lev. 13:45). פָּרַע רֹאשׁ does not signify merely uncovering the head by taking off the head-band (LXX, *Vulg.*, *Kimchi*, etc.), or by shaving off the hair (*Ges.* and others; see on the other hand *Knobel* on Lev. 21:10), but is to be taken in a similar sense to פָּרַע שֵׁער רֹאשׁוֹ, the free growth of the hair, not cut short with scissors (Num. 6: 5; Eze. 44:20). It is derived from פָּרַע, to let loose from anything (Pro. 1:25; 4: 5, etc.), to let a people loose, equivalent to giving them the reins (Exo. 32:25), and signifies *solvere crines, capellos*, to leave the hair in disorder, which certainly implies the laying aside of the head-dress in the case of the priest, though without consisting in this alone. On this sign of mourning among the Roman and other nations, see *M. Geier de Ebraeorum luctu* viii. 2. The Jews observe the same custom still, and in times of deep mourning neither wash themselves, nor cut their hair, nor pare their nails (see *Buxtorf, Synog. jud.* p. 706). They were also not to rend their clothes, i.e., not to make a rent in the clothes in front of the breast, — a very natural expression of grief, by which the sorrow of the heart was to be laid bare, and one which was not only common among the Israelites (Gen. 37:29; 44:13; 2Sa. 1:11; 3:31; 13:31), but was very widely spread among the other nations of antiquity (cf. *Geier* l.c. xxii. 9). פָּרַם, to rend, occurs, in addition to this passage, in Lev. 13:45; 21:10; in other places קָרַע, to tear in pieces, is used. Aaron and his sons were to abstain from these expressions of sorrow, “lest they should die and wrath come upon all the people.” Accordingly, we are not to seek the reason for this prohibition merely in the fact, that they would defile themselves by contact with the corpses, a reason which afterwards led to this prohibition being raised into a general law for the high priest (Lev. 21:10, 11). The reason was simply this, that any manifestation of grief on account of the death that had occurred, would have indicated dissatisfaction with the judgment of God; and Aaron and his sons would thereby not only have fallen into mortal sin themselves, but have brought down upon the congregation the wrath of God, which fell upon it through every act of sin committed by the high priest in his official position (Lev. 4: 3). “*Your brethren, (namely) the whole house of Israel, may bewail this burning*” (the burning of the wrath of Jehovah). Mourning was permitted to the nation, as an expression of sorrow on account of the calamity which had befallen the whole nation in the consecrated priests. For the nation generally did not stand in such

close fellowship with Jehovah as the priests, who had been consecrated by anointing.

Lev. 10: 7. The latter were not to go away from the door (the entrance or court of the tabernacle), sc., to take part in the burial of the dead, lest they should die, for the anointing oil of Jehovah was upon them. The anointing oil was the symbol of the Spirit of God, which is a Spirit of life, and therefore has nothing in common with death, but rather conquers death, and sin, which is the source of death (cf. Lev. 21:12).

Lev. 10: 8-11. Jehovah still further commanded Aaron and his sons not to drink wine and strong drink when they entered the tabernacle to perform service there, on pain of death, as a perpetual statute for their generations (Exo. 12:17), that they might be able to distinguish between the holy and common, the clean and unclean, and also to instruct the children of Israel in all the laws which God had spoken to them through Moses ([...], vv. 10 and 11, *et...et*, both...and also). *Shecar* was an intoxicating drink made of barley and dates or honey. חָל, *profanus*, common, is a wider or more comprehensive notion than טָמֵא, unclean. Everything was common (profane) which was not fitted for the sanctuary, even what was allowable for daily use and enjoyment, and therefore was to be regarded as clean. The motive for laying down on this particular occasion a prohibition which was to hold good for all time, seems to lie in the event recorded in v. 1, although we can hardly infer from this, as some commentators have done, that Nadab and Abihu offered the unlawful incense-offering in a state of intoxication. The connection between their act and this prohibition consisted simply in the rashness, which had lost the clear and calm reflection that is indispensable to right action.

Lev. 10:12-20. After the directions occasioned by this judgment of God, Moses reminded Aaron and his sons of the general laws concerning the consumption of the priests' portions of the sacrifices, and their relation to the existing circumstances: first of all (vv. 12, 13), of the law relating to the eating of the meat-offering, which belonged to the priests after the *azcarah* had been lifted off (Lev. 2: 3; 6: 9-11), and then (vv. 14, 15) of that relating to the wave-breast and heave-leg (Lev. 7:32-34). By the *minchah* in v. 12 we are to understand the meal and oil, which were offered with the burnt-offering of the nation (Lev. 9: 4 and 7); and by the אֲשֵׁי in vv. 12 and 15, those portions of the burnt-offering, meat-offering, and peace-offering of the nation which were burned upon the altar (Lev. 9:13, 17, and 20). He then looked for "*the he-goat of the sin-offering*," — i.e., the flesh of the goat which had been brought for a sin-offering (Lev. 9:15), and which was to have been eaten by the priests in the holy place along with the sin-offerings, whose blood was not taken into the

sanctuary (Lev. 6:19, 22); — “and, behold, it was burned” (שָׂרַף, 3 perf. Pual). Moses was angry at this, and reproved Eleazar and Ithamar, who had attended to the burning: “Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin-offering in a holy place?” he said; “for it is most holy, and He (Jehovah) hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for it before Jehovah,” as its blood had not been brought into the holy place (הוֹבִיֵא construed as a passive with an accusative, as in Gen. 4:18, etc.). “To bear the iniquity” does not signify here, as in Lev. 5: 1, to bear and atone for the sin in its consequences, but, as in Exo. 28:38, to take the sin of another upon one’s self, for the purpose of cancelling it, to make expiation for it. As, according to Exo. 28:38, the high priest was to appear before the Lord with the diadem upon his forehead, as the symbol of the holiness of his office, to cancel, as the mediator of the nation and by virtue of his official holiness, the sin which adhered to the holy gifts of the nation (see the note on this passage), so here it is stated with regard to the official eating of the most holy flesh of the sin-offering, which had been enjoined upon the priests, that they were thereby to bear the sin of the congregation, to make atonement for it. This effect or signification could only be ascribed to the eating, by its being regarded as an incorporation of the victim laden with sin, whereby the priests actually took away the sin by virtue of the holiness and sanctifying power belonging to their office, and not merely declared it removed, as *Oehler* explains the words (*Herzog’s Cycl.* x. p. 649). Exo. 28:38 is decisive in opposition to the declaratory view, which does not embrace the meaning of the words, and is not applicable to the passage at all. “Incorporabant quasi peccatum populi que reatum in se recipiebant” (*Deyling observv. ss.* i. 45, 2).¹²⁴

Lev. 10:19, 20. Aaron excused his sons, however, by saying, “Behold, this day have they offered their sin-offering and their burnt-offering, and this has happened to me,” i.e., the calamity recorded in vv. 1 ff. has befallen me (קָרָא = קָרָה, as in Gen. 42: 4); “and if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, would it have been well-pleasing to Jehovah?” וְאִכַּלְתִּי וְגו' is a conditional clause, as in Gen. 33:13, cf. *Ewald*, § 357. Moses rested satisfied with this answer. Aaron acknowledged that the flesh of the sin-offering ought to have been eaten by the priest in this instance (according to Lev. 6:19), and simply adduced, as the reason why this had not been done, the calamity which had befallen his two eldest sons. And this might really be a sufficient reason, as regarded both himself and his remaining sons, why the eating of the sin-offering should be omitted. For the judgment in question was so solemn a warning, as to the sin which still adhered to them even after the presentation of their sin-offering, that they might properly feel “that they had not so strong and overpowering a holiness as was required for eating the general sin-offering” (*M. Baumgarten*).

This is the correct view, though others find the reason in their grief at the death of their sons or brethren, which rendered it impossible to observe a joyous sacrificial meal. But this is not for a moment to be thought of, simply because the eating of the flesh of the sin-offering was not a joyous meal at all (see at Lev. 6:19). ¹²⁵

Laws Relating to Clean and Unclean Animals. — Ch. 11

(CF. DEU. 13: 3-20).

Lev. 11. The regulation of the sacrifices and institution of the priesthood, by which Jehovah opened up to His people the way of access to His grace and the way to sanctification of life in fellowship with Him, were followed by instructions concerning the various things which hindered and disturbed this living fellowship with God the Holy One, as being manifestations and results of sin, and by certain rules for avoiding and removing these obstructions. For example, although sin has its origin and proper seat in the soul, it pervades the whole body as the organ of the soul, and shatters the life of the body, even to its complete dissolution in death and decomposition; whilst its effects have spread from man to the whole of the earthly creation, inasmuch as not only did man draw nature with him into the service of sin, in consequence of the dominion over it which was given him by God, but God Himself, according to a holy law of His wise and equitable government, made the irrational creature subject to “vanity” and “corruption” on account of the sin of man (Rom. 8:20, 21), so that not only did the field bring forth thorns and thistles, and the earth produce injurious and poisonous plants (see at Gen. 3:18), but the animal kingdom in many of its forms and creatures bears the image of sin and death, and is constantly reminding man of the evil fruit of his fall from God. It is in this penetration of sin into the material creation that we may find the explanation of the fact, that from the very earliest times men have neither used every kind of herb nor every kind of animal as food; but that, whilst they have, as it were, instinctively avoided certain plants as injurious to health or destructive to life, they have also had a *horror naturalis*, i.e., an inexplicable disgust, at many of the animals, and have avoided their flesh as unclean. A similar horror must have been produced upon man from the very first, before his heart was altogether hardened, by death as the wages of sin, or rather by the effects of death, viz., the decomposition of the body; and different diseases and states of the body, that were connected with symptoms of corruption and decomposition, may also have been regarded as rendering unclean. Hence in all the nations and all the religions of antiquity we find that contrast between clean and unclean, which was developed in a dualistic form, it is true, in many of the religious systems,

but had its primary root in the corruption that had entered the world through sin. This contrast was limited in the Mosaic law to the animal food of the Israelites, to contact with dead animals and human corpses, and to certain bodily conditions and diseases that are associated with the decomposition, pointing out most minutely the unclean objects and various defilements within these spheres, and prescribing the means for avoiding or removing them.

The instructions in the chapter before us, concerning the clean and unclean animals, are introduced in the first place as laws of food (v. 2); but they pass beyond these bounds by prohibiting at the same time all contact with animal carrion (vv. 8, 11, 24ff.), and show thereby that they are connected in principle and object with the subsequent laws of purification (Lev. 12-15), to which they are to be regarded as a preparatory introduction.

Lev. 11: 1-8. The laws which follow were given to Moses and Aaron (v. 1, Lev. 13: 1; 15: 1), as Aaron had been sanctified through the anointing to expiate the sins and uncleannesses of the children of Israel.

Lev. 11: 2-8 (cf. Deu. 14: 4-8). Of the larger quadrupeds, which are divided in Gen. 1:24, 25 into beasts of the earth (living wild) and tame cattle, only the cattle (*behemoth*) are mentioned here, as denoting the larger land animals, some of which were reared by man as domesticated animals, and others used as food. Of these the Israelites might eat “*whatsoever parteth the hoof and is cloven-footed, and cheweth the cud among the cattle.*” שִׁסְעַת שִׁסְעַת פְּרָסֹת, literally “tearing (having) a rent in the hoofs,” according to Deu. 14: 5 into “two claws,” i.e., with a hoof completely severed in two. גָּרָה, rumination, μῆρυκισμός (LXX), from גָּרָה (cf. יָגַר v. 7), to draw (Hab. 1:15), to draw up and fro; hence to bring up the food again, to ruminate. מֵעֵלַת גָּרָה is connected with the preceding words with *vav cop.* to indicate the close connection of the two regulations, viz., that there was to be the perfectly cloven foot as well as the rumination (cf. vv. 4ff.). These marks are combined in the oxen, sheep, and goats, and also in the stag and gazelle. The latter are expressly mentioned in Deu. 14: 4, 5, where — in addition to the *common stag* (אַיִל) and *gazelle* (צִבְיָה, δорκάς, LXX), or *dorcās-antelope*, which is most frequently met with in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, of the size of a roebuck, with a reddish brown back and white body, horns sixteen inches long, and fine dark eyes, and the flesh of which, according to *Avicenna*, is the best of all the wild game — the following five are also selected, viz.:

(1) אֵימור, not βούβαλος, the buffalo (LXX, and *Luther*), but *Damhirsch*, a stag which is still much more common in Asia than in Europe and Palestine (see v. *Schubert*, R. iii. p. 118);

(2) אֵפְסָן, probably, according to the Chaldee, *Syriac*, etc., the *capricorn* (*Steinbock*), which is very common in Palestine, not τραγέλαφος (LXX, Vulg.), the buck-stag (*Bockhirsch*), an animal lately discovered in Nubia (cf. *Leyrer* in *Herzog's Cycl.* vi. p. 143);

(3) דִּישָׁן, according to the LXX and *Vulg.* πύραργος, a kind of *antelope* resembling the stag, which is met with in Africa (Herod. 4, 192), — according to the Chaldee and *Syriac*, the *buffalo-antelope*, — according to the Samar. and Arabic, the *mountain-stag*;

(4) אֵפְסָן, according to the Chaldee the *wild ox*, which is also met with in Egypt and Arabia, probably the *oryx* (LXX, *Vulg.*), a species of antelope as large as a stag; and

(5) גִּמְרָן, according to the LXX and most of the ancient versions, the *giraffe*, but this is only found in the deserts of Africa, and would hardly be met with even in Egypt, — it is more probably *capreae sylvestris species*, according to the Chaldee.

Lev. 11: 4, 5. Any animal which was wanting in either of these marks was to be unclean, or not to be eaten. This is the case with the *camel*, whose flesh is eaten by the Arabs; it ruminates, but it has not cloven hoofs. Its foot is severed, it is true, but not thoroughly cloven, as there is a ball behind, upon which it treads. The *hare* and *hyrax* (*Klippdachs*) were also unclean, because, although they ruminate, they have not cloven hoofs. It is true that modern naturalists affirm that the two latter do not ruminate at all, as they have not the four stomachs that are common to ruminant animals; but they move the jaw sometimes in a manner which looks like ruminating, so that even *Linnaeus* affirmed that the hare chewed the cud, and Moses followed the popular opinion. According to *Bochart*, *Oedmann*, and others, the *shaphan* is the *jerboa*, and according to the Rabbins and Luther, the rabbit or coney. But the more correct view is, that it is the *wabr* of the Arabs, which is still called *tsofun* in Southern Arabia (*hyrax Syriacus*), an animal which feeds on plants, a native of the countries of the Lebanon and Jordan, also of Arabia and Africa. They live in the natural caves and clefts of the rocks (Psa. 104:18), are very gregarious, being often seen seated in troops before the openings to their caves, and extremely timid as they are quite defenceless (Pro. 30:26). They are about the size of rabbits, of a brownish grey or brownish yellow colour, but white under the belly; they have bright eyes, round ears, and no tail. The Arabs eat them, but do not place them before their guests. ¹²⁶

Lev. 11: 7. The *swine* has cloven hoofs, but does not ruminates; and many of the tribes of antiquity abstained from eating it, partly on account of its uncleanness, and partly from fear of skin-diseases.

Lev. 11: 8. “Of their flesh shall ye not eat (i.e., not slay these animals as food), and their carcase (animals that had died) shall ye not touch.” The latter applied to the clean or edible animals also, when they had died a natural death (v. 39).

Lev. 11: 9-12 (cf. Deu. 14: 9 and 10). Of *water animals*, everything in the water, in seas and brooks, that had fins and scales was edible. Everything else that swarmed in the water was to be an abomination, its flesh was not to be eaten, and its carrion was to be avoided with abhorrence. Consequently, not only were all water animals other than fishes, such as crabs, salamanders, etc., forbidden as unclean; but also fishes without scales, such as eels for example. Numa laid down this law for the Romans: *ut pisces qui squamosi non essent ni pollicerent* (sacrificed): *Plin. h. n. 32, c. 2, s. 10*. In Egypt fishes without scales are still regarded as unwholesome (*Lane, Manners and Customs*).

Lev. 11:13-19 (cf. Deu. 14:11-18). Of *birds*, twenty varieties are prohibited, including the *bat*, but without any common mark being given; though they consist almost exclusively of birds which live upon flesh or carrion, and are most of them natives of Western Asia. ¹²⁷

The list commences with the *eagle*, as the king of the birds. *Nesher* embraces all the species of eagles proper. The idea that the eagle will not touch carrion is erroneous. According to the testimony of Arabian writers (*Damiri* in *Bochart*, ii. p. 577), and several naturalists who have travelled (e.g., *Forskal*. l.c. p. 12, and *Seetzen*, 1, p. 379), they will eat carrion if it is still fresh and not decomposed; so that the eating of carrion could very properly be attributed to them in such passages as Job. 39:30, Pro. 30:17, and Mat. 24:28. But the bald-headedness mentioned in Mic. 1:16 applies, not to the true eagle, but to the carrion-kite, which is reckoned, however, among the different species of eagles, as well as the bearded or golden vulture. The next in the list is *peres*, from *paras* = *parash* to break, *ossifragus*, i.e., wither the bearded or golden vulture, *gypaetos barbatus*, or more probably, as *Schultz* supposes, the *sea-eagle*, which may have been the species intended in the γρῦψ = γρυπαίετος of the LXX and *gryphus* of the Vulgate, and to which the ancients seem sometimes to have applied the name *ossifraga* (*Lucret.* v. 1079). By the next, עֲנִיָּהּ, we are very probably to understand the *bearded* or *golden vulture*. For this word is no doubt connected with the Arabic word for beard, and therefore points to the golden vulture, which has a tuft of hair or feathers on the lower beak, and which might very well be associated with the eagles so far as the size is

concerned, having wings that measure 10 feet from tip to tip. As it really belongs to the family of cultures, it forms a very fitting link of transition to the other species of vulture and falcon (v. 14). **הַשָּׂדֵה** (*Deu.* **הַיָּה**), according to a change which is by no means rare when the *aleph* stands between two vowels: cf. **דְּרוֹסָה** in 1Sa. 21: 8; 22: 9, and **דְּרוֹיִג** in 1Sa. 22:18, 22), from **הַשָּׂדֵה** to fly, is either the *kite*, or the *glede*, which is very common in Palestine (*v. Schubert, Reise* iii. p. 120), and lives on carrion. It is a gregarious bird (cf. Isa. 34:15), which other birds of prey are not, and is used by many different tribes as food (*Oedmann*, iii. p. 120). The conjecture that the black glede-kite is meant, — a bird which is particularly common in the East, — and that the name is derived from **הַשָּׂדֵה** to be dark, is overthrown by the use of the word **לְמִינֵהּ** in Deuteronomy, which shows that **הַשָּׂדֵה** is intended to denote the whole genus. **הַשָּׂדֵה**, which is referred to in Job. 28: 7 as sharp-sighted, is either the falcon, several species of which are natives of Syria and Arabia, and which is noted for its keen sight and the rapidity of its flight, or according to the *Vulgate, Schultz*, etc., *vultur*, the true vulture (the LXX have **ἄκτιν**, the kite, here, and **γρύψ**, the griffin, in *Deu.* and *Job*), of which there are three species in Palestine (*Lynch*, p. 229). In *Deu.* 14:13 **הַשָּׂדֵה** is also mentioned, from **הַשָּׂדֵה** to see. Judging from the name, it was a keen-sighted bird, either a falcon or another species of vulture (*Vulg. ixion*).

Lev. 11:15. “Every raven after his kind,” i.e., the whole genus of ravens, with the rest of the raven-like birds, such as crows, jackdaws, and jays, which are all of them natives of Syria and Palestine. The omission of **ר** before **הַשָּׂדֵה**, which is found in several MSS and editions, is probably to be regarded as the true reading, as it is not wanting before any of the other names.

Lev. 11:16. **בַּת הַיַּעֲנָה**, i.e., either daughter of screaming (*Bochart*), or daughter of greediness (*Gesenius*, etc.), is used according to all the ancient versions for the ostrich, which is more frequently described as the dweller in the desert (Isa. 13:21; 34:13, etc.), or as the mournful screamer (*Mic.* 1: 8; *Job.* 39:39), and is to be understood, not as denoting the female ostrich only, but as a noun of common gender denoting the ostrich generally. It does not devour carrion indeed, but it eats vegetable matter of the most various kinds, and swallows greedily stones, metals, and even glass. It is found in Arabia, and sometimes in Hauran and Belka (*Seetzen* and *Burckhardt*), and has been used as food not only by the Struthiophagi of Ethiopia (*Diod. Sic.* 3, 27; *Strabo*, xvi. 772) and Numidia (*Leo Afric.* p. 766), but by some of the Arabs also (*Seetzen*, iii. p. 20; *Burckhardt*, p. 178), whilst others only eat the eggs, and make use of the fat in the preparation of food. **תְּחֹמֶם**, according to *Bochart, Gesenius*, and others, is the *male ostrich*; but this is very improbable. According to the LXX,

Vulg., and others, it is the *owl* (*Oedmann*, iii. pp. 45ff.); but this is mentioned later under another name. According to *Saad. Ar. Erp.* it is the *swallow*; but this is called **סוּס** in Jer. 8: 7. *Knobel* supposes it to be the *cuckoo*, which is met with in Palestine (*Seetzen*, 1, p. 78), and derives the name from **סמק**, *violenter egit*, supposing it to be so called from the violence with which it is said to turn out or devour the eggs and young of other birds, for the purpose of laying its own eggs in the nest (*Aristot. hist. an.* 6, 7; 9, 29; *Ael. nat. an.* 6, 7). **שָׁהַר** is the **λάρος**, or *slender gull*, according to the LXX and *Vulg.* *Knobel* follows the Arabic, however, and supposes it to be a species of *hawk*, which is trained in Syria for hunting gazelles, hares, etc.; but this is certainly included in the genus **נִי. נִי**, from **נָצַי** to fly, is the *hawk*, which soars very high, and spreads its wings towards the south (Job. 39:26). It stands in fact, as **לְמִינֵהוּ** shows, for the hawk-tribe generally, probably the **ἑράξ**, *accipiter*, of which the ancients enumerate many different species. **פּוֹס**, which is mentioned in Psa. 102: 7 as dwelling in ruins, is an *owl* according to the ancient versions, although they differ as to the kind. In *Knobel's* opinion it is either the *screech-owl*, which inhabits ruined buildings, walls, and clefts in the rock, and the flesh of which is said to be very agreeable, or the *little screech-owl*, which also lives in old buildings and walls, and raises a mournful cry at night, and the flesh of which is said to be savoury. **שָׁלַךְ**, according to the ancient versions an aquatic bird, and therefore more in place by the side of the heron, where it stands in Deuteronomy, is called by the LXX **καταῤῥάκτης**; in the *Targ.* and *Syr.* **נִנְשָׁי** **שָׁלַי**, *extrahens pisces*. It is not the *gull*, however (*larus catarractes*), which plunges with violence, for according to *Oken* this is only seen in the northern seas, but a species of *pelican*, to be found on the banks of the Nile and in the islands of the Red Sea, which swims well, and also dives, frequently dropping perpendicularly upon fishes in the water. The flesh has an oily taste, but it is eaten for all that.

יִנְשׁוּרָה: from **נָשַׁף** to snort, according to Isa. 34:11, dwelling in ruins, no doubt a species of *owl*; according to the Chaldee and Syriac, the *uhu*, which dwells in old ruined towers and castles upon the mountains, and cries *uhupuhu*. **הַנְּשׂוּמָה**, which occurs again in v. 30 among the names of the lizards, is, according to *Damiri*, a bird resembling the *uhu*, but smaller. *Jonathan* calls it *uthya* = **ὠτός**, a *night-owl*. The primary meaning of the word **נָשַׁף** is essentially the same as that of **נָשַׁף**, to breathe or blow, so called because many of the owls have a mournful cry, and blow and snort in addition; though it cannot be decided whether the *strix otus* is intended, a bird by no means rare in Egypt, which utters a whistling blast, and rolls itself into a ball and then spreads itself out again, or the *strix flammea*, a native of Syria, which sometimes utters a

mournful cry, and at other times snores like a sleeping man, and the flesh of which is said to be by no means unpleasant, or the hissing owl (*strix stridula*), which inhabits the ruins in Egypt and Syria, and is sometimes called *massusu*, at other times *bane*, a very voracious bird, which is said to fly in at open windows in the evening and kill children that are left unguarded, and which is very much dreaded in consequence. **אָסִיף**, which also lived in desolate places (Isa. 34:11; Zep. 2:14), or in the desert itself (Psa. 102: 7), was not the *katà*, a species of partridge or heath-cock, which is found in Syria (Robinson, ii. p. 620), as this bird always flies in large flocks, and this is not in harmony with Isa. 34:11 and Zep. 2:14, but the *pelican* (**πελεκάν**, LXX), as all the ancient versions render it, which *Ephraem* (on Num. 14:17) describes as a marsh-bird, very fond of its young, inhabiting desolate places, and uttering an incessant cry. It is the true pelican of the ancients (*pelecanus graculus*), the Hebrew name of which seems to have been derived from **אָסִיף** to spit, from its habit of spitting out the fishes it has caught, and which is found in Palestine and the reedy marshes of Egypt (Robinson, Palestine). **אָסִיף**, in Deu. **אָסִיף**, is **κυκνός**, the swan, according to the Septuagint *porphyrio*, the fish-heron, according to the Vulgate; a marsh-bird therefore, possibly *vultur percnopterus* (Saad. Ar. Erp.), which is very common in Arabia, Palestine, and Syria, and was classed by the ancients among the different species of eagles (*Plin. h. n.* 10, 3), but which is said to resemble the vulture, and was also called **ὄρειπέλαργος**, the mountain-stork (*Arist. h. an.* 9, 32). It is a stinking and disgusting bird, of the raven kind, with black pinions; but with this exception it is quite white. It is also bald-headed, and feeds on carrion and filth. But it is eaten notwithstanding by many of the Arabs (*Burckhardt, Syr.* p. 1046). It received its name of “tenderly loving” from the tenderness with which it watches over its young (*Bochart, iii.* pp. 56, 57). In this respect it resembles the stork, **אָסִיף**, *avis pia*, a bird of passage according to Jer. 8: 7, which builds its nest upon the cypresses (Psa. 104:17, cf. *Bochart, iii.* pp. 85ff.). In the East the stork builds its nest not only upon high towers and the roofs of houses, but according to *Kazwini* and others mentioned by *Bochart* (iii. p. 60), upon lofty trees as well. ¹²⁸

אָנִיפָה, according to the LXX and *Vulgate* **χαραδριός**, a marsh-bird of the *snipe* kind, of which there are several species in Egypt (*Hasselquist, p.* 308). This is quite in accordance with the expression “after her kind,” which points to a numerous genus. The omission of **אָנִיפָה** before **אָנִיפָה**, whereas it is found before the name of every other animal, is very striking; but as the name is preceded by the copulative *vav* in Deuteronomy, and stands for a particular bird, it may be accounted for either from a want of precision on the part of the author, or from an error of the copyist like the omission of the **ו** before **אָנִיפָה** in v. 15. ¹²⁹ **אָנִיפָה**: according to the LXX, *Vulg.*, and others, the *lapwing*, which is

found in Syria, Arabia, and still more commonly in Egypt (*Forsk, Russel, Sonnini*), and is eaten in some places, as its flesh is said to be fat and savoury in autumn (*Sonn.* 1, 204). But it has a disagreeable smell, as it frequents marshy districts seeking worms and insects for food, and according to a common belief among the ancients, builds its nest of human dung. Lastly, **הַעֲטָלָה** is the bat (*Isa.* 2:20), which the Arabs also classified among the birds.

Lev. 11:20-23 (cf. *Deu.* 14:19). To the birds there are appended flying animals of other kinds: “*all swarms of fowl that go upon fours,*” i.e., the smaller winged animals with four feet, which are called *sherez*, “swarms,” on account of their multitude. These were not to be eaten, as they were all abominations, with the exception of those “*which have two shank-feet above their feet* (i.e., springing feet) *to leap with*” (**לֵא** for **לָא** as in *Exo.* 21: 8).

Locusts are the animals referred to, four varieties being mentioned with their different species (“*after his kind*”); but these cannot be identified with exactness, as there is still a dearth of information as to the natural history of the oriental locust. It is well known that locusts were eaten by many of the nations of antiquity both in Asia and Africa, and even the ancient Greeks thought the *Cicades* very agreeable in flavour (*Arist. h. an.* 5, 30). In Arabia they are sold in the market, sometimes strung upon cords, sometimes by measure; and they are also dried, and kept in bags for winter use. For the most part, however, it is only by the poorer classes that they are eaten, and many of the tribes of Arabia abhor them (*Robinson*, ii. p. 628); and those who use them as food do not eat all the species indiscriminately. They are generally cooked over hot coals, or on a plate, or in an oven, or stewed in butter, and eaten either with salt or with spice and vinegar, the head, wings, and feet being thrown away. They are also boiled in salt and water, and eaten with salt or butter. Another process is to dry them thoroughly, and then grind them into meal and make cakes of them. The Israelites were allowed to eat the *arbeh*, i.e., according to *Exo.* 10:13, 19, *Nah.* 3:17, etc., the flying migratory locust, *gryllus migratorius*, which still bears this name, according to *Niebuhr*, in Maskat and Bagdad, and is poetically designated in *Psa.* 78:46; 105:34, as **הַסִּיל**, *the devourer*, and **יֵלֵק**, *the eater-up*; but *Knobel* is mistaken in supposing that these names are applied to certain species of the *arbeh*. **סִלְעָם**, according to the Chaldee, *deglutivit, absorpsit*, is unquestionably a larger and peculiarly voracious species of locust. This is all that can be inferred from the *rashon* of the Targums and Talmud, whilst the **ἄττάκης** and *attacus* of the LXX and Vulg. are altogether unexplained. **חֲרָגָל**: according to the Arabic, a galloping, i.e., a hopping, not a flying species of locust. This is supported by the Samaritan, also by the LXX and Vulg., **ὀφιομάχης**, *ophiomachus*. According to *Hesychius* and *Suidas*, it was a species of locust without wings, probably a very large kind; as it is stated in *Mishnah*,

Shabb. vi. 10, that an egg of the *chargol* was sometimes suspended in the ear, as a remedy for earache. Among the different species of locusts in Mesopotamia, *Niebuhr* (Arab. p. 170) saw two of a very large size with springing feet, but without wings. **כַּגָּב**, a word of uncertain etymology, occurs in Num. 13:33, where the spies are described as being like *chagabim* by the side of the inhabitants of the country, and in 2Ch. 7:13, where the *chagab* devours the land. From these passages we may infer that it was a species of locust without wings, small but very numerous, probably the **ἀττέλαβος**, which is often mentioned along with the **ἀκρίς**, but as a distinct species, *locustarum minima sine pennis* (*Plin. h. n.* 29, c. 4, s. 29), or *parva locusta modicis pennis reptans potius quam volitans semperque subsiliens* (*Jerome* (on Nah. 3:17). ^{B0}

Lev. 11:24-28. In vv. 24-28 there follow still further and more precise instructions, concerning defilement through contact with the carcasses (i.e., the carrion) of the animals already mentioned. These instructions relate first of all (vv. 24 and 25) to aquatic and winged animals, which were not to be eaten because they were unclean (the expression “for these” in v. 24 relates to them); and then (vv. 26-28) to quadrupeds, both cattle that have not the hoof thoroughly divided and do not ruminate (v. 26), and animals that go upon their hands, i.e., upon paws, and have no hoofs, such as cats, dogs, bears, etc.

Lev. 11:27, 28. The same rule was applicable to all these animals: “whoever toucheth the carcass of them shall be unclean until the even,” i.e., for the rest of the day; he was then of course to wash himself. Whoever carried their carrion, viz., to take it away, was also unclean till the evening, and being still more deeply affected by the defilement, he was to wash his clothes as well.

Lev. 11:29-38. To these there are attached analogous instructions concerning defilement through contact with the smaller creeping animals (*Sherez*), which formed the fourth class of the animal kingdom; though the prohibition against eating these animals is not introduced till vv. 41, 42, as none of these were usually eaten. *Sherez*, the swarm, refers to animals which swarm together in great numbers (see at Gen. 1:21), and is synonymous with *remes* (cf. Gen. 7:14 and 7:21), “the creeping;” it denotes the smaller land animals which move without feet, or with feet that are hardly perceptible (see at Gen. 1:24). Eight of the creeping animals are named, as defiling not only the men with whom they might come in contact, but any domestic utensils and food upon which they might fall; they were generally found in houses, therefore, or in the abodes of men. **חֹלֵד** is not the *mole* (according to *Saad. Ar. Abys.*, etc.), although the Arabs still call this *chuld*, but the *weasel* (LXX, *Onk.*, etc.), which is common in Syria and Palestine, and is frequently mentioned by the Talmudists in the feminine form **חֹלְדָה**, as an animal which caught birds

(*Mishn. Cholin* iii. 4), which would run over the wave-loaves with a *sherez* in its mouth (*Mishn. Tohor* iv. 2), and which could drink water out of a vessel (*Mishn. Para* ix. 3). עֵבֶבֶר is the *mouse* (according to the ancient versions and the Talmud), and in 1Sa. 6: 5 the *field-mouse*, the scourge of the fields, not the *jerboa*, as *Knobel* supposes; for this animal lives in holes in the ground, is very shy, and does not frequent houses as is assumed to be the case with the animals mentioned here. צָב is a kind of *lizard*, but whether the *thav* or *dsabb*, a harmless yellow lizard of 18 inches in length, which is described by *Seetzen*, iii. pp. 436ff., also by *Hasselquist* under the name of *lacerta Aegyptia*, or the *waral*, as *Knobel* supposes, a large land lizard reaching as much as four feet in length, which is also met with in Palestine (*Robinson*, ii. 160) and is called *el worran* by *Seetzen*, cannot be determined.

Lev. 11:30. The early translators tell us nothing certain as to the three following names, and it is still undecided how they should be rendered. שִׁנְקָה is translated *μυγάλη* by the LXX, i.e., *shrew-mouse*; but the oriental versions render it by various names for a lizard. *Bochart* supposes it to be a species of lizard with a sharp groaning voice, because שִׁנְקָה signifies to breathe deeply, or groan. *Rosenmüller* refers it to the *lacerta Gecko*, which is common in Egypt, and utters a peculiar cry resembling the croaking of frogs, especially in the night. *Leyrer* imagines it to denote the whole family of *monitores*; and *Knobel*, the large and powerful river lizard, the water-waral of the Arabs, called *lacerta Nilotica* in *Hasselquist*, pp. 361ff., though he has failed to observe, that Moses could hardly have supposed it possible that an animal four feet long, resembling a crocodile, could drop down dead into either pots or dishes. כַּוֵּה is not the chameleon (LXX), for this is called *tinshemeth*, but the *chardaun* (*Arab.*), a lizard which is found in old walls in Natolia, Syria, and Palestine, *lacerta stellio*, or *lacerta coslordilos* (*Hasselquist*, pp. 351-2). *Knobel* supposes it to be the frog, because *coach* seems to point to the crying or croaking of frogs, to which the Arabs apply the term *kuk*, the Greeks *κοάξ*, the Romans *coaxare*. But this is very improbable, and the frog would be quite out of place in the midst of simple lizards. לְטָטָה, according to the ancient versions, is also a lizard. *Leyrer* supposes it to be the nocturnal, salamander-like family of *beckons*; *Knobel*, on the contrary, imagines it to be the tortoise, which creeps upon the earth (*terrae adhaeret*), because the Arabic verb signifies *terrae adhaesit*. This is very improbable, however. אֲמַט (LXX), σαῦρα, *Vulg. lacerta*, probably the *true lizard*, or, as *Leyrer* conjectures, the *anguis* (*Luth. Blindschleiche*, blind-worm), or *zygnis*, which forms the link between lizards and snakes. The rendering “snail” (*Sam. Rashi*, etc.) is not so probable, as this is called שְׂבִיל in *Psa.* 58: 9; although the purple snail and all the marine species are eaten in

Egypt and Palestine. Lastly, תַּנְּשֵׁמֶת, the self-inflating animal (see at v. 18), is no doubt the *chameleon*, which frequently inflates its belly, for example, when enraged, and remains in this state for several hours, when it gradually empties itself and becomes quite thin again. Its flesh was either cooked, or dried and reduced to powder, and used as a specific for corpulence, or a cure for fevers, or as a general medicine for sick children (*Plin. h. n.* 28, 29). The flesh of many of the lizards is also eaten by the Arabs (*Leyrer*, pp. 603, 604).

Lev. 11:31. The words, “*these are unclean to you among all swarming creatures,*” are neither to be understood as meaning, that the eight species mentioned were the only swarming animals that were unclean and not allowed to be eaten, nor that they possessed and communicated a larger amount of uncleanness; but when taken in connection with the instructions which follow, they can only mean, that such animals would even defile domestic utensils, clothes, etc., if they fell down dead upon them. Not that they were more unclean than others, since all the unclean animals would defile not only persons, but even the clothes of those who carried their dead bodies (vv. 25, 28); but there was more fear in their case than in that of others, of their falling dead upon objects in common use, and therefore domestic utensils, clothes, and so forth, could be much more easily defiled by them than by the larger quadrupeds, by water animals, or by birds. “*When they be dead,*” lit., “*in their dying;*” i.e., not only if they were already dead, but if they died at the time when they fell upon any object.

Lev. 11:32. In either case, anything upon which one of these animals fell became unclean, “*whether a vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin.*” Every vessel (כֵּל in the widest sense, as in *Exo. 22: 6*), “*wherein any work is done,*” i.e., that was an article of common use, was to be unclean till the evening, and then placed in water, that it might become clean again.

Lev. 11:33. Every earthen vessel, into which (lit., into the midst of which) one of them fell, became unclean, together with the whole of its contents, and was to be broken, i.e., destroyed, because the uncleanness was absorbed by the vessel, and could not be entirely removed by washing (see at *Lev. 6:21*). Of course the contents of such a vessel, supposing there were any, were not to be used.

Lev. 11:34. “*Every edible food (אֲכָלָה before כֵּל partitive, as in *Lev. 4: 2*) upon which water comes,*” — that is to say, which was prepared with water, — and “*every drink that is drunk...becomes unclean in every vessel,*” sc., if such an animal should fall dead upon the food, or into the drink. The traditional rendering of v. 34a, “*every food upon which water out of such a vessel*

comes, ” is untenable; because מַיִם without an article cannot mean such water, or this water.

Lev. 11:35. Every vessel also became unclean, upon which the body of such an animal fell: such as תַּנּוּר, the *earthen baking-pot* (see Lev. 2: 4), and כִּירָה, the *covered pan or pot*. כִּיר, a *boiling or roasting vessel* (1Sa. 2:14), can only signify, when used in the dual, a vessel consisting of two parts, i.e., a pan or pot *with a lid*.

Lev. 11:36. Springs and wells were not defiled, because the uncleanness would be removed at once by the fresh supply of water. But whoever touched the body of the animal, to remove it, became unclean.

Lev. 11:37, 38. All seed-corn that was intended to be sown remained clean, namely, because the uncleanness attaching to it externally would be absorbed by the earth. But if water had been put upon the seed, i.e., if the grain had been softened by water, it was to be unclean, because in that case the uncleanness would penetrate the softened grains and defile the substance of the seed, which would therefore produce uncleanness in the fruit.

Lev. 11:39-47. Lastly, contact with edible animals, if they had not been slaughtered, but had died a natural death, and had become carrion in consequence, is also said to defile (cf. vv. 39, 40 with vv. 24-28). This was the case, too, with the eating of the swarming land animals, whether they went upon the belly,^{B1} as snakes and worms, or upon four feet, as rats, mice, weasels, etc., or upon many feet, like the insects (vv. 41-43). Lastly (vv. 44, 45), the whole law is enforced by an appeal to the calling of the Israelites, as a holy nation, to be holy as Jehovah their God, who had brought them out of Egypt to be a God to them, was holy (Exo. 6: 7; 29:45, 46).

Lev. 11:46, 47. Vv. 46, 47 contain the concluding formula to the whole of this law. If we take a survey, in closing, of the animals that are enumerated as unclean and not suitable for food, we shall find that among the larger land animals they were chiefly beasts of prey, that seize upon other living creatures and devour them in their blood; among the water animals, all snake-like fishes and slimy shell-fish; among birds, the birds of prey, which watch for the life of other animals and kill them, the marsh-birds, which live on worms, carrion, and all kinds of impurities, and such mongrel creatures as the ostrich, which lives in the desert, and the bat, which flies about in the dark; and lastly, all the smaller animals, with the exception of a few graminivorous locusts, but more especially the snake-like lizards, — partly because they called to mind the old serpent, partly because they crawled in the dust, seeking their food in mire and filth, and suggested the thought of corruption by the slimy nature of their bodies. They

comprised, in fact, all such animals as exhibited more or less the darker type of sin, death, and corruption; and it was on this ethical ground alone, and not for all kinds of sanitary reasons, or even from political motives, that the nation of Israel, which was called to sanctification, was forbidden to eat them. It is true there are several animals mentioned as unclean, e.g., the ass, the camel, and others, in which we can no longer recognise this type. But we must bear in mind, that the distinction between clean animals and unclean goes back to the very earliest times (Gen. 7: 2, 3), and that in relation to the large land animals, as well as to the fishes, the Mosaic law followed the marks laid down by tradition, which took its rise in the primeval age, whose childlike mind, acute perception, and deep intuitive insight into nature generally, discerned more truly and essentially the real nature of the animal creation than we shall ever be able to do, with thoughts and perceptions disturbed as ours are by the influences of unnatural and ungodly culture. ¹³²

Laws of Purification. — Ch. 12-15.

Lev. 12-15. The laws concerning defilement through eating unclean animals, or through contact with those that had died a natural death, are followed by rules relating to defilements proceeding from the human body, in consequence of which persons contaminated by them were excluded for a longer or shorter period from the fellowship of the sanctuary, and sometimes even from intercourse with their fellow-countrymen, and which had to be removed by washing, by significant lustrations, and by expiatory sacrifices. They comprised the uncleanness of a woman in consequence of child-bearing (Lev. 12), leprosy (Lev. 13 and 14), and both natural and diseased secretions from the sexual organs of either male or female (emissio seminis and gonorrhoea, also menses and flux: Lev. 15); and to these there is added in Num. 19:11-22, defilement proceeding from a human corpse. Involuntary emission defiled the man; voluntary emission, in sexual intercourse, both the man and the woman and any clothes upon which it might come, for an entire day, and this defilement was to be removed in the evening by bathing the body, and by washing the clothes, etc. (Lev. 15:16-18). Secretions from the sexual organs, whether of a normal kind, such as the menses and those connected with child-birth, or the result of disease, rendered not only the persons affected with them unclean, but even their couches and seats, and any persons who might sit down upon them; and this uncleanness was even communicated to persons who touched those who were diseased, or to anything with which they had come in contact (Lev. 15: 3-12, 19-27). In the case of the menses, the uncleanness lasted seven days (Lev. 15:19, 24); in that of child-birth, either seven or fourteen days, and then still further thirty-three or sixty-six, according to circumstances (Lev. 12: 2, 4, 5); and in that of a diseased flux, as long as the disease itself lasted, and seven

days afterwards (Lev. 15:13, 28); but the uncleanness communicated to others only lasted till the evening. In all these cases the purification consisted in the bathing of the body and washing of the clothes and other objects. But if the uncleanness lasted more than seven days, on the day after the purification with water a sin-offering and a burnt-offering were to be offered, that the priest might pronounce the person clean, or receive him once more into the fellowship of the holy God (Lev. 12: 6, 8; 15:14, 15, 29, 30). Leprosy made those who were affected with it so unclean, that they were excluded from all intercourse with the clean (Lev. 13:45, 46): and on their recovery they were to be cleansed by a solemn lustration, and received again with sacrifices into the congregation of the Lord (Lev. 14: 1-32). There are no express instructions as to the communicability of leprosy; but this is implied in the separation of the leper from the clean (Lev. 13:45, 46), as well as from the fact that a house affected by the leprosy rendered all who entered it, or slept in it, unclean (Lev. 14:46, 47). The defilement caused by a death was apparently greater still. Not only the corpse of a person who had died a natural death, as well as of one who had been killed by violence, but a dead body or grave defiled, for a period of seven days, both those who touched them, and (in the case of the corpse) the house in which the man had died, all the persons who were in it or might enter it, and all the open vessels that were there (Num. 19:11, 14-16). Uncleanness of this kind could only be removed by sprinkling water prepared from running water and the ashes of a sin-offering (Num. 19:12, 17ff.), and would even spread from the persons defiled to persons and things with which they came in contact, so as to render them unclean till the evening (Num. 19:22); whereas the defilement caused by contact with a dead animal lasted only a day, and then, like every other kind of uncleanness that only lasted till the evening, could be removed by bathing the persons or washing the things (Lev. 11:25ff.).

But whilst, according to this, generation and birth as well as death were affected with uncleanness; generation and death, the coming into being and the going out of being, were not defiling in themselves, or regarded as the two poles which bound, determine, and enclose the finite existence, so as to warrant us in tracing the principle which lay at the foundation of the laws of purification, as *Bähr* supposes, “to the antithesis between the infinite and the finite being, which falls into the sphere of the sinful when regarded ethically as the opposite to the absolutely holy.” Finite existence was created by God, quite as much as the corporeality of man; and both came forth from His hand pure and good. Moreover it is not begetting, giving birth, and dying, that are said to defile; but the secretions connected with generation and child-bearing, and the corpses of those who had died. In the decomposition which follows death, the effect of sin, of which death is the wages, is made manifest in the body. Decomposition, as the embodiment of the unholy nature of sin, is uncleanness *κατ’ ἐξοχήν*; and this

the Israelite, who was called to sanctification in fellowship with God, was to avoid and abhor. Hence the human corpse produced the greatest amount of defilement; so great, in fact, that to remove it a sprinkling water was necessary, which had been strengthened by the ashes of a sin-offering into a kind of sacred alkali. Next to the corpse, there came on the one hand *leprosy*, that bodily image of death which produced all the symptoms of decomposition even in the living body, and on the other hand the offensive secretions from the organs of generation, which resemble the putrid secretions that are the signs in the corpse of the internal dissolution of the bodily organs and the commencement of decomposition. From the fact that the impurities, for which special rites of purification were enjoined, are restricted to these three forms of manifestation in the human body, it is very evident that the laws of purification laid down in the O.T. were not regulations for the promotion of cleanliness or of good morals and decency, that is to say, were not police regulations for the protection of the life of the body from contagious diseases and other things injurious to health; but that their simple object was “to impress upon the mind a deep horror of everything that is and is called death in the creature, and thereby to foster an utter abhorrence of everything that is or is called sin, and also, to the constant humiliation of fallen man, to remind him in all the leading processes of the natural life — generation, birth, eating, disease, death — -how everything, even his own bodily nature, lies under the curse of sin (Gen. 3:14-19), that so the law might become a ‘schoolmaster to bring unto Christ,’ and awaken and sustain the longing for a Redeemer from the curse which had fallen upon his body also (see Gal. 3:24, Rom 7:24; 8:19ff.; Phil. 3:21).” *Leyrer*.

Lev. 12. Uncleaness and Purification after Child-Birth. — Vv. 2-4. “*If a woman bring forth (תִּזְרֶה) seed and bear a boy, she shall be unclean seven days as in the days of the uncleaness of her (monthly) sickness.*” נָדָה, from נָדַד to flow, lit., that which is to flow, is applied more especially to the uncleaness of a woman’s secretions (Lev. 15:19). נִדְוָה, inf. of נָדָה, to be sickly or ill, is applied here and in Lev. 15:33; 20:18, to the suffering connected with an issue of blood.

Lev. 12: 3, 4. After the expiration of this period, on the eighth day, the boy was to be circumcised (see at Gen. 17). She was then to sit, i.e., remain at home, thirty-three days in the blood of purification, without touching anything holy or coming to the sanctuary (she was not to take any part, therefore, in the sacrificial meals, the Passover, etc.), until the days of her purification were full, i.e., had expired.

Lev. 12: 5. But if she had given birth to a girl, she was to be unclean two weeks (14 days), as in her menstruation, and then after that to remain at home

66 days. The distinction between the seven (or fourteen) days of the “separation for her infirmity,” and the thirty-three (or sixty-six) days of the “blood of her purifying,” had a natural ground in the bodily secretions connected with childbirth, which are stronger and have more blood in them in the first week (*lochia rubra*) than the more watery discharge of the *lochia alba*, which may last as much as five weeks, so that the normal state may not be restored till about six weeks after the birth of the child. The prolongation of the period, in connection with the birth of a girl, was also founded upon the notion, which was very common in antiquity, that the bleeding and watery discharge continued longer after the birth of a girl than after that of a boy (*Hippocr. Opp. ed. Kühn. i. p. 393; Aristot. h. an. 6, 22; 7, 3, cf. Burdach, Physiologie iii. p. 34*). But the extension of the period to 40 and 80 days can only be accounted for from the significance of the numbers, which we meet with repeatedly, more especially the number forty (see at Exo. 24:18).

Lev. 12: 6, 7. After the expiration of the days of her purification “with regard to a son or a daughter,” i.e., according as she had given birth to a son or a daughter (not for the son or daughter, for the woman needed purification for herself, and not for the child to which she had given birth, and it was the woman, not the child, that was unclean), she was to bring to the priest a yearling lamb for a burnt-offering, and a young pigeon or turtle-dove for a sin-offering, that he might make atonement for her before Jehovah and she might become clean from the course of her issue. **בֶּן־שָׁנָהוּ**, lit., *son of his year*, which is a year old (cf. Lev. 23:12; Num. 6:12, 14; 7:15, 21, etc.), is used interchangeably with **בֶּן שָׁנָה** (Exo. 12: 5), and with **בְּנֵי שָׁנָה** in the plural (Lev. 23:18, 19; Exo. 29:38; Num. 7:17, 23, 29). **מִקְוֵה דָּמִים**, fountain of bleeding (see at Gen. 4:10), equivalent to hemorrhage (cf. Lev. 20:18). The purification by bathing and washing is not specially mentioned, as being a matter of course; nor is anything stated with reference to the communication of her uncleanness to persons who touched either her or her couch, since the instructions with regard to the period of menstruation no doubt applied to the first seven and fourteen days respectively. For her restoration to the Lord and His sanctuary, she was to come and be cleansed with a sin-offering and a burnt-offering, on account of the uncleanness in which the sin of nature had manifested itself; because she had been obliged to absent herself in consequence for a whole week from the sanctuary and fellowship of the Lord. But as this purification had reference, not to any special moral guilt, but only to sin which had been indirectly manifested in her bodily condition, a pigeon was sufficient for the sin-offering, that is to say, the smallest of the bleeding sacrifices; whereas a yearling lamb was required for a burnt-offering, to express the importance and strength of her surrender of herself to the Lord after so long a

separation from Him. But in cases of great poverty a pigeon might be substituted for the lamb (v. 8, cf. Lev. 5: 7, 11).

Lev. 13 and 14. Leprosy. — The law for leprosy, the observance of which is urged upon the people again in Deu. 24: 8, 9, treats, in the *first* place, of leprosy in men: (a) in its dangerous forms when appearing either on the skin (vv. 2-28), or on the head and beard (vv. 29-37); (b) in harmless forms (vv. 38 and 39); and (c) when appearing on a bald head (vv. 40-44). To this there are added instructions for the removal of the leper from the society of other men (vv. 45 and 46). It treats, *secondly*, of leprosy in linen, woollen, and leather articles, and the way to treat them (vv. 47-59); *thirdly*, of the purification of persons recovered from leprosy (Lev. 14: 1-32); and *fourthly*, of leprosy in houses and the way to remove it (vv. 33-53). — The laws for leprosy in man relate exclusively to the so-called white leprosy, *λευκή λέπρα*, *lepra*, which probably existed at that time in hither Asia alone, not only among the Israelites and Jews (Num. 12:10ff.; 2Sa. 3:29; 2Ki. 5:27; 7: 3; 15: 5; Mat. 8: 2, 3; 10: 8; 11: 5; 26: 6, etc.), but also among the Syrians (2Ki. 5: 1ff.), and which is still found in that part of the world, most frequently in the countries of the Lebanon and Jordan and in the neighbourhood of Damascus, in which city there are three hospitals for lepers (*Seetzen*, pp. 277, 278), and occasionally in Arabia (*Niebuhr*, *Arab.* pp. 135ff.) and Egypt; though at the present time the pimply leprosy, *lepra tuberosa s. articularum* (the leprosy of the joints), is more prevalent in the East, and frequently occurs in Egypt in the lower extremities in the form of elephantiasis. Of the white leprosy (called *Lepra Mosaica*), which is still met with in Arabia sometimes, where it is called *Baras*, *Trusen* gives the following description: “Very frequently, even for years before the actual outbreak of the disease itself, white, yellowish spots are seen lying deep in the skin, particularly on the genitals, in the face, on the forehead, or in the joints. They are without feeling, and sometimes cause the hair to assume the same colour as the spots. These spots afterwards pierce through the cellular tissue, and reach the muscles and bones. The hair becomes white and woolly, and at length falls off; hard gelatinous swellings are formed in the cellular tissue; the skin gets hard, rough, and seamy, lymph exudes from it, and forms large scabs, which fall off from time to time, and under these there are often offensive running sores. The nails then swell, curl up, and fall off; *entropium* is formed, with bleeding gums, the nose stopped up, and a considerable flow of saliva.... The senses become dull, the patient gets thin and weak, colliquative diarrhea sets in, and incessant thirst and burning fever terminate his sufferings” (*Krankheiten d. alten Hebr.* p. 165).

Lev. 13: 2-28. The symptoms of leprosy, whether proceeding directly from eruptions in the skin, or caused by a boil or burn. — Vv. 2-8. The first case:

“When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh (body) a raised spot or scab, or a bright spot.” **שֵׂאֵת**, a lifting up (Gen. 4: 7, etc.), signifies here an elevation of the skin in some part of the body, a raised spot like a pimple. **סִפְחָה**, an eruption, scurf, or scab, from **סָפַח** to pour out, “a pouring out as it were from the flesh or skin” (*Knobel*). **בִּפְהָרָה**, from **פָּהַר**, in the Arabic and Chaldee to shine, is a bright swollen spot in the skin. If either of these signs became “a spot of leprosy,” the person affected was to be brought to the priest, that he might examine the complaint. The term *zaraath*, from an Arabic word signifying to strike down or scourge, is applied to leprosy as a scourge of God, and in the case of men it always denotes the white leprosy, which the Arabs call *baras*. **נִגַּע**, a stroke (lit., “stroke of leprosy”), is applied not only to the spot attacked by the leprosy, the leprous mole (vv. 3, 29-32, 42, etc.), but to the persons and even to things affected with leprosy (vv. 4, 12, 13, 31, 50, 55).

Lev. 13: 3. A person so diseased was to be pronounced unclean, (a) if the hair of his head had turned white on the mole, i.e., if the dark hair which distinguished the Israelites had become white; and (b) if the appearance of the mole was deeper than the skin of the flesh, i.e., if the spot, where the mole was, appeared depressed in comparison with the rest of the skin. In that case it was leprosy. These signs are recognised by modern observers (e.g., *Hensler*); and among the Arabs leprosy is regarded as curable if the hair remains black upon the white spots, but incurable if it becomes whitish in colour.

Lev. 13: 4-6. But if the bright spot was white upon the skin, and its appearance was not deeper than the skin, and the place therefore was not sunken, nor the hair turned white, the priest was to shut up the leper, i.e., preclude him from intercourse with other men, for seven days, and on the seventh day examine him again. If he then found that the mole still stood, i.e., remained unaltered, “in his eyes,” or in his view, that it had not spread any further, he was to shut him up for seven days more. And if, on further examination upon the seventh day, he found that the mole had become paler, had lost its brilliant whiteness, and had not spread, he was to declare him clean, for it was a scurf, i.e., a mere skin eruption, and not true leprosy. The person who had been pronounced clean, however, was to wash his clothes, to change himself from even the appearance of leprosy, and then to be clean.

Lev. 13: 7, 8. But if the scurf had spread upon the skin “after his (first) appearance before the priest with reference to his cleansing,” i.e., to be examined concerning his purification; and if the priest notice this on his second appearance, he was to declare him unclean, for in that case it was leprosy.

Lev. 13: 9-17. The *second case* (vv. 9-17): if the leprosy broke out without previous eruptions.

Lev. 13: 9ff. “If a mole of leprosy is in a man, and the priest to whom he is brought sees that there is a white rising in the skin, and this has turned the hair white, and there is raw (proud) flesh upon the elevation, it is an old leprosy.” The apodosis to vv. 9 and 10 commences with v. 11. **בְּשָׂר חַי** living, i.e., raw, proud flesh. **מִחַיָּה** the preservation of life (Gen. 45: 5), sustenance (Jud. 6: 4); here, in vv. 10 and 24, it signifies life in the sense of that which shows life, not a blow or spot (**נָגַע**, from **מָחָה** to strike), as it is only in a geographical sense that the verb has this signification, viz., to strike against, or reach as far as (Num. 34:11). If the priest found that the evil was an old, long-standing leprosy, he was to pronounce the man unclean, and not first of all to shut him up, as there was no longer any doubt about the matter.

Lev. 13:12, 13. If, on the other hand, the leprosy broke out blooming on the skin, and covered the whole of the skin from head to foot “with regard to the whole sight of the eyes of the priest,” i.e., as far as his eyes could see, the priest was to pronounce the person clean. “He has turned quite white,” i.e., his dark body has all become white. The breaking out of the leprous matter in this complete and rapid way upon the surface of the whole body was the crisis of the disease; the diseased matter turned into a scurf, which died away and then fell off.

Lev. 13:14. “But in the day when proud flesh appears upon him, he is unclean,...the proud flesh is unclean; it is leprosy.” That is to say, if proud flesh appeared after the body had been covered with a white scurf, with which the diseased matter had apparently exhausted itself, the disease was not removed, and the person affected with it was to be pronounced unclean.

The *third case*: if the leprosy proceeded from an abscess which had been cured. In v. 18 **בְּשָׂר** is first of all used absolutely, and then resumed with **בּו**, and the latter again is more closely defined in **בְּעֵרוֹ**: “if there arises in the flesh, in him, in his skin, an abscess, and (it) is healed, and there arises in the place of the abscess a white elevation, or a spot of a reddish white, he (the person so affected) shall appear at the priest’s.”

Lev. 13:20. If the priest found the appearance of the diseased spot lower than the surrounding skin, and the hair upon it turned white, he was to pronounce the person unclean. “It is a mole of leprosy: it has broken out upon the abscess.”

Lev. 13:21ff. But if the hair had not turned white upon the spot, and there was no depression on the skin, and it (the spot) was pale, the priest was to shut him up for seven days. If the mole spread upon the skin during this period, it was leprosy; but if the spot stood in its place, and had not spread, it was **הַשְּׁחִין צָרְבַת**, “the closing of the abscess:” literally “the burning;” here, that part of the skin or flesh which has been burnt up or killed by the inflammation or abscess, and gradually falls off as scurf (*Knobel*).

Lev. 13:24-28. The *fourth case* (vv. 24-28): if there was a burnt place upon the skin of the flesh (**מִכְוֵת־אֵשׁ**, a spot where he had burnt himself with fire, the scar of a burn), and the “life of the scar” — i.e., the skin growing or forming upon the scar (see v. 10) — “becomes a whitish red, or white spot,” i.e., if it formed itself into a bright swollen spot. This was to be treated exactly like the previous case. **שֹׁאֵת הַמִּכְוֶה** (v. 28), rising of the scar of the burn, i.e., a rising of the flesh and skin growing out of the scar of the burn.

Lev. 13:29-37. Leprosy upon the head or chin. — If the priest saw a mole upon the head or chin of a man or woman, the appearance of which was deeper than the skin, and on which the hair was yellow (**צָהָב** golden, reddish, fox-colour) and thin, he was to regard it as **נִתְקַ**. Leprosy on the head or chin is called **נִתְקַ**, probably from **נָתַק** to pluck or tear, from its plucking out the hair, or causing it to fall off; like **κνίφη**, the itch, from **κνῶω**, to itch or scratch, and *scabies*, from *scabere*. But if he did not observe these two symptoms, if there was no depression of the skin, and the hair was black and not yellow, he was to shut up the person affected for seven days. In **שָׁחַר אֵין בּוֹ** (v. 31) there is certainly an error of the text: either **חַר** must be retained and **אֵין** dropped, or **שָׁחַר** must be altered into **צָהָב**, according to v. 37. The latter is probably the better of the two.

Lev. 13:32ff. If the mole had not spread by that time, and the two signs mentioned were not discernible, the person affected was to shave himself, but not to shave the *nethek*, the eruption or scurfy place, and the priest was to shut him up for seven days more, and then to look whether any alteration had taken place; and if not, to pronounce him clean, whereupon he was to wash his clothes (see v. 6).

Lev. 13:35, 36. But if the eruption spread even after his purification, the priest, on seeing this, was not to look for yellow hair. “He is unclean:” that is to say, he was to pronounce him unclean without searching for yellow hairs; the spread of the eruption was a sufficient proof of the leprosy.

Lev. 13:37. But if, on the contrary, the eruption stood (see v. 5), and black hair grew out of it, he was healed, and the person affected was to be declared clean.

Lev. 13:38, 39. Harmless leprosy. — This broke out upon the skin of the body in **תַּהַרְרָה** plaits, “white rings.” If these were dull or a pale white, it was the harmless *bohak*, **ἀλφός** (LXX), which did not defile, and which even the Arabs, who still call it *bahak*, consider harmless. It is an eruption upon the skin, appearing in somewhat elevated spots or rings of unequal sizes and a pale white colour, which do not change the hair; it causes no inconvenience, and lasts from two months to two years.

Lev. 13:40-44. The leprosy of bald heads. — **קַרְחָה** is a head bald behind; **קַרְחָה**, in front, “bald from the side, or edge of his face, i.e., from the forehead and temples.” Bald heads of both kinds were naturally clean.

Lev. 13:42ff. But if a white reddish mole was formed upon the bald place before or behind, it was leprosy breaking out upon it, and was to be recognised by the fact that the rising of the mole had the appearance of leprosy on the skin of the body. In that case the person was unclean, and to be pronounced so by the priest. “On his head is his plague of leprosy,” i.e., he has it in his head.

Lev. 13:45 and 46. With regard to *the treatment of lepers*, the lawgiver prescribed that they should wear mourning costume, rend their clothes, leave the hair of their head in disorder (see at Lev. 10: 6), keep the beard covered (Eze. 24:17, 22), and cry “Unclean, unclean,” that every one might avoid them for fear of being defiled (Lam. 4:15); and as long as the disease lasted they were to dwell apart outside the camp (Num. 5: 2ff., 12:10ff., cf. 2Ki. 15: 5; 7: 3), ^{B3} a rule which implies that the leper rendered others unclean by contact. From this the Rabbins taught, that by merely entering a house, a leper polluted everything within it (*Mishnah*, *Kelim* i. 4; *Negaim* xiii. 11).

Lev. 13:47-59. Leprosy in linen, woollen, and leather fabrics and clothes. — The only wearing apparel mentioned in v. 47 is either woollen or linen, as in Deu. 22:11, Hos. 2: 7, Pro. 31:13; and among the ancient Egyptians and ancient Greeks these were the materials usually worn. In vv. 48ff. **שֵׁתִי** and **עֵרְב**, “the flax and the wool,” i.e., for linen and woollen fabrics, are distinguished from clothes of wool or flax. The rendering given to these words by the early translators is **στήμων** and **κρόκη**, *stamen et subtegmen* (LXX, *Vulg.*), i.e., warp and weft. The objection offered to this rendering, that warp and weft could not be kept so separate from one another, that the one could be touched and rendered leprous without the other, has been met by *Gussetius* by the simple but

correct remark, that the reference is to the yarn prepared for the warp and weft, and not to the woven fabrics themselves. So long as the yarn was not woven into a fabric, the warp-yarn and weft-yarn might very easily be separated and lie in different places, so that the one could be injured without the other. In this case the yarn intended for weaving is distinguished from the woven material, just as the leather is afterwards distinguished from leather-work (v. 49). The signs of leprosy were, if the mole in the fabric was greenish or reddish. In that case the priest was to shut up the thing affected with leprosy for seven days, and then examine it. If the mole had spread in the meantime, it was a “grievous leprosy.” מִמְאֲרָתָּהּ, from מֵאֲרָר irritavit, recruduit (*vulnus*), is to be explained, as it is by *Bochart*, as signifying *lepra exasperata*. מִמְאֲרָתָּהּ הִנְנֵעַ making the mole bad or angry; not, as *Gesenius* maintains, from מֵאֲרָר = מֵרָר *acerbum faciens*, i.e., *dolorem acerbum excitans*, which would not apply to leprosy in fabrics and houses (Lev. 14:44), and is not required by Eze. 28:24. All such fabrics were to be burned as unclean.

Lev. 13:53ff. If the mole had not spread during the seven days, the priest was to cause the fabric in which the mole appeared to be washed, and then shut it up for seven days more. If the mole did not alter its appearance after being washed, even though it had not spread, the fabric was unclean, and was therefore to be burned. “It is a corroding in the back and front” (of the fabric of leather).

בְּפִחָתָּהּ, from פִּחָתָּהּ, in Syriac *fodit*, from which comes פִּחָתָּהּ a pit, lit., a digging: here a corroding depression. קִרְרָחָתָּהּ a bald place in the front or right side, גִּבְבָּחָתָּהּ a bald place in the back or left side of the fabric or leather.

Lev. 13:56. But if the mole had turned pale by the seventh day after the washing, it (the place of the mole) was to be separated (torn off) from the clothes, leather or yarn, and then (as is added afterwards in v. 58) the garment or fabric from which the mole had disappeared was to be washed a second time, and would then be clean.

Lev. 13:57. But if the mole appeared *again* in any such garment or cloth, i.e., if it appeared again after this, it was a leprosy bursting forth afresh, and the thing affected with it was to be burned. Leprosy in linen and woollen fabrics or clothes, and in leather, consisted in all probability in nothing but so-called mildew, which commonly arises from damp and want of air, and consists, in the case of linen, of round, partially coloured spots, which spread, and gradually eat up the fabric, until it falls to pieces like mould. In leather the mildew consists most strictly of “holes eaten in,” and is of a “greenish, reddish, or whitish colour, according to the species of the delicate cryptogami by which it has been formed.”

Lev. 14: 1-32. Purification of the leper, after his recovery from his disease. As leprosy, regarded as a decomposition of the vital juices, and as putrefaction in a living body, was an image of death, and like this introduced the same dissolution and destruction of life into the corporeal sphere which sin introduced into the spiritual; and as the leper for this very reason as not only excluded from the fellowship of the sanctuary, but cut off from intercourse with the covenant nation which was called to sanctification: the man, when recovered from leprosy, was first of all to be received into the fellowship of the covenant nation by a significant rite of purification, and then again to be still further inducted into living fellowship with Jehovah in His sanctuary. Hence the purification prescribed was divided into two acts, separated from one another by an interval of seven days.

Lev. 14: 2-8. The first act (vv. 2-8) set forth the restoration of the man, who had been regarded as dead, into the fellowship of the living members of the covenant nation, and was therefore performed by the priest outside the camp.

Lev. 14: 2ff. On the day of his purification the priest was to examine the leper outside the camp; and if he found the leprosy cured and gone (נִרְפָּא מִן, *const. praegnans*, healed away from, i.e., healed and gone away from), he was to send for (lit., order them to fetch or bring) two living (חַיִּים, with all the fulness of their vital power) birds (without any precise direction as to the kind, not merely sparrows), and (a piece of) cedar-wood and coccus (probably scarlet wool, or a little piece of scarlet cloth), and hyssop (see at Exo. 12:22).

Lev. 14: 5ff. The priest was to have one of the birds killed *into* an earthen vessel upon fresh water (water drawn from a fountain or brook, Lev. 15:13, Gen. 26:19), that is to say, slain in such a manner that its blood should flow into the fresh water which was in a vessel, and should mix with it. He was then to take the (other) live bird, together with the cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop, and dip them (these accompaniments) along with the bird into the blood of the one which had been killed over the water. With this the person cured of leprosy was to be sprinkled seven times (see Lev. 4: 6) and purified; after which the living bird was to be “let loose upon the face of the field,” i.e., to be allowed to fly away into the open country. The two birds were symbols of the person to be cleansed. The one let loose into the open country is regarded by all the commentators as a symbolical representation of the fact, that the former leper was now imbued with new vital energy, and released from the fetters of his disease, and could now return in liberty again into the fellowship of his countrymen. But if this is established, the other must also be a symbol of the leper; and just as in the second the essential point in the symbol was its escape to the open country, in the first the main point must have been its death. Not,

however, in this sense, that it was a figurative representation of the previous condition of the leper; but that, although it was no true sacrifice, since there was no sprinkling of blood in connection with it, its bloody death was intended to show that the leper would necessarily have suffered death on account of his uncleanness, which reached to the very foundation of his life, if the mercy of God had not delivered him from this punishment of sin, and restored to him the full power and vigour of life again. The restitution of this full and vigorous life was secured to him symbolically, by his being sprinkled with the blood of the bird which was killed in its stead. But because his liability to death had assumed a bodily form in the uncleanness of leprosy, he was sprinkled not only with blood, but with the flowing water of purification into which the blood had flowed, and was thus purified from his mortal uncleanness. Whereas one of the birds, however, had to lay down its life, and shed its blood for the person to be cleansed, the other was made into a symbol of the person to be cleansed by being bathed in the mixture of blood and water; and its release, to return to its fellows and into its nest, represented his deliverance from the ban of death which rested upon leprosy, and his return to the fellowship of his own nation. This signification of the rite serves to explain not only the appointment of birds for the purpose, since free unfettered movement in all directions could not be more fittingly represented by anything than by birds, which are distinguished from all other animals by their freedom and rapidity of motion, but also the necessity for their being alive and clean, viz., to set forth the renewal of life and purification; also the addition of cedar-wood, scarlet wool, and hyssop, by which the life-giving power of the blood mixed with living (spring) water was to be still further strengthened. The cedar-wood, on account of its antiseptic qualities (*ἔχει ἄσηπτον ἢ κέδρος*, *Theodor.* on Eze. 17:22), was a symbol of the continuance of life; the coccus colour, a symbol of freshness of life, or fulness of vital energy; and the hyssop (*βοτάνη ῥυπτικὴ*, *herba humilis, medicinalis, purgandis pulmonibus apta*: *August.* on Psa. 51), a symbol of purification from the corruption of death. The sprinkling was performed seven times, because it referred to a readmission into the covenant, the stamp of which was seven; and it was made with a mixture of blood and fresh water, the blood signifying life, the water purification.

Lev. 14: 8. After this symbolical purification from the mortal ban of leprosy, the person cleansed had to purify himself bodily, by washing his clothes, shaving off all his hair — i.e., not merely the hair of his head and beard, but that of his whole body (cf. v. 9), — and bathing in water; and he could then enter into the camp. But he had still to remain outside his tent for seven days, not only because he did not yet feel himself at home in the congregation, or because he was still to retain the consciousness that something else was wanting before he could be fully restored, but, as the Chaldee has explained it by adding the

clause, *et non accedat ad latus uxoris suae*, that he might not defile himself again by conjugal rights, and so interrupt his preparation for readmission into fellowship with Jehovah.

Lev. 14: 9-20. The *second act* (vv. 9-20) effected his restoration to fellowship with Jehovah, and his admission to the sanctuary. It commenced on the seventh day after the first with a fresh purification; viz., shaving off all the hair from the head, the beard, the eyebrows — in fact, the whole body, — washing the clothes, and bathing the body. On the eighth day there followed a sacrificial expiation; and for this the person to be expiated was to bring two sheep without blemish, a ewe-lamb of a year old, three-tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil as a meat-offering, and a log (or one-twelfth of a hin, i.e., as much as six hens' eggs, or 15·62 Rhenish cubic inches) of oil; and the priest was to present him, together with these gifts, before Jehovah, i.e., before the altar of burnt-offering. The one lamb was then offered by the priest as a trespass-offering, together with the log of oil; and both of these were waves by him. By the waving, which did not take place on other occasions in connection with sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, the lamb and oil were transferred symbolically to the Lord; and by the fat that these sacrificial gifts represented the offerer, the person to be consecrated to the Lord by means of them was dedicated to His service again, just as the Levites were dedicated to the Lord by the ceremony of waving (Num. 8:11, 15). But a trespass-offering was required as the consecration-offering, because the consecration itself served as a restoration to all the rights of the priestly covenant nation, which had been lost by the mortal ban of leprosy. ¹³⁴

Lev. 14:13, 14. After the slaying of the lamb in the holy place, as the trespass-offering, like the sin-offering, was most holy and belonged to the priest (see at Lev. 7: 6), the priest put some of its blood upon the tip of the right ear, the right thumb, and the great toe of the right foot of the person to be consecrated, in order that the organ of hearing, with which he hearkened to the word of the Lord, and those used in acting and walking according to His commandments, might thereby be sanctified through the power of the atoning blood of the sacrifice; just as in the dedication of the priests (Lev. 8:24).

Lev. 14:15-18. The priest then poured some oil out of the log into the hollow of his left hand, and dipping the finger of his right hand in the oil, sprinkled it seven times before Jehovah, i.e., before the altar of burnt-offering, to consecrate the oil to God, and sanctify it for further use. With the rest of the oil he smeared the same organs of the person to be consecrated which he had already smeared with blood, placing it, in fact, "*upon the blood of the trespass-offering,*" i.e., upon the spots already touched with blood; he then poured the remainder upon the head of the person to be consecrated, and so made

atonement for him before Jehovah. The priests were also anointed at their consecration, not only by the pouring of oil upon their head, but by the sprinkling of oil upon their garments (Lev. 8:12, 30). But in their case the anointing of their head preceded the consecration-offering, and holy anointing oil was used for the purpose. Here, on the contrary, it was ordinary oil, which the person to be consecrated had offered as a sacrificial gift; and this was first of all sanctified, therefore, by being sprinkled and poured upon the organs with which he was to serve the Lord, and then upon the head, which represented his personality. Just as the anointing oil, prepared according to divine directions, shadowed forth the power and gifts of the Spirit, with which God endowed the priests for their peculiar office in His kingdom; so the oil, which the leper about to be consecrated presented as a sacrifice out of his own resources, represented the spirit of life which he had received from God, and now possessed as his own. This property of his spirit was presented to the Lord by the priestly waving and sprinkling of the oil before Jehovah, to be pervaded and revived by His spirit of grace, and when so strengthened, to be not only applied to those organs of the person to be consecrated, with which he fulfilled the duties of his vocation as a member of the priestly nation of God, but also poured upon his head, to be fully appropriated to his person. And just as in the sacrifice the blood was the symbol of the soul, so in the anointing the oil was the symbol of the spirit. If, therefore, the soul was established in gracious fellowship with the Lord by being sprinkled with the atoning blood of sacrifice, the anointing with oil had reference to the spirit, which gives life to soul and body, and which was thereby endowed with the power of the Spirit of God. In this way the man cleansed from leprosy was reconciled to Jehovah, and reinstated in the covenant privileges and covenant grace.

Lev. 14:19, 20. It was not till all this had been done, that the priest could proceed to make expiation for him with the sin-offering, for which the ewe-lamb was brought, “on account of his uncleanness,” i.e., on account of the sin which still adhered to him as well as to all the other members of the covenant nation, and which had come outwardly to light in the uncleanness of his leprosy; after which he presented his burnt-offering and meat-offering, which embodied the sanctification of all his members to the service of the Lord, and the performance of works well-pleasing to Him. The sin-offering, burnt-offering, and meat-offering were therefore presented according to the general instructions, with this exception, that, as a representation of diligence in good works, a larger quantity of meal and oil was brought than the later law in Num. 15: 4 prescribed for the burnt-offering.

Lev. 14:21-32. In cases of poverty on the part of the person to be consecrated, the burnt-offering and sin-offering were reduced to a pair of turtle-doves or

young pigeons, and the meat-offering to a tenth of an ephah of meal and oil; but no diminution was allowed in the trespass-offering as the consecration-offering, since this was the *conditio sine qua non* of reinstatement in full covenant rights. On account of the importance of all the details of this law, every point is repeated a second time in vv. 21-32.

Lev. 14:33-53. The law concerning the leprosy of houses was made known to Moses and Aaron, as intended for the time when Israel should have taken possession of Canaan and dwell in houses. As it was Jehovah who gave His people the land for a possession, so “putting the plague of leprosy in a house of the land of their possession” is also ascribed to Him (v. 34), inasmuch as He held it over them, to remind the inhabitants of the house that they owed not only their bodies but also their dwelling-places to the Lord, and that they were to sanctify these to Him. By this expression, “*I put,*” the view which *Knobel* still regards as probable, viz., that the house-leprosy was only the transmission of human leprosy to the walls of the houses, is completely overthrown; not to mention the fact, that throughout the whole description there is not the slightest hint of any such transmission, but the inhabitants, on the contrary, are spoken of as clean, i.e., free from leprosy, and only those who went into the house, or slept in the house after it had been shut up as suspicious, are pronounced unclean (vv. 46, 47), though even they are not said to have been affected with leprosy. The only thing that can be gathered from the signs mentioned in v. 37 is, that the house-leprosy was an evil which calls to mind “the vegetable formations and braid-like structures that are found on mouldering walls and decaying walls, and which eat into them so as to produce a slight depression in the surface.” ^{B5}

Lev. 14:35, 36. When the evil showed itself in a house, the owner was to send this message to the priest, “*A leprous evil has appeared in my house,*” and the priest, before entering to examine it, was to have the house cleared, lest everything in it should become unclean. Consequently, as what was in the house became unclean only when the priest had declared the house affected with leprosy, the reason for the defilement is not to be sought for in physical infection, but must have been of an ideal or symbolical kind.

Lev. 14:37ff. If the leprous spot appeared in “*greenish or reddish depressions, which looked deeper than the wall,*” the priest was to shut up the house for seven days. If after that time he found that the mole had spread on the walls, he was to break out the stones upon which it appeared, and remove them to an unclean place outside the town, and to scrape the house all round inside, and throw the dust that was scraped off into an unclean place outside the town. He was then to put other stones in their place, and plaster the house with fresh mortar.

Lev. 14:43ff. If the mole broke out again after this had taken place, it was a malicious leprosy, and the house was to be pulled down as unclean, whilst the stones, the wood, and the mortar were to be taken to an unclean place outside the town.

Lev. 14:46, 47. Whoever went into the house during the time that it was closed, became unclean till the evening and had to wash himself; but whoever slept or ate therein during this time, was to wash his clothes, and of course was unclean till the evening. **הִסְגִּיר אֹתוֹ** (v. 46) may be a perfect tense, and a relative clause dependent upon **יָמֵי**, or it may be an infinitive for **הִסְגִּיר** as in v. 43.

Lev. 14:48. If the priest should find, however, that after the fresh plastering the mole had not appeared again, or spread (to other places), he was to pronounce the house clean, because the evil was cured, and (vv. 49-53) to perform the same rite of purification as was prescribed for the restoration of a man, who had been cured of leprosy, to the national community (vv. 4-7). The purpose was also the same, namely, to cleanse (**הִטַּהַר** cleanse from sin) and make atonement for the house, i.e., to purify it from the uncleanness of sin which had appeared in the leprosy. For, although it is primarily in the human body that sin manifests itself, it spreads from man to the things which he touches, uses, inhabits, though without our being able to represent this spread as a physical contagion.

Lev. 14:54-57 Vv. 54-57 contain the concluding formula to Lev. 13 and 14. The law of leprosy was given “to teach in the day of the unclean and the clean,” i.e., to give directions for the time when they would have to do with the clean and unclean.

Lev. 15. THE UNCLEANNESS OF SECRETIONS. — These include

- (1) a running issue from a man (vv. 2-15);
- (2) involuntary emission of seed (vv. 16, 17), and the emission of seed in sexual intercourse (v. 18);
- (3) the monthly period of a woman (vv. 19-24);
- (4) a diseased issue of blood from a woman (vv. 25-30). They consist, therefore, of two diseased and two natural secretions from the organs of generation.

Lev. 15: 2-15. The *running issue from a man* is not described with sufficient clearness for us to be able to determine with certainty what disease is referred to: “if a man becomes flowing out of his flesh, he is unclean in his flux.” That even here the term flesh is not a euphemism for the organ of generation, as is frequently assumed, is evident from v. 13, “he shall wash his clothes and bathe his *flesh* in water,” when compared with Lev. 16:23, 24, 28, etc., where flesh cannot possibly have any such meaning. The “flesh” is the body as in v. 7,

“whoever touches the flesh of him that hath the issue,” as compared with v. 19, “whosoever toucheth her.” At the same time, the agreement between the law relating to the man with an issue and that concerning the woman with an issue (v. 19, “her issue in her flesh”) points unmistakably to a secretion from the sexual organs. Only the seat of the disease is not more closely defined. The issue of the man is not a hemorrhoidal disease, for nothing is said about a flow of blood; still less is it a syphilitic suppuration (*gonorrhoea virulenta*), for the occurrence of this at all in antiquity is very questionable; but it is either a diseased flow of *semen* (*gonorrhoea*), i.e., an involuntary flow drop by drop arising from weakness of the organ, as *Jerome* and the Rabbins assume, or more probably, simply *blenorhoea urethrae*, a discharge of mucus arising from a catarrhal affection of the mucous membrane of the urethra (*urethritis*). The participle **וְהָיָה נֹבֵחַ** is expressive of continued duration. In v. 3 the uncleanness is still more closely defined: “whether his flesh run with his issue, or his flesh closes before his issue,” i.e., whether the member lets the matter flow out or by closing retains it, “it is his uncleanness,” i.e., in the latter case as well as the former it is uncleanness to him, he is unclean. For the “closing” is only a temporary obstruction, brought about by some particular circumstance.

Lev. 15: 4. Every bed upon which he lay, and everything upon which he sat, was defiled in consequence; also every one who touched his bed (v. 5), or sat upon it (v. 6), or touched his flesh, i.e., his body (v. 7), was unclean, and had to bathe himself and wash his clothes in consequence.

Lev. 15: 9, 10. The conveyance in which such a man rode was also unclean, as well as everything under him; and whoever touched them was defiled till the evening, and the person who carried them was to wash his clothes and bathe himself.

Lev. 15:11. This also applied to every one whom the man with an issue might touch, without first rinsing his hands in water.

Lev. 15:12, 13. Vessels that he had touched were to be broken to pieces if they were of earthenware, and rinsed with water if they were of wood, for the reasons explained in Lev. 11:33 and 6:21.

Lev. 15:13-15. When he was cleansed, i.e., recovered from his issue, he was to wait seven days with regard to his purification, and then wash his clothes and bathe his body in fresh water, and be clean. On the eighth day he was to bring two turtle-doves or young pigeons, in order that the priest might prepare one as a sin-offering and the other as a burnt-offering, and make an atonement for him before the Lord for his issue.

Lev. 15:16-18. Involuntary emission of seed. — This defiled for the whole of the day, not only the man himself, but any garment or skin upon which any of it had come, and required for purification that the whole body should be bathed, and the polluted things washed.

Lev. 15:18. Sexual connection. “If a man lie with a woman with the emission of seed, both shall be unclean till the evening, and bathe themselves in water.” Consequently it was not the *concupitus* as such which defiled, as many erroneously suppose, but the emission of seed in the *coitus*. This explains the law and custom, of abstaining from conjugal intercourse during the preparation for acts of divine worship, or the performance of the same (Exo. 19: 5; 1Sa. 21: 5, 6; 2Sa. 11: 4), in which many other nations resembled the Israelites. (For proofs see Leyrer’s article in *Herzog’s Cyclopaedia*, and *Knobel in loco*, though the latter is wrong in supposing that conjugal intercourse itself defiled.)

Lev. 15:19-24. The menses of a woman. — “If a woman have an issue, (if) blood is her issue in her flesh, she shall be seven days in her uncleanness.” As the discharge does not last as a rule more than four or five days, the period of seven days was fixed on account of the significance of the number seven. In this condition she rendered every one who touched her unclean (v. 19), everything upon which she lay or sat (v. 20), every one who touched her bed or whatever she sat upon (vv. 21, 22), also any one who touched the blood upon her bed or seat (v. 23, where **הוא** and **בוא** are to be referred to **דך**); and they remained unclean till the evening, when they had to wash their clothes and bathe themselves.

Lev. 15:24. If a man lay with her and her uncleanness came upon him, he became unclean for seven days, and the bed upon which he lay became unclean as well. The meaning cannot be merely if he lie upon the same bed with her, but if he have conjugal intercourse, as is evident from Lev. 20:18 and Num. 5:13 (cf. Gen. 26:10; 34: 2; 35:22; 1Sa. 2:22). It cannot be adduced as an objection to this explanation, which is the only admissible one, that according to Lev. 18:19 and 20:18 intercourse with a woman during her menses was an accursed crime, to be punished by extermination. For the law in Lev. 20:18 refers partly to conjugal intercourse during the hemorrhage of a woman after child-birth, as the similarity of the words in Lev. 20:18 and 12: 7 (**מקור דמייה**) clearly proves, and to the case of a man attempting cohabitation with a woman during her menstruation. The verse before us, on the contrary, refers simply to the possibility of menstruation commencing during the act of conjugal intercourse, when the man would be involuntarily defiled through the unexpected uncleanness of the woman.

Lev. 15:25-31. Diseased issue from a woman. — If an issue of blood in a woman flowed many days away from (not in) the time of her monthly uncleanness, or if it flowed beyond her monthly uncleanness, she was to be unclean as long as her unclean issue continued, just as in the days of her monthly uncleanness, and she defiled her couch as well as everything upon which she sat, as in the other case, also every one who touched either her or these things.

Lev. 15:28-30. After the issue had ceased, she was to purify herself like the man with an issue, as described in vv. 13-15. — Obedience to these commands is urged in v. 31: “Cause that the children of Israel free themselves from their uncleanness, that they die not through their uncleanness, by defiling My dwelling in the midst of them.” **הִפִּיל**, *Hiphil*, to cause that a person keeps aloof from anything, or loosens himself from it, from **נָּוַר**, *Niphal* to separate one’s self, signifies here deliverance from the state of uncleanness, purification from it. Continuance in it was followed by death, not merely in the particular instance in which an unclean man ventured to enter the sanctuary, but as a general fact, because uncleanness as irreconcilable with the calling of Israel to be a holy nation, in the midst of which Jehovah the Holy One had His dwelling-place (Lev. 11:44), and continuance in uncleanness without the prescribed purification was a disregard of the holiness of Jehovah, and involved rebellion against Him and His ordinances of grace.

Lev. 15:32, 33. Concluding formula. The words, “*him that lieth with her that is unclean,*” are more general than the expression, “*lie with her,*” in v. 24, and involve not only intercourse with an unclean woman, but lying by her side upon one and the same bed.

The Day of Atonement. — Ch. 16.

Lev. 16. The sacrifices and purifications enjoined thus far did not suffice to complete the reconciliation between the congregation of Israel, which was called to be a holy nation, but in its very nature was still altogether involved in sin and uncleanness, and Jehovah the Holy One, — that is to say, to restore the perfect reconciliation and true vital fellowship of the nation with its God, in accordance with the idea and object of the old covenant, — because, even with the most scrupulous observance of these directions, many sins and defilements would still remain unacknowledged, and therefore without expiation, and would necessarily produce in the congregation a feeling of separation from its God, so that it would be unable to attain to the true joyousness of access to the throne of grace, and to the place of reconciliation with God. This want was met by the appointment of a yearly general and perfect expiation of all the sins and

uncleanness which had remained unatoned for and uncleansed in the course of the year. In this respect the laws of sacrifice and purification received their completion and finish in the institution of the festival of atonement, which provided for the congregation of Israel the highest and most comprehensive expiation that was possible under the Old Testament. Hence the law concerning the day of atonement formed a fitting close to the ordinances designed to place the Israelites in fellowship with their God, and raise the promise of Jehovah, "I will be your God," into a living truth. This law is described in the present chapter, and contains (1) the instructions as to the performance of the general expiation for the year (vv. 2-28), and (2) directions for the celebration of this festival every year (vv. 29-34). From the expiation effected upon this day it received the name of "*day of expiations*," i.e., of the highest expiation (Lev. 23:27). The Rabbins call it briefly **יום כיפור**, the day **κατ' ἑξοχήν**.

Lev. 16: 1, 2. The chronological link connecting the following law with the death of the sons of Aaron (Lev. 10: 1-5) was intended, not only to point out the historical event which led to the appointment of the day of atonement, but also to show the importance and holiness attached to an entrance into the inmost sanctuary of God. The death of Aaron's sons, as a punishment for wilfully "drawing near before Jehovah," was to be a solemn warning to Aaron himself, "not to come at all times into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy-seat upon the ark," i.e., into the most holy place (see Exo. 25:10ff.), but only at the time to be appointed by Jehovah, and for the purposes instituted by Him, i.e., according to vv. 29ff., only once a year, on the day of atonement, and only in the manner prescribed in vv. 3ff., that he might not die. — "For I will appear in the cloud above the capporeth." The cloud in which Jehovah appeared above the capporeth, between the cherubim (Exo. 25:22), was not the cloud of the incense, with which Aaron was to cover the capporeth on entering (v. 13), as *Vitringa*, *Bähr*, and others follow the Sadducees in supposing, but the cloud of the divine glory, in which Jehovah manifested His essential presence in the most holy place above the ark of the covenant. Because Jehovah appeared in this cloud, not only could no unclean and sinful man go before the capporeth, i.e., approach the holiness of the all-holy God; but even the anointed and sanctified high priest, if he went before it at his own pleasure, or without the expiatory blood of sacrifice, would expose himself to certain death. The reason for this prohibition is to be found in the fact, that the holiness communicated to the priest did not cancel the sin of his nature, but only covered it over for the performance of his official duties, and so long as the law, which produced only the knowledge of sin and not its forgiveness and removal, was not abolished by the complete atonement, the holy God was and remained to mortal and sinful man a consuming fire, before which no one could stand.

Lev. 16: 3-5. Only **בְּזָאתָ**, “with this,” i.e., with the sacrifices, dress, purifications, and means of expiation mentioned afterwards, could he go into “the holy place,” i.e., according to the more precise description in v. 2, into the inmost division of the tabernacle, which is called *Kodesh hakkodashim*, “the holy of holies,” in Exo. 26:33. He was to bring an ox (bullock) for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering, as a sacrifice for himself and his house (i.e., the priesthood, v. 6), and two he-goats for a sin-offering and a ram for a burnt-offering, as a sacrifice for the congregation. For this purpose he was to put on, not the state-costume of the high priest, but a body-coat, drawers, girdle, and head-dress of white cloth (*bad*: see Exo. 28:42), having first bathed his body, and not merely his hands and feet, as he did for the ordinary service, to appear before Jehovah as entirely cleansed from the defilement of sin (see at Lev. 8: 6) and arrayed in clothes of holiness. The dress of white cloth was not the plain official dress of the ordinary priests, for the girdle of that dress was coloured (see at Exo. 28:39, 40); and in that case the high priest would not have appeared in the perfect purity of his divinely appointed office as chief of the priesthood, but simply as the priest appointed for this day (*v. Hofmann*). Nor did he officiate (as many of the Rabbins, and also *C. a Lapide, Grotius, Rosenmüller, and Knobel* suppose) as a penitent praying humbly for the forgiveness of sin. For where in all the world have clear white clothes been worn either in mourning or as a penitential garment? The emphatic expression, “*these are holy garments,*” is a sufficient proof that the pure white colour of all the clothes, even of the girdle, was intended as a representation of holiness. Although in Exo. 28: 2, 4, etc., the official dress not only of Aaron, but of his sons also, that is to say, the priestly costume generally, is described as “holy garments,” yet in the present chapter the word *kodesh*, “holy,” is frequently used in an emphatic sense (for example, in vv. 2, 3, 16, of the most holy place of the dwelling), and by this predicate the dress is characterized as most holy. Moreover, it was in *baddim* (“linen”) that the angel of Jehovah was clothed (Eze. 9: 2, 3, 11; 10: 2, 6, 7, and Dan. 10: 5; 12: 6, 7), whose whole appearance, as described in Dan. 10: 6, resembled the appearance of the glory of Jehovah, which Ezekiel saw in the vision of the four cherubim (Eze. 1), and was almost exactly like the glory of Jesus Christ, which John saw in the Revelation (Rev. 1:13-15). The white material, therefore, of the dress which Aaron wore, when performing the highest act of expiation under the Old Testament, was a symbolical shadowing forth of the holiness and glory of the one perfect Mediator between God and man, who, being the radiation of the glory of God and the image of His nature, effected by Himself the perfect cleansing away of our sin, and who, as the true High Priest, being holy, innocent, unspotted, and separate from sinners, entered once by His own blood into the holy place not made with hands, namely, into heaven itself, to appear

before the face of God for us, and obtain everlasting redemption (Heb. 1: 3; 7:26; 9:12, 24).

Lev. 16: 6-10. With the bullock Aaron was to make atonement for himself and his house. The two he-goats he was to place before Jehovah (see Lev. 1: 5), and “give lots over them,” i.e., have lots cast upon them, one lot for Jehovah, the other for Azazel. The one upon which the lot for Jehovah fell (עֲלָה, from the coming up of the lot out of the urn, Jos. 18:11; 19:10), he was to prepare as a sin-offering for Jehovah, and to present the one upon which the lot for Azazel fell alive before Jehovah, לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו, “to expiate it,” i.e., to make it the object of expiation (see at v. 21), to send it (them) into the desert to Azazel. עֲזָאוּל, which only occurs in this chapter, signifies neither “a remote solitude,” nor any locality in the desert whatever (as *Jonathan, Rashi*, etc., suppose); nor the “he-goat” (from עֵז goat, and עָזַל to turn off, “the goat departing or sent away,” as *Symm., Theodot., the Vulgate, Luther*, and others render it); nor “complete removal” (*Bähr, Winer, Tholuck*, etc.). The words, one lot for Jehovah and one for Azazel, require unconditionally that *Azazel* should be regarded as a personal being, in opposition to Jehovah. The word is a more intense form of עָזַל *removit, dimovit*, and comes from עֲזָלוּל by absorbing the liquid, like *Babel* from *balbel* (Gen. 11: 9), and *Golgotha* from *gulgalta* (*Ewald*, § 158c). The Septuagint rendering is correct, ὁ ἀποπομπᾶιος; although in v. 10 the rendering ἀποπομπή is also adopted, i.e., “*averruncus*, a fiend, or demon whom one drives away” (*Ewald*). We have not to think, however, of any demon whatever, who seduces men to wickedness in the form of an evil spirit, as the fallen angel *Azazel* is represented as doing in the Jewish writings (Book of Enoch 8: 1; 10:10; 13: 1ff.), like the terrible field *Shibe*, whom the Arabs of the peninsula of Sinai so much dread (*Seetzen*, i. pp. 273-4), but of the devil himself, the head of the fallen angels, who was afterwards called Satan; for no subordinate evil spirit could have been placed in antithesis to Jehovah as *Azazel* is here, but only the ruler or head of the kingdom of demons. The desert and desolate places are mentioned elsewhere as the abode of evil spirits (Isa. 13:21; 34:14; Mat. 12:43; Luk. 11:24; Rev. 18: 2). The desert, regarded as an image of death and desolation, corresponds to the nature of evil spirits, who fell away from the primary source of life, and in their hostility to God devastated the world, which was created good, and brought death and destruction in their train.

Lev. 16:11-20. He was then to slay the bullock of the sin-offering, and make atonement for himself and his house (or family, i.e., for the priests, v. 33). But before bringing the blood of the sin-offering into the most holy place, he was to take “*the filling of the censer (machtah, a coal-pan, Exo. 25:38) with fire-*

coals,” i.e., as many burning coals as the censer would hold, from the altar of burnt-offering, and “*the filling of his hands,*” i.e., two hands full of “*fragrant incense*” (Exo. 30:34), and go with this within the veil, i.e., into the most holy place, and there place the incense upon the fire before Jehovah, “*that the cloud of (burning) incense might cover the capporeth above the testimony, and he might not die.*” The design of these instructions was not that the holiest place, the place of Jehovah’s presence, might be hidden by the cloud of incense from the gaze of the unholy eye of man, and so he might separate himself reverentially from it, that the person approaching might not be seized with destruction. But as burning incense was a symbol of *prayer*, this covering of the capporeth with the cloud of incense was a symbolical covering of the glory of the Most Holy One with prayer to God, in order that He might not see the sin, nor suffer His holy wrath to break forth upon the sinner, but might graciously accept, in the blood of the sin-offering, the souls for which it was presented. Being thus protected by the incense from the wrath of the holy God, he was to sprinkle (once) some of the blood of the ox with his finger, first upon the capporeth *in front*, i.e., not upon the top of the capporeth, but merely upon or against the front of it, and then seven times *before* the capporeth, i.e., upon the ground in front of it. It is here assumed as a matter of course, that when the offering of incense was finished, he would necessarily come out of the most holy place again, and go to the altar of burnt-offering to fetch some of the blood of the ox which had been slaughtered there.

Lev. 16:15. After this he was to slay the he-goat as a sin-offering for the nation, for which purpose, of course, he must necessarily come back to the court again, and then take the blood of the goat into the most holy place, and do just the same with it as he had already done with that of the ox. A double sprinkling took place in both cases, first upon or against the capporeth, and then seven times in front of the capporeth. The first sprinkling, which was performed once only, was for the expiation of the sins, first of the high priest and his house, and then of the congregation of Israel (Lev. 4: 7, and 18); the second, which was repeated seven times, was for the expiation of the sanctuary from the sins of the people. This is implied in the words of v. 16a, “and so shall he make expiation for the most holy place, on account of the uncleanness of the children of Israel, and on account of their transgressions with regard to all their sins,” which refer to both the sacrifices; since Aaron first of all expiated the sins of the priesthood, and the uncleanness with which the priesthood had stained the sanctuary through their sin, by the blood of the bullock of the sin-offering; and then the sins of the nation, and the uncleannesses with which it had defiled the sanctuary, by the he-goat, which was also slain as a sin-offering. ¹³⁶

Lev. 16:16b,17. “And so shall he do to the tabernacle of the congregation that dwelleth among them.” (i.e., has its place among them, Jos. 22:19) “in the midst of their uncleanness.” The holy things were rendered unclean, not only by the sins of those who touched them, but by the uncleanness, i.e., the bodily manifestations of the sin of the nation; so that they also required a yearly expiation and cleansing through the expiatory blood of sacrifice. By *ohel moed*, “the tabernacle of the congregation,” in vv. 16 and 17, as well as vv. 20 and 33, we are to understand the holy place of the tabernacle, to which the name of the whole is applied on account of its occupying the principal space in the dwelling, and in distinction from *kodesh* (the holy), which is used in this chapter to designate the most holy place, or the space at the back of the dwelling. It follows still further from this, that by the altar in v. 18, and also in v. 20 and 33, which is mentioned here as the third portion of the entire sanctuary, we are to understand the altar of burnt-offering in the court, and not the altar of incense, as the Rabbins and most of the commentators assume. This rabbinical view cannot be sustained, either from Exo. 30:10 or from the context. Exo. 30:10 simply prescribes a yearly expiation of the altar of incense on the day of atonement; and this is implied in the words “so shall he do,” in v. 16b. For these words can only mean, that in the same way in which he had expiated the most holy place he was also to expiate the holy place of the tabernacle, in which the altar of incense took the place of the ark of the covenant of the most holy place; so that the expiation was performed by his putting blood, in the first place, upon the horns of the altar, and then sprinkling it seven times upon the ground in front of it. The expression “go out” in v. 18 refers, not to his going out of the most holy into the holy place, but to his going out of the *ohel moed* (or holy place) into the court.

Lev. 16:17. There was to be no one in the *ohel moed* when Aaron went into it to make expiation in the most holy place, until he came out (of the tabernacle) again; not because no one but the chief servant of Jehovah was worthy to be near or present either as spectator or assistant at this sacred act before Jehovah (*Knobel*), but because no unholy person was to defile by his presence the sanctuary, which had just been cleansed; just as no layman at all was allowed to enter the holy place, or could go with impunity into the presence of the holy God.

Lev. 16:18, 19. After he had made atonement for the dwelling, Aaron was to expiate the altar in the court, by first of all putting some of the blood of the bullock and he-goat upon the horns of the altar, and then sprinkling it seven times with his finger, and thus cleansing and sanctifying it from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel. The application of blood to the horns of the altar was intended to expiate the sins of the priests as well as those of the

nation; just as in the case of ordinary sin-offerings it expiated the sins of individual members of the nation (Lev. 4:25, 30, 34), to which the priests also belonged; and the sevenfold sprinkling effected the purification of the place of sacrifice from the uncleanness of the congregation.

The meaning of the sprinkling of blood upon the capporeth and the horns of the two altars was the same as in the case of every sin-offering (see pp. 509 and 523). The peculiar features in the expiatory ritual of the day of atonement were the following. In the first place, the blood of both sacrifices was taken not merely into the holy place, but into the most holy, and sprinkled directly upon the throne of God. This was done to show that the true atonement could only take place before the throne of God Himself, and that the sinner was only then truly reconciled to God, and placed in the full and living fellowship of peace with God, when he could come directly to the throne of God, and not merely to the place where, although the Lord indeed manifested His grace to him, He was still separated from him by a curtain. In this respect, therefore, the bringing of the blood of atonement into the most holy place had a prophetic signification, and was a predictive sign that the curtain, which then separated Israel from its God, would one day be removed, and that with the entrance of the full and eternal atonement free access would be opened to the throne of the Lord. The *second* peculiarity in this act of atonement was the sprinkling of the blood seven times upon the holy places, the floor of the holy of holies and holy place, and the altar of the court; also the application of blood to the media of atonement in the three divisions of the tabernacle, for the cleansing of the holy places from the uncleanness of the children of Israel. As this uncleanness cannot be regarded as consisting of physical defilement, but simply as the ideal effluence of their sins, which had been transferred to the objects in question; so, on the other hand, the cleansing of the holy places can only be understood as consisting in an ideal transference of the influence of the atoning blood to the inanimate objects which had been defiled by sin. If the way in which the sacrificial blood, regarded as the expiation of souls, produced its cleansing effects was, that by virtue thereof the sin was covered over, whilst the sinner was reconciled to God and received forgiveness of sin and the means of sanctification, we must regard the sin-destroying virtue of the blood as working in the same way also upon the objects defiled by sin, namely, that powers were transferred to them which removed the effects proceeding from sin, and in this way wiped out the uncleanness of the children of Israel that was in them. This communication of purifying powers to the holy things was represented by the sprinkling of the atoning blood upon and against them, and indeed by their being sprinkled seven times, to set forth the communication as raised to an efficiency corresponding to its purpose, and to impress upon it the stamp of a divine act through the number seven, which was sanctified by the work of God in creation.

Lev. 16:20-22. After the completion of the expiation and cleansing of the holy things, Aaron was to bring up the live goat, i.e., to have it brought before the altar of burnt-offering, and placing both his hands upon its head, to confess all the sins and transgressions of the children of Israel upon it, and so put them upon its head. He was then to send the goat away into the desert by a man who was standing ready, that it might carry all its sins upon it into a land cut off; and there the man was to set the goat at liberty. עֵתִי, ἀπαξ λεγ. from עֵת an appointed time, signifies opportune, present at the right time, or ready. גְּזֵרָה, which is also met with in this passage alone, from גָּזַר to cut, or cut off, that which is severed, a country cut off from others, not connected by roads with any inhabited land. “The goat was not to find its way back” (*Knobel*). To understand clearly the meaning of this symbolical rite, we must start from the fact, that according to the distinct words of v. 5, the two goats were to serve as a sin-offering (לְחַטָּאת). They were both of them devoted, therefore, to one and the same purpose, as was pointed out by the Talmudists, who laid down the law on that very account, that they were to be exactly alike, *colore, statura, et valore*. The living goat, therefore, is not to be regarded merely as the bearer of the sin to be taken away, but as quite as truly a sin-offering as the one that was slaughtered. It was appointed לְכַפֵּר עָלָיו (v. 10), i.e., not that an expiatory rite might be performed over it, for עַל with כִּפֵּר always applies to the object of the expiation, but properly to expiate it, i.e., to make it the object of the expiation, or make expiation with it. To this end the sins of the nation were confessed upon it with the laying on of hands, and thus symbolically laid upon its head, that it might bear them, and when sent into the desert carry them away thither. The sins, which were thus laid upon its head by confession, were the sins of Israel, which had already been expiated by the sacrifice of the other goat. To understand, however, how the sins already expiated could still be confessed and laid upon the living goat, it is not sufficient to say, with *Bähr*, that the expiation with blood represented merely a covering or covering up of the sin, and that in order to impress upon the expiation the stamp of the greatest possible completeness and perfection, a supplement was appended, which represented the carrying away and removal of the sin. For in the case of every sin-offering for the congregation, in addition to the covering or forgiveness of sin represented by the sprinkling of blood, the removal or abolition of it was also represented by the burning of the flesh of the sacrifice; and this took place in the present instance also. As both goats were intended for a sin-offering, the sins of the nation were confessed upon both, and placed upon the heads of both by the laying on of hands; though it is of the living goat only that this is expressly recorded, being omitted in the case of the other, because the rule laid down in Lev. 4: 4ff. was followed. ¹³⁷

By both Israel was delivered from all sins and transgressions; but by the one, upon which the lot “for Jehovah” fell, it was so with regard to Jehovah; by the other, upon which the lot “for Azazel” fell, with regard to Azazel. With regard to Jehovah, or in relation to Jehovah, the sins were wiped away by the sacrifice of the goat; the sprinkling of the blood setting forth their forgiveness, and the burning of the animal blotting of them out; and with this the separation of the congregation from Jehovah because of its sin was removed, and living fellowship with God restored. But Israel had also been brought by its sin into a distinct relation to Azazel, the head of the evil spirits; and it was necessary that this should be brought to an end, if reconciliation with God was to be perfectly secured. This complete deliverance from sin and its author was symbolized in the leading away of the goat, which had been laden with the sins, into the desert. This goat was to take back the sins, which God had forgiven to His congregation, into the desert to Azazel, the father of all sin, in the one hand as a proof that his evil influences upon men would be of no avail in the case of those who had received expiation from God, and on the other hand as a proof to the congregation also that those who were laden with sin could not remain in the kingdom of God, but would be banished to the abode of evil spirits, unless they were redeemed therefrom. This last point, it is true, is not expressly mentioned in the text; but it is evident from the fate which necessarily awaited the goat, when driven into the wilderness in the “land cut off.” It would be sure to perish out there in the desert, that is to say, to suffer just what a winner would have to endure if his sins remained upon him; though probably it is only a later addition, not founded in the law, which we find in the *Mishnah, Joma* vi. 6, viz., that the goat was driven headlong from a rock in the desert, and dashed to pieces at the foot. There is not the slightest idea of presenting a sacrifice to Azazel. This goat was a sin-offering, only so far as it was laden with the sins of the people to carry them away into the desert; and in this respect alone is there a resemblance between the two goats and the two birds used in the purification of the leper (Lev. 14: 4ff.), of which the one to be set free was bathed in the blood of the one that was killed. In both cases the reason for making use of two animals is to be found purely in the physical impossibility of combining all the features, that had to be set forth in the sin-offering, in one single animal.

Lev. 16:23-28. After the living goat had been sent away, Aaron was to go into the tabernacle, i.e., the holy place of the dwelling, and there take off his white clothes and lay them down, i.e., put them away, because they were only to be worn in the performance of the expiatory ritual of this day, and then bathe his body in the holy place, i.e., in the court, in the laver between the altar and the door of the dwelling, probably because the act of laying the sins upon the goat rendered him unclean. He was then to put on his clothes, i.e., the coloured state-dress of the high priest, and to offer in this the burnt-offerings, for an

atonement for himself and the nation (see Lev. 1: 4), and to burn the fat portions of the sin-offerings upon the altar.

Lev. 16:26ff. The man who took the goat into the desert, and those who burned the two sin-offerings outside the camp (see at Lev. 4:11, 21), had also to wash their clothes and bathe their bodies before they returned to the camp, because they had been defiled by the animals laden with sin.

Lev. 16:29-34. “*General directions for the yearly celebration of the day of atonement.* — It was to be kept on the tenth day of the seventh month, as an “everlasting statute” (see at Exo. 12:14). On that day the Israelites were to “afflict their souls,” i.e., to fast, according to Lev. 23:32, from the evening of the 9th till the evening of the 10th day. Every kind of work was to be suspended as on the Sabbath (Exo. 20:10), by both natives and foreigners (see Exo. 12:49), because this day was a high Sabbath (Exo. 31:15). Both fasting and sabbatical rest are enjoined again in Lev. 23:27ff. and Num. 29: 7, on pain of death. The fasting commanded for this day, the only fasting prescribed in the law, is most intimately connected with the signification of the feast of atonement. If the general atonement made on this day was not to pass into a dead formal service, the people must necessarily enter in spirit into the signification of the act of expiation, prepare their souls for it with penitential feelings, and manifest this penitential state by abstinence from the ordinary enjoyments of life. To “*afflict (bow, humble) the soul,*” by restraining the earthly appetites, which have their seat in the soul, is the early Mosaic expression for *fasting* (צוּם). The latter word came first of all into use in the time of the Judges (Jud. 20:26; 1Sa. 7: 6; cf. Ps. 35:13: “I afflicted my soul with fasting”). “By bowing his soul the Israelite was to place himself in an inward relation to the sacrifice, whose soul was given for his soul; and by this state of mind, answering to the outward proceedings of the day, he was to appropriate the fruit of it to himself, namely, the reconciliation of his soul, which passed through the animal’s death” (*Baumgarten*).

Lev. 16:32ff. In the future, the priest who was anointed and set apart for the duty of the priesthood in his father’s stead, i.e., the existing high priest, was to perform the act of expiation in the manner prescribed, and that “once a year.” The yearly repetition of the general atonement showed that the sacrifices of the law were not sufficient to make the servant of God perfect according to his own conscience. And this imperfection of the expiation, made with the blood of bullocks and goats, could not fail to awaken a longing for the perfect sacrifice of the eternal High Priest, who has obtained eternal redemption by entering once, through His own blood, into the holiest of all (Heb. 9: 7-12). And just as this was effected negatively, so by the fact that the high priest entered on this

day into the holiest of all, as the representative of the whole congregation, and there, before the throne of God, completed its reconciliation with Him, was the necessity exhibited in a positive manner for the true reconciliation of man, and his introduction into a perfect and abiding fellowship with Him, and the eventual realization of this by the blood of the Son of God, our eternal High Priest and Mediator, prophetically foreshadowed. The closing words in v. 34, "and he (i.e., Aaron, to whom Moses was to communicate the instructions of God concerning the feast of atonement, v. 2) did as the Lord commanded Moses," are anticipatory in their character, like Exo. 12:50. For the law in question could not be carried out till the seventh month of the current year, that is to say, as we find from a comparison of Num. 10:11 with Exo. 40:17, not till after the departure of Israel from Sinai.

II. — Laws for the Sanctification of Israel in the Covenant-Fellowship of its God.

CH. 17-25.

HOLINESS OF CONDUCT ON THE PART OF THE ISRAELITES. — CH. 17-20.

Lev. 17-25. The contents of these four chapters have been very fittingly summed up by *Baumgarten* in the following heading: "Israel is not to walk in the way of the heathen and of the Canaanites, but in the ordinances of Jehovah," as all the commandments contained in them relate to holiness of life.

Lev. 17. Holiness of Food. — The Israelites were not to slaughter domestic animals as food either within or outside the camp, but before the door of the tabernacle, and as slain-offerings, that the blood and fat might be offered to Jehovah. They were not to sacrifice any more to field-devils (vv. 3-7), and were to offer all their burnt-offerings or slain-offerings before the door of the tabernacle (vv. 8 and 9); and they were not to eat either blood or carrion (vv. 10-16). These laws are not intended simply as supplements to the food laws in Lev. 11; but they place the eating of food on the part of the Israelites in the closest relation with their calling as the holy nation of Jehovah, on the one hand to oppose an effectual barrier to the inclination of the people to idolatrous sacrificial meals, on the other hand to give a consecrated character to the food of the people in harmony with their calling, that it might be received with thanksgiving and sanctified with prayer (1Ti. 4: 4, 5).

Lev. 17: 1, 2. The directions are given to "Aaron and his sons, and all the children of Israel," because they were not only binding upon the nation

generally, but upon the priesthood also; whereas the instructions in Lev. 18-20 are addressed to “the children of Israel,” or “the whole congregation” (Lev. 18: 2; 19: 2; 20: 2), just as special laws are laid down for the priests in Lev. 20 and 21 with reference to the circumstances mentioned there.

Lev. 17: 3-7. Whoever of the house of Israel slaughtered an ox, sheep, or goat, either within or outside the camp, without bringing the animal to the tabernacle, to offer a sacrifice therefrom to the Lord, “*blood was to be reckoned to him;*” that is to say, as the following expression, “he hath shed blood,” shows, such slaughtering was to be reckoned as the shedding of blood, or blood-guiltiness, and punished with extermination (see Gen. 17:14). The severity of this prohibition required some explanation, and this is given in the reason assigned in vv. 5-7, viz., “that the Israelites may bring their slain-offerings, which they slay in the open field, before the door of the tabernacle, as peace-offerings to Jehovah,” and “no more offer their sacrifices to the שְׂעִירִים, after whom they go a whoring” (v. 7). This reason presupposes that the custom of dedicating the slain animals as sacrifices to some deity, to which a portion of them was offered, was then widely spread among the Israelites. It had probably been adopted from the Egyptians; though this is not expressly stated by ancient writers: *Herodotus* (i. 132) and *Strabo* (xv. 732) simply mentioning it as a Persian custom, whilst the law book of *Manu* ascribes it to the Indians. To root out this idolatrous custom from among the Israelites, they were commanded to slay every animal before the tabernacle, as a sacrificial gift to Jehovah, and to bring the slain-offerings, which they would have slain in the open field, to the priest at the tabernacle, as *shelamim* (praise-offerings and thank-offerings), that he might sprinkle the blood upon the altar, and burn the fat as a sweet-smelling savour for Jehovah (see Lev. 3: 2-5). “*The face of the field*” (v. 5, as in Lev. 14: 7, 53): the open field, in distinction from the enclosed space of the court of Jehovah’s dwelling. “*The altar of Jehovah*” is spoken of in v. 6 instead of “*the altar*” only (Lev. 1: 5; 11:15, etc.), on account of the contrast drawn between it and the altars upon which they offered sacrifice to *Seirim*. שְׂעִירִים, literally goats, is here used to signify *daemones* (*Vulg.*), “field-devils” (*Luther*), demons, like the שְׂדֵיִם in Deu. 32:17, who were supposed to inhabit the desert (Isa. 13:21; 34:14), and whose pernicious influence they sought to avert by sacrifices. The Israelites had brought this superstition, and the idolatry to which it gave rise, from Egypt. The *Seirim* were the gods whom the Israelites worshipped and went a whoring after in Egypt (Jos. 24:14; Eze. 20: 7; 23: 3, 8, 19, 21, 27). Both the thing and the name were derived from the Egyptians, who worshipped goats as gods (*Josephus c. Ap. 2, 7*), particularly *Pan*, who was represented in the form of a goat, a personification of the male and fertilizing principle in nature, whom they called *Mendes* and reckoned among the eight leading gods, and to whom they had built a splendid and celebrated temple in

Thmuis, the capital of the Mendesian *Nomos* in Lower Egypt, and erected statues in the temples in all directions (cf. *Herod.* 2, 42, 46; *Strabo*, xvii. 802; *Diod. Sic.* i. 18). The expression “a statute for ever” refers to the principle of the law, that sacrifices were to be offered to Jehovah alone, and not to the law that every animal was to be slain before the tabernacle, which was afterwards repealed by Moses, when they were about to enter Canaan, where it could no longer be carried out (Deu. 12:15).

Lev. 17: 8-16. To this there are appended three laws, which are kindred in their nature, and which were binding not only upon the Israelites, but also upon the foreigners who dwelt in the midst of them.

Lev. 17: 8, 9. Vv. 8, 9 contain the command, that whoever offered a burnt-offering of slain-offering, and did not bring it to the tabernacle to prepare it for Jehovah there, was to be exterminated; a command which involved the prohibition of sacrifice in any other place whatever, and was given, as the further extension of this law in Deu. 12 clearly proves, for the purpose of suppressing the disposition to offer sacrifice to other gods, as well as in other places. In vv. 10-14 the prohibition of the eating of blood is repeated, and ordered to be observed on pain of extermination; it is also extended to the strangers in Israel; and after a more precise explanation of the reason for the law, is supplemented by instructions for the disposal of the blood of edible game. God threatens that He will inflict the punishment Himself, because the eating of blood was a transgression of the law which might easily escape the notice of the authorities. “To set one’s face against:” i.e., to judge. The reason for the command in v. 11, “For the soul of the flesh (the soul which gives life to the flesh) is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls,” is not a double one, viz., (1) because the blood contained the soul of the animal, and (2) because God had set apart the blood, as the medium of expiation for the human soul, for the altar, i.e., to be sprinkled upon the altar. The first reason simply forms the foundation for the second: God appointed the blood for the altar, as containing the soul of the animal, to be the medium of expiation for the souls of men, and therefore prohibited its being used as food. “For the blood it expiates *by virtue of* the soul,” not “the soul” itself. כֶּבֶד with כִּפֹּר has only a local or instrumental signification (Lev. 6:23; 16:17, 27; also 7: 7; Exo. 29:33; Num. 5: 8). Accordingly, it was not the blood as such, but the blood as the vehicle of the soul, which possessed expiatory virtue; because the animal soul was offered to God upon the altar as a substitute for the human soul. Hence every bleeding sacrifice had an expiatory force, though without being an expiatory sacrifice in the strict sense of the word.

Lev. 17:13. The blood also of such hunted game as was edible, whether bird or beast, was not to be eaten either by the Israelite or stranger, but to be poured out and covered with earth. In Deu. 12:16 and 24, where the command to slay all the domestic animals at the tabernacle as slain-offerings is repealed, this is extended to such domestic animals as were slaughtered for food; their blood also was not to be eaten, but to be poured upon the earth “like water,” i.e., not *quasi rem profanam et nullo ritu sacro* (Rosenmüller, etc.), but like water which is poured upon the earth, sucked in by it, and thus given back to the womb of the earth, from which God had caused the animals to come forth at their creation (Gen. 1:24). Hence pouring it out upon the earth like water was substantially the same as pouring it out and covering it with earth (cf. Eze. 24: 7, 8); and the purpose of the command was to prevent the desecration of the vehicle of the soulish life, which was sanctified as the medium of expiation.

Lev. 17:14. “For as for the soul of all flesh...its blood makes out its soul:” i.e., “this is the case with the soul of all flesh, that it is its blood which makes out its soul.” **בַּנֶּפֶשׁוֹ** is to be taken as a predicate in its meaning, introduced with *beth essentiale*. It is only as so understood, that the clause supplies a reason at all in harmony with the context. Because the distinguishing characteristic of the blood as, that it was the soul of the being when living in the flesh; therefore it was not to be eaten in the case of any animal: and even in the case of animals that were not proper for sacrifice, it was to be allowed to run out upon the ground, and then covered with earth, or, so to speak, buried. ³⁸ — Lastly (vv. 15, 16), the prohibition against eating “that which died” (Lev. 11:39, 40), or “that which was torn” (Exo. 22:30), is renewed and supplemented by the law, that whoever, either of the natives or of foreigners, should eat the flesh of that which had fallen (died a natural death), or had been torn in pieces by wild beasts (sc., thoughtlessly or in ignorance; cf. Lev. 5: 2), and neglected the legal purification afterwards, was to bear his iniquity (Lev. 5: 1). Of course the flesh intended is that of animals which were clean, and therefore allowable as food, when properly slaughtered, and which became unclean simply from the fact, that when they had died a natural death, or had been torn to pieces by wild beasts, the blood remained in the flesh, or did not flow out in a proper manner. According to Exo. 22:30, the **נִבְלָה** (that which had fallen) was to be thrown to the dogs; but in Deu. 14:21 permission is given either to sell it or give it to a stranger or alien, to prevent the plea that it was a pity that such a thing should be entirely wasted, and so the more effectually to secure the observance of the command, that it was not to be eaten by an Israelite.

Lev. 18. Holiness of the Marriage Relation. — The prohibition of incest and similar sensual abominations is introduced with a general warning as to the

licentious customs of the Egyptians and Canaanites, and an exhortation to walk in the judgments and ordinances of Jehovah (vv. 2-5), and is brought to a close with a threatening allusion to the consequences of all such defilements (vv. 24-30).

Lev. 18: 1-5. By the words, “I am Jehovah your God,” which are placed at the head and repeated at the close (v. 30), the observance of the command is enforced upon the people as a covenant obligation, and urged upon them most strongly by the promise, that through the observance of the ordinances and judgments of Jehovah they should live (v. 5).

Lev. 18: 5. “The man who does them (the ordinances of Jehovah) shall live (gain true life) through them” (see at Exo. 1:16 and Gen. 3:22).

Lev. 18: 6-18. The laws against incest are introduced in v. 6 with the general prohibition, descriptive of the nature of this sin, “None of you shall approach אֶל-כָּל-שֵׂאֵר בְּשָׂרוֹ to any flesh of his flesh, to uncover nakedness.” The difference between שֵׂאֵר flesh, and בְּשָׂר flesh, is involved in obscurity, as both words are used in connection with edible flesh (see the Lexicons). “Flesh of his flesh” is a flesh that is of his own flesh, belongs to the same flesh as himself (Gen. 2:24), and is applied to a blood-relation, blood-relationship being called שֵׂאֵרָה (or flesh-kindred) in Hebrew (v. 17). Sexual intercourse is called uncovering the nakedness of another (Eze. 16:36; 23:18). The prohibition relates to both married and unmarried intercourse, though the reference is chiefly to the former (see v. 18, Lev. 20:14, 17, 21). Intercourse is forbidden

- (1) with a mother,
- (2) with a step-mother,
- (3) with a sister or half-sister,
- (4) with a granddaughter, the daughter of either son or daughter,
- (5) with the daughter of a step-mother,
- (6) with an aunt, the sister of either father or mother,
- (7) with the wife of an uncle on the father’s side,
- (8) with a daughter-in-law,
- (9) with a sister-in-law, or brother’s wife,
- (10) with a woman and her daughter, or a woman and her granddaughter, and
- (11) with two sisters at the same time. No special reference is made to sexual intercourse with (a) a daughter, (b) a full sister, (c) a mother-in-law; the last, however, which is mentioned in Deu. 27:23 as an accursed crime, is included here in No. 10, and the second in No. 3, whilst the first, like parricide in Exo. 21:15, is not expressly noticed, simply because the crime was regarded as one that never could occur.

Those mentioned under Nos. 1, 2, 3, 8, and 10 were to be followed by the death or extermination of the criminals (Lev. 20:11, 12, 14, 17), on account of their being accursed crimes (Deu. 23: 1; 27:20, 22, 23). On the other hand, the

only threat held out in the case of the connection mentioned under Nos. 6, 7, and 9, was that those who committed such crimes should bear their iniquity, or die childless (Lev. 20:19-21). The cases noticed under Nos. 4 and 5 are passed over in Lev. 20, though they no doubt belonged to the crimes which were to be punished with death, and No. 11, for which no punishment was fixed, because the wrong had been already pointed out in v. 18. ¹³⁹

Elaborate commentaries upon this chapter are to be found in *Michaelis Abhandl. über die Ehegesetze Moses*, and his *Mos. Recht*; also in *Saalschütz Mos. Recth.* See also my *Archäologie* ii. p. 108. For the rabbinical laws and those of the Talmud, see *Selden oxur ebr.* lib. 1, c. 1ff., and *Saalschütz ut sup.*

The enumeration of the different cases commences in v. 7 very appropriately with the prohibition of incest with a mother. Sexual connection with a mother is called “uncovering the nakedness of father and mother.” As husband and wife are one flesh (Gen. 2:24), the nakedness of the husband is uncovered in that of his wife, or, as it is described in Deu. 22:30; 27:20, the wing, i.e., the edge, of the bedclothes of the father’s bed, as the husband spreads his bedclothes over his wife as well as himself (Rut. 3: 9). For, strictly speaking, גְּלוּת עֵרְוָה is only used with reference to the wife; but in the dishonouring of his wife the honour of the husband is violated also, and his bed defiled, Gen. 49: 4. It is wrong, therefore, to interpret the verse, as *Jonathan* and *Clericus* do, as relating to carnal intercourse between a daughter and father. Not only is this at variance with the circumstance that all these laws are intended for the man alone, and addressed expressly to him, but also with v. 8, where the nakedness of the father’s wife is distinctly called the father’s shame.

Lev. 18: 8. Intercourse with a father’s wife, i.e., with a step-mother, is forbidden as uncovering the father’s nakedness; since a father’s wife stood in blood-relationship only to the son whose mother she was. But for the father’s sake her nakedness was to be inaccessible to the son, and uncovering it was to be punished with death as incest (Lev. 20:11; Deu. 27:20). By the “father’s wife” we are probably to understand not merely his full lawful wife, but his concubine also, since the father’s bed was defiled in the latter case no less than in the former (Gen. 49: 4), and an accursed crime was committed, the punishment of which was death. At all events, it cannot be inferred from Lev. 19:20-22 and Exo. 21: 9, as *Knobel* supposes, that a milder punishment was inflicted in this case.

Lev. 18: 9. By the sister, the daughter of father or mother, we are to understand only the step- or half-sister, who had either the same father or the same mother as the brother had. The clause, “*whether born at home or born abroad,*” does not refer to legitimate or illegitimate birth, but is to be taken as a more precise

definition of the words, daughter of thy father or of thy mother, and understood, as *Lud. de Dieu* supposes, as referring to the half-sister “of the first marriage, whether the father’s daughter left by a deceased wife, or the mother’s daughter left by a deceased husband,” so that the person marrying her would be a son by a second marriage. Sexual intercourse with a half-sister is described as **תִּזְנֶה** in Lev. 20:17, and threatened with extermination. This word generally signifies sparing love, favour, grace; but here, as in Pro. 14:34, it means dishonour, shame, from the *Piel* **תִּזְנֶה**, to dishonour.

Lev. 18:10. The prohibition of marriage with a granddaughter, whether the daughter of a son or daughter, is explained in the words, “for they are thy nakedness,” the meaning of which is, that as they were directly descended from the grandfather, carnal intercourse with them would be equivalent to dishonouring his own flesh and blood.

Lev. 18:11. “The daughter of thy father’s wife (i.e., thy step-mother), born to thy father,” is the half-sister by a second marriage; and the prohibition refers to the son by a first marriage, whereas v. 9 treats of the son by a second marriage. The notion that the man’s own mother is also included, and that the prohibition includes marriage with a full sister, is at variance with the usage of the expression “thy father’s wife.”

Lev. 18:12 and 13. Marriage or conjugal intercourse with the sister of either father or mother (i.e., with either the paternal or maternal aunt) was prohibited, because she was the blood-relation of the father or mother. **שֵׂאֵר בְּשָׂר = שֵׂאֵר** (v. 6, as in Lev. 20:19; 21: 2, Num. 27:11), hence **שֵׂאֵרָה**, blood-relationship (v. 17).

Lev. 18:14. So, again, with the wife of the father’s brother, because the nakedness of the uncle was thereby uncovered. The threat held out in Lev. 20:19 and 20 against the alliances prohibited in vv. 12-14, is that the persons concerned should bear their iniquity or sin, i.e., should suffer punishment in consequence (see at Lev. 5: 1); and in the last case it is stated that they should die childless. From this it is obvious that sexual connection with the sister of either father or mother was not to be punished with death by the magistrate, but would be punished with disease by God Himself.

Lev. 18:15. Sexual connection with a daughter-in-law, a son’s wife, is called **תִּזְנֶה** in Lev. 20:12, and threatened with death to both the parties concerned. **תִּזְנֶה**, from **בָּלַל** to mix, to confuse, signifies a sinful mixing up or confusing of the divine ordinances by unnatural unchastity, like the lying of a woman with a beast, which is the only other connection in which the word occurs (v. 23).

Lev. 18:16. Marriage with a brother's wife was a sin against the brother's nakedness, a sexual defilement, which God would punish with barrenness. This prohibition, however, only refers to cases in which the deceased brother had left children; for if he had died childless, the brother not only might, but was required to marry his sister-in-law (Deu. 25: 5).

Lev. 18:17. Marriage with a woman and her daughter, whether both together or in succession, is described in Deu. 27:20 as an accursed lying with the mother-in-law; whereas here it is the relation to the step-daughter which is primarily referred to, as we may see from the parallel prohibition, which is added, against taking the daughter of her son or daughter, i.e., the granddaughter-in-law. Both of these were crimes against blood-relationship which were to be punished with death in the case of both parties (Lev. 20:14), because they were "wickedness," זָמָה, lit., invention, design, here applied to the crime of licentiousness and whoredom (Lev. 19:29; Jud. 20: 6; Job. 31:11).

Lev. 18:18. Lastly, it was forbidden to take a wife to her sister (עֲלִיָּהּ upon her, as in Gen. 28: 9; 31:50) in her life-time, that is to say, to marry two sisters at the same time, לְצַרֵּר "to pack together, to uncover this nakedness," i.e., to pack both together into one marriage bond, and so place the sisters in carnal union through their common husband, and disturb the sisterly relation, as the marriage with two sisters that was forced upon Jacob had evidently done. No punishment is fixed for the marriage with two sisters; and, of course, after the death of the first wife a man was at liberty to marry her sister.

Lev. 18:19-23. *Prohibition of other kinds of unchastity and of unnatural crimes.* — V. 19 prohibits intercourse with a woman during her uncleanness. נִדַּת טְמֵאָה signifies the uncleanness of a woman's hemorrhage, whether menstruation or after childbirth, which is called in Lev. 12: 7; 20:18, the fountain of bleeding. The guilty persons were both of them to be cut off from their nation according to Lev. 20:18, i.e., to be punished with death.

Lev. 18:20. "To a neighbour's wife thou shalt not give תִּשְׁכַּבְּתָהּ thy pouring as seed" (i.e., make her pregnant), "to defile thyself with her," viz., by the *emissio seminis* (Lev. 15:16, 17), a defilement which was to be punished as adultery by the stoning to death of both parties (Lev. 20:10; Deu. 22:22, cf. Joh. 9: 5).

Lev. 18:21. To bodily unchastity there is appended a prohibition of spiritual whoredom. "Thou shalt not give of thy seed to cause to pass through (sc., the fire; Deu. 18:10) for Moloch." הַמֹּלֶךְ is constantly written with the article: it is rendered by the LXX ἄρχων both here and in Lev. 20: 2ff., but ὁ Μολόχ βασιλεύς in other places (2Ki. 23:10; Jer. 32:35). *Moloch* was an old Canaanitish idol, called by the Phoenicians and Carthaginians *Melkarth*, *Baal-*

melech, *Malcom*, and other such names, and related to Baal, a sun-god worshipped, like *Kronos* and *Saturn*, by the sacrifice of children. It was represented by a brazen statue, which was hollow and capable of being heated, and formed with a bull's head, and arms stretched out to receive the children to be sacrificed. From the time of Ahaz children were slain at Jerusalem in the valley of Ben-Hinnom, and then sacrificed by being laid in the heated arms and burned (Eze. 16:20, 21; 20:31; Jer. 32:35; 2Ki. 23:10; 16: 3; 17:17; 21: 6, cf. Psa. 106:37, 38). Now although this offering of children in the valley of Ben-Hinnom is called a "slaughtering" by Ezekiel (Eze. 16:21), and a "burning through (in the) fire" by Jeremiah (Jer. 7:31), and although, in the times of the later kings, children were actually given up to Moloch and burned as slain-offerings, even among the Israelites; it by no means follows from this, that "passing through to Moloch," or "passing through the fire," or "passing through the fire to Moloch" (2Ki. 23:10), signified slaughtering and burning with fire, though this has been almost unanimously assumed since the time of *Clericus*. But according to the unanimous explanation of the Rabbins, fathers, and earlier theologians, "causing to pass through the fire" denoted primarily going through the fire without burning, a februation, or purification through fire, by which the children were consecrated to Moloch; a kind of fire-baptism, which preceded the sacrificing, and was performed, particularly in olden time, without actual sacrificing, or slaying and burning. For februation was practised among the most different nations without being connected with human sacrifices; and, like most of the idolatrous rites of the heathen, no doubt the worship of Moloch assumed different forms at different times and among different nations. If the Israelites had really sacrificed their children to Moloch, i.e., had slain and burned them, before the time of Ahaz, the burning would certainly have been mentioned before; for Solomon had built a high place upon the mountain to the east of Jerusalem for Moloch, the abomination of the children of Ammon, to please his foreign wives (1Ki. 11: 7: see the Art. Moloch in *Herzog's Cycl.*). This idolatrous worship was to be punished with death by stoning, as a desecration of the name of Jehovah, and a defiling of His sanctuary (Lev. 20: 3), i.e., as a practical contempt of the manifestations of the grace of the living God (Lev. 20: 2, 3).

Lev. 18:22, 23. Lastly, it was forbidden to "lie with mankind as with womankind," i.e., to commit the crime of *paederastia*, that sin of Sodom (Gen. 19: 5), to which the whole of the heathen were more or less addicted (Rom. 1:27), and from which even the Israelites did not keep themselves free (Jud. 19:22ff.); or to "lie with any beast." "Into no beast shalt thou give thine emission of seed,...and a woman shall not place herself before a beast to lie down thereto." רַבֵּעַ = רַבֵּץ "to lie," is the term used particularly to denote a crime of this description (Lev. 20:13 and 15, 16, cf. Exo. 22:18). Lying with

animals was connected in Egypt with the worship of the goat; at Mendes especially, where the women lay down before he-goats (*Herodotus*, 2, 46; *Strabo*, 17, p. 802). *Aelian* (*nat. an.* vii. 19) relates an account of the crime being also committed with a dog in Rome; and according to *Sonnini*, R. 11, p. 330, in modern Egypt men are said to lie even with female crocodiles.

Lev. 18:24-30. In the concluding exhortation God pointed expressly to the fact, that the nations which He was driving out before the Israelites (the participle מְשִׁלָּה is used of that which is certainly and speedily coming to pass) had defiled the land by such abominations as those, that He had visited their iniquity and the land had spat out its inhabitants, and warned the Israelites to beware of these abominations, that the land might not spit them out as it had the Canaanites before them. The pret. יִתְקַסֵּי (v. 25) and יִקְסֶה (v. 28) are prophetic (cf. Lev. 20:22, 23), and the expression is poetical. The land is personified as a living creature, which violently rejects food that it dislikes. "*Hoc enim tropo vult significare Scriptura enormitatem criminum, quod scilicet ipsae creaturae irrationales suo creatori semper obedientes et pro illo pugnantes detestentur peccatores tales eosque terra quasi evomat, cum illi expelluntur ab ea*" (*C. a Lap.*).

Lev. 19. Holiness of Behaviour Towards God and Man. — However manifold the commandments, which are grouped together rather according to a loose association of ideas than according to any logical arrangement, they are all linked together by the common purpose expressed in v. 2 in the words, "*Ye shall be holy, for I am holy, Jehovah your God.*" The absence of any strictly logical arrangement is to be explained chiefly from the nature of the object, and the great variety of circumstances occurring in life which no casuistry can fully exhaust, so that any attempt to throw light upon these relations must consist more or less of the description of a series of concrete events.

Lev. 19: 2-8. The commandment in v. 2, "to be holy as God is holy," expresses on the one hand the principle upon which all the different commandments that follow were based, and on the other hand the goal which the Israelites were to keep before them as the nation of Jehovah.

Lev. 19: 3. The first thing required is reverence towards parents and the observance of the Lord's Sabbaths, — the two leading pillars of the moral government, and of social well-being. To fear father and mother answers to the honour commanded in the decalogue to be paid to parents; and in the observance of the Sabbaths the labour connected with a social calling is sanctified to the Lord God.

Lev. 19: 4. V. 4 embraces the first two commandments of the decalogue: viz., not to turn to idols to worship them (Deu. 31:18, 20), nor to make molten gods (see at Exo. 34:17). The gods beside Jehovah are called *elilim*, i.e., nothings, from their true nature.

Lev. 19: 5-8. True fidelity to Jehovah was to be shown, so far as sacrifice, the leading form of divine worship, was concerned, in the fact, that the holiness of the sacrificial flesh was strictly preserved in the sacrificial meals, and none of the flesh of the peace-offerings eaten on the third day. To this end the command in Lev. 7:15-18 is emphatically repeated, and transgressors are threatened with extermination. On the singular **שָׁרֵף** in v. 8, see at Gen. 27:29, and for the expression “shall be cut off,” Gen. 17:14.

Lev. 19: 9-18. Laws concerning the conduct towards one’s neighbour, which should flow from unselfish love, especially with regard to the poor and distressed.

Lev. 19: 9, 10. In reaping the field, “thou shalt not finish to reap the edge of thy field,” i.e., not reap the field to the extreme edge; “neither shalt thou hold a gathering up (gleaning) of thy harvest,” i.e., not gather together the ears left upon the field in the reaping. In the vineyard and olive-plantation, also, they were not to have any gleaning, or gather up what was strewn about (*peret* signifies the grapes and olives that had fallen off), but to leave them for the distressed and the foreigner, that he might also share in the harvest and gathering. **בַּרְבֵּי**, lit., a noble plantation, generally signifies a vineyard; but it is also applied to an olive-plantation (Jud. 15: 5), and here it is to be understood of both. For when this command is repeated in Deu. 24:20, 21, both vineyards and olive-plantations are mentioned. When the olives had been gathered by being knocked off with sticks, the custom of shaking the boughs (**בִּסֵּר**) to get at those olives which could not be reached with the sticks was expressly forbidden, in the interest of the strangers, orphans, and widows, as well as gleaning after the vintage. The command with regard to the corn-harvest is repeated again in the law for the feast of Weeks or Harvest Feast (Lev. 23:20); and in Deu. 24:19 it is extended, quite in the spirit of our law, so far as to forbid fetching a sheaf that had been overlooked in the field, and to order it to be left for the needy. (Compare with this Deu. 23:25, 26.)

Lev. 19:11ff. The Israelites were not to steal (Exo. 20:15); nor to deny, viz., anything entrusted to them or found (Lev. 5:21ff.); nor to lie to a neighbour, i.e., with regard to property or goods, for the purpose of overreaching and cheating him; nor to swear by the name of Jehovah to lie and defraud, and so profane the name of God (see Exo. 20: 7, 16); nor to oppress and rob a neighbour (cf. Lev. 5:21), by the unjust abstraction or detention of what

belonged to him or was due to him, — for example, they were not to keep the wages of a day-labourer over night, but to pay him every day before sunset (Deu. 24:14, 15).

Lev. 19:14. They were not to do an injury to an infirm person: neither to ridicule or curse the deaf, who could not hear the ridicule or curse, and therefore could not defend himself (Psa. 38:15); nor “to put a stumblingblock before the blind,” i.e., to put anything in his way over which he might stumble and fall (compare Deu. 27:18, where a curse is pronounced upon the man who should lead the blind astray). But they were to “fear before God,” who hears, and sees, and will punish every act of wrong (cf. v. 32, 25:17, 36, 43).

Lev. 19:15. In judgment, i.e., in the administration of justice, they were to do no unrighteousness: neither to respect the person of the poor (πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, to do anything out of regard to a person, used in a good sense in Gen. 19:21, in a bad sense here, namely, to act partially from unmanly pity); nor to adorn the person of the great (i.e., powerful, distinguished, exalted), i.e., to favour him in a judicial decision (see at Exo. 23: 3).

Lev. 19:16. They were not to go about as calumniators among their countrymen, to bring their neighbour to destruction (Eze. 22: 9); nor to set themselves against the blood of a neighbour, i.e., to seek his life. רָכִיל does not mean calumny, but, according to its formation, a calumniator (*Ewald*, § 149e).

Lev. 19:17. They were not to cherish hatred in their hearts towards their brother, but to admonish a neighbour, i.e., to tell him openly what they had against him, and reprove him for his conduct, just as Christ teaches His disciples in Mat. 18:15-17, and “not to load a sin upon themselves.” נָשָׂא עָלָיו חַטָּא does not mean to have to bear, or atone for a sin on his account (*Onkelos*, *Knobel*, etc.), but, as in Lev. 22: 9, Num. 18:32, to bring sin upon one’s self, which one then has to bear, or atone for; so also in Num. 18:22, שָׂאת חַטָּא, from which the meaning “to bear,” i.e., atone for sin, or suffer its consequences, was first derived.

Lev. 19:18. Lastly, they were not to avenge themselves, or bear malice against the sons of their nation (their countrymen), but to love their neighbour as themselves. נָטַר to watch for (Son. 1: 6; 8:11, 12), hence (= τηρεῖν) to cherish a design upon a person, or bear him malice (Psa. 103: 9; Jer. 3: 5, 12; Nah. 1: 2).

Lev. 19:19-32. The words, “Ye shall keep My statutes,” open the second series of commandments, which make it a duty on the part of the people of God to keep the physical and moral order of the world sacred. This series begins in v. 19 with the commandment not to mix the things which are separated in the

creation of God. “Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed, or put on a garment of mixed stuff.” בְּלֵאִים, from בָּלַא separation, signifies *duae res diversi generis, heterogeneae*, and is a substantive in the accusative, giving a more precise definition. שַׁעֲמֹנוּ is in apposition to בְּגָד בְּלֵאִים, and according to Deu. 22:11 refers to cloth or a garment woven of wool and flax, to a mixed fabric therefore. The etymology is obscure, and the rendering given by the LXX, κίβδηλον, i.e., forged, not genuine, is probably merely a conjecture based upon the context. The word is probably derived from the Egyptian; although the attempt to explain it from the Coptic has not been so far satisfactory. In Deu. 22: 9-11, instead of the field, the vineyard is mentioned, as that which they were not to sow with things of two kinds, i.e., so that a mixed produce should arise; and the threat is added, “that thy fulness (full fruit, Exo. 22:28), the seed, and the produce of the vineyard (i.e., the corn and wine grown upon the vineyard) may not become holy” (cf. Lev. 27:10, 21), i.e., fall to the sanctuary for its servants. It is also forbidden to plough with an ox and ass together, i.e., to yoke them to the same plough. By these laws the observance of the natural order and separation of things is made a duty binding upon the Israelites, the people of Jehovah, as a divine ordinance founded in the creation itself (Gen. 1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25). All the symbolical, mystical, moral, and utilitarian reasons that have been supposed to lie at the foundation of these commands, are foreign to the spirit of the law. And with regard to the observance of them, the statement of *Josephus* and the Rabbins, that the dress of the priests, as well as the tapestries and curtains of the tabernacle, consisted of wool and linen, is founded upon the assumption, which cannot be established, that שֵׁשׁ, βύσσος, is a term applied to linen. The mules frequently mentioned, e.g., in 2Sa. 13:29; 18: 9, 1Ki. 1:33, may have been imported from abroad, as we may conclude from 1Ki. 10:25.

Lev. 19:20-22. Even the personal rights of slaves were to be upheld; and a maid, though a slave, was not to be degraded to the condition of personal property. If any one lay with a woman who was a slave and betrothed to a man, but neither redeemed nor emancipated, the punishment of death was not to be inflicted, as in the case of adultery (Lev. 20:10), or the seduction of a free virgin who was betrothed (Deu. 22:23ff.), because she was not set free; but scourging was to be inflicted, and the guilty person was also to bring a trespass-offering for the expiation of his sin against God (see at Lev. 5:15ff.). נִחְרַפֶּת, from חָרַף *carpere*, lit., plucked, i.e., set apart, betrothed to a man, not abandoned or despised. הִפְדָּה redeemed, הִפְשָׁה emancipation without purchase, — the two ways in which a slave could obtain her freedom. בִּקְרָה, ἀπ. λεγ., from בָּקַר to examine (Lev. 13:36), lit., investigation, then punishment, chastisement. This

referred to both parties, as is evident from the expression, “they shall not be put to death;” though it is not more precisely defined. According to the *Mishnah, Kerith.* ii. 4, the punishment of the woman consisted of forty stripes.

Lev. 19:23-25. The garden-fruit was also to be sanctified to the Lord. When the Israelites had planted all kinds of fruit-trees in the land of Canaan, they were to treat the fruit of every tree as uncircumcised for the first three years, i.e., not to eat it, as being uncircumcised. The singular suffix in עֲרָלָתוֹ refers to בָּל, and the verb עָרַל is a *denom.* from עָרַלָה, to make into a foreskin, to treat as uncircumcised, i.e., to throw away as unclean or uneatable. The reason for this command is not to be sought for in the fact, that in the first three years fruit-trees bear only a little fruit, and that somewhat insipid, and that if the blossom or fruit is broken off the first year, the trees will bear all the more plentifully afterwards (*Aben Esra, Clericus, J. D. Mich.*), though this end would no doubt be thereby attained; but it rests rather upon ethical grounds. Israel was to treat the fruits of horticulture with the most careful regard as a gift of God, and sanctify the enjoyment of them by a thank-offering. In the fourth year the whole of the fruit was to be a holiness of praise for Jehovah, i.e., to be offered to the Lord as a holy sacrificial gift, in praise and thanksgiving for the blessing which He had bestowed upon the fruit-trees. This offering falls into the category of first-fruits, and was no doubt given up entirely to the Lord for the servants of the altar; although the expression עֲשֵׂה הַלִּוּלִים (Jud. 9:27) seems to point to sacrificial meals of the first-fruits, that had already been reaped: and this is the way in which *Josephus* has explained the command (*Ant.* iv. 8, 19). For (v. 25) they were not to eat the fruits till the fifth year, “to add (increase) its produce to you,” viz., by the blessing of God, not by breaking off the fruits that might set in the first years.

Lev. 19:26-32. The Israelites were to abstain from all unnatural, idolatrous, and heathenish conduct.

Lev. 19:26. “Ye shall not eat upon blood” (עַל) as in Exo. 12: 8, referring to the basis of the eating), i.e., no flesh of which blood still lay at the foundation, which was not entirely cleansed from blood (cf. 1Sa. 14:32). These words were not a mere repetition of the law against eating blood (Lev. 17:10), but a strengthening of the law. Not only were they to eat no blood, but no flesh to which any blood adhered. They were also “to practise no kind of incantations.” נִחֵשׁ: from נָחַשׁ to whisper (see Gen. 44: 5), or, according to some, a *denom.* verb from נָחַשׁ a serpent; literally, to prophesy from observing snakes, then to prophesy from auguries generally, *augurari.* עָרַן a *denom.* verb, not from עָרַן a cloud, with the signification to prophesy from the motion of the clouds, of

which there is not the slightest historical trace in Hebrew; but, as the Rabbins maintain, from עַיִן an eye, literally, to ogle, then to bewitch with an evil eye.

Lev. 19:27. “Ye shall not round the border of your head:” i.e., not cut the hair in a circle from one temple to the other, as some of the Arab tribes did, according to *Herodotus* (3, 8), in honour of their god *Οροτάλ*, whom he identifies with the *Dionysos* of the Greeks. In *Jer.* 9:25; 25:23; 49:32, the persons who did this are called קְצוּצֵי פֶּאהַ, round-cropped, from their peculiar tonsure. “Neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard,” sc., by cutting it off (cf. *Lev.* 21: 5), which *Pliny* reports some of the Arabs to have done, *barba abraditur, praeterquam in superiore labro, aliis et haec intonsa*, whereas the modern Arabs either wear a short moustache, or shave off the beard altogether (*Niebuhr*, Arab. p. 68).

Lev. 19:28. “Ye shall not make cuttings on your flesh (body) on account of a soul, i.e., a dead person (נֶפֶשׁ מֵת = נֶפֶשׁ מַת, *Lev.* 21:11, *Num.* 6: 6, or מַת, *Deu.* 14: 1; so again in *Lev.* 22: 4, *Num.* 5: 2; 9: 6, 7, 10), nor make engraven (or branded) writing upon yourselves.” Two prohibitions of an unnatural disfigurement of the body. The first refers to passionate outbursts of mourning, common among the excitable nations of the East, particularly in the southern parts, and to the custom of scratching the arms, hands, and face (*Deu.* 14: 1), which is said to have prevailed among the Babylonians and Armenians (*Cyrop.* iii. 1, 13, iii. 3, 67), the Scythians (*Herod.* 4, 71), and even the ancient Romans (cf. *M. Geier de Ebraeor. luctu*, c. 10), and to be still practised by the Arabs (*Arvieux Beduinen*, p. 153), the Persians (*Morier Zweite Reise*, p. 189), and the Abyssinians of the present day, and which apparently held its ground among the Israelites notwithstanding the prohibition (cf. *Jer.* 16: 6; 41: 5; 47: 5), — as well as to the custom, which is also forbidden in *Lev.* 21: 5 and *Deu.* 14: 1, of cutting off the hair of the head and beard (cf. *Isa.* 3:24; 22:12; *Mic.* 1:16; *Amo.* 8:10; *Eze.* 7:18). It cannot be inferred from the words of *Plutarch*, quoted by *Spencer*, *δοκούντες χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς τετελευτηκόσιν*, that the heathen associated with this custom the idea of making an expiation to the dead. The prohibition of כְּתַבַּת קַעֲקַע, *scriptio stigmatis*, writing corroded or branded (see *Ges. thes.* pp. 1207-8), i.e., of tattooing, — a custom not only very common among the savage tribes, but still met with in Arabia (*Arvieux Beduinen*, p. 155; *Burckhardt Beduinen*, pp. 40, 41) and in Egypt among both men and women of the lower orders (*Lane*, *Manners and Customs* i. pp. 25, 35, iii. p. 169), — had no reference to idolatrous usages, but was intended to inculcate upon the Israelites a proper reverence for God’s creation.

Lev. 19:29. “Do not prostitute thy daughter, to cause her to be a whore, lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land become full of vice” (*zimmah*: see

Lev. 18:17). The reference is not to spiritual whoredom or idolatry (Exo. 34:16), but to fleshly whoredom, the word *zimmah* being only used in this connection. If a father caused his daughter to become a prostitute, immorality would soon become predominant, and the land (the population of the land) fall away to whoredom.

Lev. 19:30. The exhortation now returns to the chief point, the observance of the Lord's Sabbaths and reverence for His sanctuary, which embrace the true method of divine worship as laid down in the ritual commandments. When the Lord's day is kept holy, and a holy reverence for the Lord's sanctuary lives in the heart, not only are many sins avoided, but social and domestic life is pervaded by the fear of God and characterized by chasteness and propriety.

Lev. 19:31. True fear of God, however, awakens confidence in the Lord and His guidance, and excludes all superstitious and idolatrous ways and methods of discovering the future. This thought prepares the way for the warning against turning to familiar spirits, or seeking after wizards. **אֹב** denotes a departed spirit, who was called up to make disclosures with regard to the future, hence a familiar spirit, *spiritum malum qui certis artibus eliciebatur ut evocaret mortuorum manes, qui praedicarent quae ab eis petebantur* (Cler.). This is the meaning in Isa. 29: 4, as well as here and in Lev. 20: 6, as is evident from Lev. 20:27, "a man or woman in whom is an *ob*," and from 1Sa. 28: 7, 8, *baalath ob*, "a woman with such a spirit." The name was then applied to the necromantist himself, by whom the departed were called up (1Sa. 28: 3; 2Ki. 23:24). The word is connected with *ob*, a skin. **יָדַעַן**, the knowing, so to speak, "clever man" (Symm. γνώστης, Aq. γνωριστής), is only found in connection with *ob*, and denotes unquestionably a person acquainted with necromancy, or a conjurer who devoted himself to the invocation of spirits. (For further remarks, see as 1Sa. 28: 7ff.).

Lev. 19:32. This series concludes with the moral precept, "Before a hoary head thou shalt rise up (sc., with reverence, Job. 29: 8), and the countenance (the person) of the old man thou shalt honour and fear before thy God." God is honoured in the old man, and for this reason reverence for age is required. This virtue was cultivated even by the heathen, e.g., the Egyptians (*Herod.* 2, 80), the Spartans (*Plutarch*), and the ancient Romans (*Gellius*, ii. 15). It is still found in the East (*Lane, Sitten und Gebr.* ii. p. 121).

Lev. 19:33-37. A few commandments are added of a judicial character. — Vv. 33, 34. The Israelite was not only not to oppress the foreigner in his land (as had already been commanded in Exo. 22:20 and 23: 9), but to treat him as a native, and love him as himself.

Lev. 19:35, 36. As a universal rule, they were to do no wrong in judgment (the administration of justice, v. 15), or in social intercourse and trade with weights and measures of length and capacity; but to keep just scales, weights, and measures. On *ephah* and *hin*, see at Exo. 16:36 and 29:40. In the renewal of this command in Deu. 25:13-16, it is forbidden to carry “stone and stone” in the bag, i.e., two kinds of stones (namely, for weights), large and small; or to keep two kinds of measures, a large one for buying and a small one for selling; and full (unadulterated) and just weight and measure are laid down as an obligation. This was a command, the breach of which was frequently condemned (Pro. 16:11; 20:10, 23; Amo. 8: 5; Mic. 6:10, cf. Eze. 45:10).

Lev. 19:37. Concluding exhortation, summing up all the rest.

Lev. 20. Punishments for the Vices and crimes Prohibited in Ch. 18 and 19. — The list commences with idolatry and soothsaying, which were to be followed by extermination, as a practical apostasy from Jehovah, and a manifest breach of the covenant.

Lev. 20: 2. Whoever, whether an Israelite or a foreigner in Israel, dedicated of his seed (children) to Moloch (see Lev. 18:21), was to be put to death. The people of the land were to stone him. רָגַם בְּאֶבֶן, *lapide obruere*, is synonymous with סָקַל, lit., *lapidem jacere*: this was the usual punishment appointed in the law for cases in which death was inflicted, either as the result of a judicial sentence, or by the national community.

Lev. 20: 3. By this punishment the nation only carried out the will of Jehovah; for He would cut off such a man (see at Lev. 17:10 and 18:21) for having defiled the sanctuary of Jehovah and desecrated the name of Jehovah, not because he had brought the sacrifice to Moloch into the sanctuary of Jehovah, as *Movers* supposes, but in the same sense in which all the sins of Israel defiled the sanctuary in their midst (Lev. 15:31; 16:16).

Lev. 20: 4, 5. If the people, however (the people of the land), should hide their eyes from him (on the *dagesh* in הָעֵלָם and יַעֲלִימוּ see the note on p. 526), from an unscrupulous indifference or a secret approval of his sin, the Lord would direct His face against him and his family, and cut him off with all that went a whoring after him.

Lev. 20: 6. He would also do the same to every soul that turned to familiar spirits and necromantists (Lev. 19:31, cf. Exo. 22:17), “to go a whoring after them,” i.e., to make himself guilty of idolatry by so doing, such practices being always closely connected with idolatry.

Lev. 20: 7, 8. For the Israelites were to sanctify themselves, i.e., to keep themselves pure from all idolatrous abominations, to be holy because Jehovah was holy (Lev. 11:44; 19: 2), and to keep the statutes of their God who sanctified them (Exo. 31:13).

Lev. 20: 9-18. Whoever cursed father or mother was to be punished with death (Lev. 19: 3); “*His blood would be upon him.*” The cursing of parents was a capital crime (see at Lev. 17: 4, and for the plural **לְאָבִי** Exo. 22: 1 and Gen. 4:10), which was to return upon the doer of it, according to Gen. 9: 6. The same punishment was to be inflicted upon adultery (v. 10, cf. Lev. 18:20), carnal intercourse with a father’s wife (v. 11, cf. Lev. 18: 7, 8) or with a daughter-in-law (v. 12, cf. Lev. 18:17), sodomy (v. 13, cf. Lev. 18:22), sexual intercourse with a mother and her daughter, in which case the punishment was to be heightened by the burning of the criminals when put to death (v. 14, cf. Lev. 18:17), lying with a beast (vv. 15, 16, cf. Lev. 18:23), sexual intercourse with a half-sister (v. 17, cf. Lev. 18: 9 and 11), and lying with a menstruous woman (v. 18, cf. Lev. 18:19). The punishment of death, which was to be inflicted in all these cases upon both the criminals, and also upon the beast that had been abused (vv. 15, 16), was to be by stoning, according to vv. 2, 27, and Deu. 22:21ff.; and by the burning (v. 14) we are not to understand death by fire, or burning alive, but, as we may clearly see from Jos. 7:15 and 25, burning the corpse after death. This was also the case in Lev. 21: 9 and Gen. 38:24.

Lev. 20:19-21. No civil punishment, on the other hand, to be inflicted by the magistrate or by the community generally, was ordered to follow marriage with an aunt, the sister of father or mother (v. 19, cf. Lev. 18:12, 13), with an uncle’s wife (v. 20, cf. Lev. 18: 4), or with a sister-in-law, a brother’s wife (v. 21, cf. Lev. 18:16). In all these cases the threat is simply held out, “they shall bear their iniquity,” and (according to vv. 20, 21) “die childless;” that is to say, God would reserve the punishment to Himself (see at Lev. 18:14). In the list of punishments no reference is made to intercourse with a mother (Lev. 18: 7) or a granddaughter (Lev. 18:10), as it was taken for granted that the punishment of death would be inflicted in such cases as these; just as marriage with a daughter or a full sister is passed over in the prohibitions in Lev. 18.

Lev. 20:22-27. The list of punishments concludes, like the prohibitions in Lev. 18:24ff., with exhortations to observe the commandments and judgments of the Lord, and to avoid such abominations (on v. 22 cf. Lev. 18: 3-5, 26, 28, 30; and on v. 23 cf. Lev. 18: 3 and 24). The reason assigned for the exhortations is, that Jehovah was about to give them for a possession the fruitful land, whose inhabitants He had driven out because of their abominations, and that Jehovah was their God, who had separated Israel from the nations. For this reason (v. 25) they were also to sever (make distinctions)

between clean and unclean cattle and birds, and not make their souls (i.e., their persons) abominable through unclean animals, with which the earth swarmed, and which God had “*separated to make unclean,*” i.e., had prohibited them from eating or touching when dead, because they defiled (see Lev. 11). For (v. 26) they were to be holy, because Jehovah their God was holy, who had severed them from the nations, to belong to Him, i.e., to be the nation of His possession (see Exo. 19: 4-6).

Lev. 20:27. But because Israel was called to be the holy nation of Jehovah, every one, ether man or woman, in whom there was a heathenish spirit of soothsaying, was to be put to death, viz., stoned (cf. Lev. 19:31), to prevent defilement by idolatrous abominations.

Holiness of the Priests, of the Holy Gifts, and of Sacrifices. — Ch. 21 and 22.

Lev. 21. The Sanctification of the Priests. — As the whole nation was to strive after sanctification in all the duties of life, on account of its calling as a nation of God, the priests, whom Jehovah had chosen out of the whole nation to be the custodians of His sanctuary, and had sanctified to that end, were above all to prove themselves the sanctified servants of the Lord in their domestic life and the duties of their calling.

- (1) They were not to defile themselves by touching the dead or by signs of mourning (vv. 1-6 and 10-12);
- (2) they were to contract and maintain a spotless marriage (vv. 7-9 and 13-15); and
- (3) those members of the priesthood who had any bodily failings were to keep away from the duties of the priests’ office (vv. 16-24).

Lev. 21: 1-6. The priest was not to defile himself on account of a soul, i.e., a dead person (*nephesh*, as in Lev. 19:28), among his countrymen, unless it were of his kindred, who stood near to him (i.e., in the closest relation to him), formed part of the same family with him (cf. v. 3), such as his mother, father, son, daughter, brother, or a sister who was still living with him as a virgin and was not betrothed to a husband (cf. Eze. 44:25). As every corpse not only defiled the persons who touched it, but also the tent or dwelling in which the person had died (Num. 19:11, 14); in the case of death among members of the family or household, defilement was not to be avoided on the part of the priest as the head of the family. It was therefore allowable for him to defile himself on account of such persons as these, and even to take part in their burial. The words of v. 4 are obscure: “*He shall not defile himself* **בַּעַל בְּעַמּוֹ**, i.e., as lord (pater-familias) among his countrymen, to desecrate himself;” and the early translators have wandered in uncertainty among different renderings. In all

probability **בעל** denotes the master of the house or husband. But, for all that, the explanation given by *Knobel* and others, “as a husband he shall not defile himself on the death of his wife, his mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, by taking part in their burial,” is decidedly to be rejected. For, apart from the unwarrantable introduction of the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law, there is sufficient to prevent our thinking of defilement on the death of a wife, in the fact that the wife is included in the “kin that is near unto him” in v. 2, though not in the way that many Rabbins suppose, who maintain that **שאר** signifies wife, but *implicite*, the wife not being expressly mentioned, because man and wife form one flesh (Gen. 2:24), and the wife stands nearer to the husband than father and mother, son and daughter, or brother and sister. Nothing is proved by appealing to the statement made by *Plutarch*, that the priests of the Romans were not allowed to defile themselves by touching the corpses of their wives; inasmuch as there is no trace of this custom to be found among the Israelites, and the Rabbins, for this very reason, suppose the death of an illegitimate wife to be intended. The correct interpretation of the words can only be arrived at by considering the relation of the fourth verse to what precedes and follows. As vv. 1b -3 stand in a very close relation to vv. 5 and 6, — the defilement on account of a dead person being more particularly explained in the latter, or rather, strictly speaking, greater force being given to the prohibition, — it is natural to regard v. 4 as standing in a similar relation to v. 7, and to understand it as a general prohibition, which is still more clearly expounded in vv. 7 and 9. The priest was not to defile himself as a husband and the head of a household, either by marrying a wife of immoral or ambiguous reputation, or by training his children carelessly, so as to desecrate himself, i.e., profane the holiness of his rank and office by either one or the other (cf. vv. 9 and 15). — In v. 5 desecration is forbidden in the event of a death occurring. He was not to shave a bald place upon his head. According to the *Chethib* **יִקְרָחָהּ** is to be pointed with **הָ** attached, and the *Keri* **יִקְרָחוּ** is a grammatical alteration to suit the plural suffix in **בְּרֵאשִׁים**, which is obviously to be rejected on account of the parallel **וּפְאֵת זְקָנָם לֹא יִגְלָחוּ**. In both of the clauses there is a *constructio ad sensum*, the prohibition which is addressed to individuals being applicable to the whole: upon their head shall no one shave a bald place, namely, in front above the forehead, “between the eyes” (Deu. 14: 1). We may infer from the context that reference is made to a customary mode of mourning for the dead; and this is placed beyond all doubt by Deu. 14: 1, where it is forbidden to all the Israelites “for the dead.” According to *Herodotus*, 2, 36, the priests in Egypt were shaven, whereas in other places they wore their hair long. In other nations it was customary for those who were more immediately concerned to shave their heads as a sign of mourning; but the Egyptians let their hair grow both upon their head and chin when any of their relations were dead, whereas they

shaved at other times. The two other outward signs of mourning mentioned, namely, cutting off the edge of the beard and making incisions in the body, have already been forbidden in Lev. 19:27, 28, and the latter is repeated in Deu. 14: 1. The reason for the prohibition is given in v. 6, — “*they shall be holy unto their God,*” and therefore not disfigure their head and body by signs of passionate grief, and so profane the name of their God when they offer the firings of Jehovah; that is to say, when they serve and approach the God who has manifested Himself to His people as the Holy One. On the epithet applied to the sacrifices, “the food of God,” see at Lev. 3:11 and 16.

Lev. 21: 7-9. Their marriage and their domestic life were also to be in keeping with their holy calling. They were not to marry a whore (i.e., a public prostitute), or a fallen woman, or a woman put away (divorced) from her husband, that is to say, any person of notoriously immoral life, for this would be irreconcilable with the holiness of the priesthood, but (as may be seen from this in comparison with v. 14) only a virgin or widow of irreproachable character. She need not be an Israelite, but might be the daughter of a stranger living among the Israelites; only she must not be an idolater or a Canaanite, for the Israelites were all forbidden to marry such a woman (Exo. 34:16; Deu. 7: 3).

Lev. 21: 8. “*Thou shalt sanctify him therefore,*” that is to say, not merely “respect his holy dignity” (*Knobel*), but take care that he did not desecrate his office by a marriage so polluted. The Israelites as a nation are addressed in the persons of their chiefs. The second clause of the verse, “*he shall be holy unto thee,*” contains the same thought. The repetition strengthens the exhortation. The reason assigned for the first clause is the same as in v. 6; and that for the second, the same as in Lev. 20: 8, 26, Exo. 31:13, etc.

Lev. 21: 9. The priests’s family was also to lead a blameless life. If a priest’s daughter began to play the whore, she profaned her father, and was to be burned, i.e., to be stoned and then burned (see Lev. 20:14). **אִישׁ כֹּהֵן**, a man who is a priest, a priest-man.

Lev. 21:10-15. The high priest was to maintain a spotless purity in a higher degree still. He, whose head had been anointed with oil, and who had been sanctified to put on the holy clothes (see Lev. 8: 7-12 and 7:37), was not to go with his hair flying loose when a death had taken place, nor to rend his clothes (see Lev. 10: 6), nor to go in to any dead body (**נַפְשֵׁת מֵת**) souls of a departed one, i.e., dead persons); he was not to defile himself (cf. v. 2) on account of his father and mother (i.e., when they were dead), nor to go out of the sanctuary *funeris nempe causa* (*Ros.*), to give way to his grief or attend the funeral. We are not to understand by this, however, that the sanctuary was to be his constant abode, as *Bähr* and *Baumgarten* maintain (cf. Lev. 10: 7). “*Neither*

shall he profane the sanctuary of his God,” sc., by any defilement of his person which he could and ought to avoid; “for the consecration of the anointing oil of his God is upon him” (cf. Lev. 10: 7), and defilement was incompatible with this. **נִזְר** does not mean the diadem of the high priest here, as in Exo. 29: 6; 39:30, but *consecration* (see at Num. 6: 7).

Lev. 21:13, 14. He was only to marry a woman in her virginity, not a widow, a woman put away, or a fallen woman, a whore (**זֹנָה** without a copulative is in apposition to **הַלְלָהּ** a fallen girl, who was to be the same to him as a whore), but “a virgin of his own people,” that is to say, only an Israelitish woman.

Lev. 21:15. “Neither shall he profane his seed (posterity) among his people,” sc., by contracting a marriage that was not in keeping with the holiness of his rank.

Lev. 21:16-24. Directions for the sons (descendants) of Aaron who were afflicted with bodily imperfections. As the spiritual nature of a man is reflected in his bodily form, only a faultless condition of body could correspond to the holiness of the priest; just as the Greeks and Romans required, for the very same reason, that the priests should be *ῥόδοι*, *integri corporis* (Plato *de legg.* 6, 759; Seneca *excerpt. controv.* 4, 2; Plutarch *quaest. rom.* 73). Consequently none of the descendants of Aaron, “according to their generations,” i.e., in all future generations (see Exo. 12:14), who had any blemish (*mum*, **מוֹמָה**, bodily fault) were to approach the vail, i.e., enter the holy place, or draw near to the altar (in the court) to offer the food of Jehovah, viz., the sacrifices. No blind man, or lame man, or *charum*, **κολοβόριον** (from **κολοβός** and **ρίον**), *naso mutilus* (LXX), i.e., one who had sustained any mutilation, especially in the face, on the nose, ears, lips, or eyes, not merely one who had a flat or stunted nose; or **שָׂרֵיט**, lit., stretched out, i.e., one who had anything beyond what was normal, an ill-formed bodily member therefore; so that a man who had more than ten fingers and ten toes might be so regarded (2Sa. 21:20).

Lev. 21:19. Whoever had a fracture in his foot or hand.

Lev. 21:20. **גִּבְנָן** a hump-backed man. **דָּק**, lit., crushed to powder, fine: as distinguished from the former, it signified one how had an unnaturally thin or withered body or member, not merely consumptive or wasted away. **בְּעֵינוֹ תִּבְלָל** mixed, i.e., spotted in his eye, one who had a white speck in his eye (*Onk., Vulg., Saad.*), not blear-eyed (LXX). **גָּרַב**, which occurs nowhere else except in Lev. 22:22 and Deu. 28:27, signifies, according to the ancient versions, the itch; and **גִּלְפַת**, which only occurs here and in Lev. 22:22, the

ring-worm (LXX, *Targ.*, etc.). מְרוּחַ אֲשָׁד, crushed in the stones, one who had crushed or softened stones; for in Isa. 38:21, the only other place where מְרוּחַ occurs, it signifies, not to rub to pieces, but to squeeze out, to lay in a squeezed or liquid form upon the wound: the Sept. rendering is μόνος γίγξ, having only one stone. Others understand the word as signifying ruptured (*Vulg.*, *Saad.*), or with swollen testicles (*Juda ben Karish*). All that is certain is, that we are not to think of castration of any kind (cf. Deu. 23: 2), and that there is not sufficient ground for altering the text into מְרוּחַ extension.

Lev. 21:22. Persons afflicted in the manner described might eat the bread of their God, however, the sacrificial gifts, the most holy and the holy, i.e., the wave-offerings, the first-fruits, the firstlings, tithes and things laid under a ban (Num. 18:11-19 and 26-29), — that is to say, they might eat them like the rest of the priests; but they were not allowed to perform any priestly duty, that they might not desecrate the sanctuary of the Lord (v. 23, cf. v. 12).

Lev. 21:24. Moses communicated these instructions to Aaron and his sons.

Lev. 22: 1-16. Reverence for Things Sanctified. — The law on this matter was,

- (1) that no priest who had become unclean was to touch or eat them (vv. 2-9), and
- (2) that no one was to eat them who was not a member of a priestly family (vv. 10-16).

Lev. 22: 2. Aaron and his sons were to keep away from the holy gifts of the children of Israel, which they consecrated to Jehovah, that they might not profane the holy name of Jehovah by defiling them הִקְדִּיר with מָן to keep away, separate one's self from anything, i.e., not to regard or treat them as on a par with unconsecrated things. The words, "*which they sanctify to Me,*" are a supplementary apposition, added as a more precise definition of the "holy things of the children of Israel;" as the expression "holy things" was applied to the holy objects universally, including the furniture of the tabernacle. Here, however, the reference is solely to the holy offerings or gifts, which were not placed upon the altar, but presented to the Lord as heave-offerings and wave-offerings, and assigned by Him to the priests as the servants of His house, for their maintenance (Num. 18:11-19, 26-29). None of the descendants of Aaron were to approach these gifts, which were set apart for them, -i.e., to touch them either for the purpose of eating, or making them ready for eating, — whilst any uncleanness was upon them, on pain of extermination.

Lev. 22: 4, 5. No leper was to touch them (see Lev. 13: 2), or person with gonorrhoea (Lev. 15: 2), until he was clean; no one who had touched a person

defiled by a corpse (Lev. 19:28; Num. 19:22), or whose seed had gone from him (Lev. 15:16, 18); and no one who had touched an unclean creeping animal, or an unclean man. **לְכָל טְמֵאתוֹ**, as in Lev. 5: 3, a closer definition of **טִמְאָה לּוֹ אִשָּׁר**, “who is unclean to him with regard to (on account of) any uncleanness which he may have.”

Lev. 22: 6, 7. “A soul which touches it,” i.e., any son of Aaron, who had touched either an unclean person or thing, was to be unclean till the evening, and then bathe his body; after sunset, i.e., when the day was over, he became clean, and could eat of the sanctified things, for they were his food.

Lev. 22: 8. In this connection the command given to all the Israelites, not to eat anything that had fallen down dead or been torn in pieces (Lev. 17:15, 16), is repeated with special reference to the priests. (On. v. 9, see Lev. 8:35; 18:30, and 19:17). **יְחַלְלֶהוּ**, “because they have defiled it (the sanctified thing).”

Lev. 22:10-16. No stranger was to eat a sanctified thing. **נָר** is in general the non-priest, then any person who was not fully incorporated into a priestly family, e.g., a visitor or day-labourer (cf. Exo. 12:49), who were neither of them members of his family.

Lev. 22:11. On the other hand, slaves bought for money, or born in the house, became members of his family and lived upon his bread; they were therefore allowed to eat of that which was sanctified along with him, since the slaves were, in fact, formally incorporated into the nation by circumcision (Gen. 17:12, 13).

Lev. 22:12, 13. So again the daughter of a priest, if she became a widow, or was put away by her husband, and returned childless to her father’s house, and became a member of his family again, just as in the days of her youth, might eat of the holy things. But if she had any children, then after the death of her husband, or after her divorce, she formed with them a family of her own, which could not be incorporated into the priesthood, of course always supposing that her husband was not a priest.

Lev. 22:14. But if any one (i.e., a layman) should eat unawares of that which was sanctified, he was to bring it, i.e., an equivalent for it, with the addition of a fifth as a compensation for the priest; like a man who had sinned by unfaithfulness in relation to that which was sanctified (Lev. 5:16). — In the concluding exhortation in vv. 15 and 16, the subject to **יְחַלְלֶהוּ** (profane) and **הִשִּׂיאוּ** (bear) is indefinite, and the passage to be rendered thus: “They are not to profane the sanctified gifts of the children of Israel, what they heave for the Lord (namely, by letting laymen eat of them), and are to cause them (the

laymen) *who do this unawares to bear a trespass-sin* (by imposing the compensation mentioned in v. 14), *if they eat their* (the priests') *sanctified gifts.*" Understood in this way, both verses furnish a fitting conclusion to the section vv. 10-14. On the other hand, according to the traditional interpretation of these verses, the priesthood is regarded as the subject of the first verb, and a negative supplied before the second. Both of these are arbitrary and quite indefensible, because vv. 10-14 do not refer to the priests but to laymen, and in the latter case we should expect **וְלֹא יֵשְׂאוּ אֲלֵיהֶם** (cf. v. 9) instead of the unusual **הִשְׂאוּ אוֹתָם**.

Lev. 22:17-33. ACCEPTABLE SACRIFICES. — Vv. 18-20. Every sacrifice offered to the Lord by an Israelite or foreigner, in consequence of a vow or as a freewill-offering (cf. Lev. 7:16), was to be faultless and male, "for good pleasure to the offerer" (cf. 1: 3), i.e., to secure for him the good pleasure of God. An animal with a fault would not be acceptable.

Lev. 22:21, 22. Every peace-offering was also to be faultless, whether brought "to fulfil a special (important) vow" (cf. Num. 15: 3, 8: **פְּלִיא**, from **פָּלַא** to be great, distinguished, wonderful), or as a freewill gift; that is to say, it was to be free from such faults as blindness, or a broken limb (from lameness therefore: Deu. 15:21), or cutting (i.e., mutilation, answering to **חָרַץ** Lev. 21:18), or an abscess (**יִבְלֶתָ**, from **יָבַל** to flow, probably a flowing suppurating abscess).

Lev. 22:23. As a voluntary peace-offering they might indeed offer an ox or sheep that was **שָׂרֹעַ וְקָלוּט**, "stretched out and drawn together," i.e., with the whole body or certain limbs either too large or too small,⁴⁰ but such an animal could not be acceptable as a votive offering.

Lev. 22:24. Castrated animals were not to be sacrificed, nor in fact to be kept in the land at all. **מְעוּדָא compressus**, **θλιβίας**, an animal with the stones crushed; **כְּתוּתָא contusus**, **θλασίνας**, with them beaten to pieces; **נְתִיקָא avulsus**, **σπάδων**, with them twisted off; **כְּרוּתָא excisus**, **τομίνας** or **ἐκτομίνας**, with them cut off. In all these different ways was the operation performed among the ancients (cf. *Aristot. hist. an.* ix. 37, 3; *Colum.* vi. 26, vii. 11; *Pallad.* vi. 7). "And in your land ye shall not make," sc., **מְעוּדָא וגו'**, i.e., castrated animals, that is to say, "not castrate animals." This explanation, which is the one given by *Josephus* (*Ant.* iv. 8, 40) and all the Rabbins, is required by the expression "in your land," which does not at all suit the interpretation adopted by *Clericus* and *Knobel*, who understand by **עֲשֶׂה** the preparation of sacrifices, for sacrifices were never prepared outside the land. The castration of animals is a mutilation of God's

creation, and the prohibition of it was based upon the same principle as that of mixing heterogeneous things in Lev. 19:19.

Lev. 22:25. Again, the Israelites were not to accept any one of all these, i.e., the faulty animals described, as sacrifice from a foreigner. “*For their corruption is in them,*” i.e., something corrupt, a fault, adheres to them; so that such offerings could not procure good pleasure towards them. — In vv. 26-30 three laws are given of a similar character.

Lev. 22:27. A young ox, sheep, or goat was to be seven days under its mother, and could only be sacrificed from the eighth day onwards, according to the rule laid down in Exo. 22:29 with regard to the first-born. The reason for this was, that the young animal had not attained to a mature and self-sustained life during the first week of its existence. ⁴⁴¹

This maturity was not reached till after the lapse of a week, that period of time sanctified by the creation. There is no rule laid down in the law respecting the age up to which an animal was admissible in sacrifice. *Bullocks*, i.e., steers or young oxen of more than a year old, are frequently mentioned and prescribed for the festal sacrifices (for the young ox of less than a year old is called עֵגֶל; Lev. 9: 3), viz., as *burnt-offerings* in Lev. 23:18, Num. 7:15, 21, 27, 33, 39ff., 8: 8; 15:24; 28:11, 19, 27; 29: 2, 8, and as *sin-offerings* in Lev. 4: 3, 14; 16: 3; — *sheep* (lambs) of one year old are also prescribed as *burnt-offerings* in Lev. 9: 3; 12: 6; 23:12, Exo. 29:38, Num. 6:14; 7:17, 21, 27, 33, 39ff., 28: 3, 9, 19, 27; 29: 2, 8, 13, 17ff., as *peace-offerings* in Num. 7:17, 23; 29:35ff., and as *trespass-offerings* in Num. 6:12; also a yearling *ewe* as a sin-offering in Lev. 14:10 and Num. 6:14, and a yearling *goat* in Num. 15:27. They generally brought older oxen or bullocks for peace-offerings (Num. 7:17; 23:29ff.), and sometimes as burnt-offerings. In Jud. 6:25 an ox of seven years old is said to have been brought as a burnt-offering; and there can be no doubt that the goats and rams presented as sin-offerings and trespass-offerings were more than a year old.

Lev. 22:28. The command not to kill an ox or sheep at the same time as its young is related to the law in Exo. 23:19 and Deu. 22: 6, 7, and was intended to lay it down as a duty on the part of the Israelites to keep sacred the relation which God had established between parent and offspring. — In vv. 29, 30, the command to eat the flesh of the animal on the day on which it was offered (Lev. 7:15; 19: 5, 6) is repeated with special reference to the praise-offering.

Lev. 22:31-33. Concluding exhortation, as in Lev. 18:29; 19:37. (On v. 32, cf. Lev. 18:21 and 11:44, 45.)

Sanctification of the Sabbath and the Feasts of Jehovah. — Ch. 23.

Lev. 23. This chapter does not contain a “calendar of feasts,” or a summary and completion of the directions previously given in a scattered form concerning the festal times of Israel, but simply a list of those festal days and periods of the year at which holy meetings were to be held. This is most clearly stated in the heading (v. 2): “*the festal times of Jehovah, which ye shall call out as holy meetings, these are they, My feasts,*” i.e., those which are to be regarded as My feasts, sanctified to Me. The festal seasons and days were called “feasts of Jehovah,” times appointed and fixed by Jehovah (see Gen. 1:14), not because the feasts belonged to fixed times regulated by the course of the moon (*Knobel*), but because Jehovah had appointed them as days, or times, which were to be sanctified to Him. Hence the expression is not only used with reference to the Sabbath, the new moon, and the other yearly feasts; but in Num. 28: 2 and 29:39 it is extended so as to include the times of the daily morning and evening sacrifice. (On the “holy convocation” see Exo. 12:16.)

Lev. 23: 3. At the head of these *moadim* stood the *Sabbath*, as the day which God had already sanctified as a day of rest for His people, by His own rest on the seventh creation-day (Gen. 2: 3, cf. Exo. 20: 8-11). On **שַׁבַּת שְׁבִטוֹן**, see at Exo. 31:15 and 16:33. As a weekly returning day of rest, the observance of which had its foundation in the creative work of God, the Sabbath was distinguished from the yearly feasts, in which Israel commemorated the facts connected with its elevation into a people of God, and which were generally called “feasts of Jehovah” in the stricter sense, and as such were distinguished from the Sabbath (vv. 37, 38; Isa. 1:13, 14; 1Ch. 23:31; 2Ch. 31: 3; Neh. 10:34). This distinction is pointed out in the heading, “*these are the feasts of Jehovah*” (v. 4).^{f42}

In Num. 28:11 the feast of new moon follows the Sabbath; but this is passed over here, because the new moon was not to be observed either with sabbatical rest or a holy meeting.

Lev. 23: 4-14. V. 4 contains the special heading for the yearly feasts. **בְּמוֹעֵדָם** at their appointed time.

Lev. 23: 5-8. The leading directions for the *Passover* and *feast of Mazzoth* are repeated from Exo. 12: 6, 11, 15-20. **מְלֹאכֶת עֲבֹדָה**, occupation of a work, signifies labour at some definite occupation, e.g., the building of the tabernacle, Exo. 35:24; 36: 1, 3; hence occupation in connection with trade or one’s social calling, such as agriculture, handicraft, and so forth; whilst **מְלֹאכָה** is the

performance of any kind of work, e.g., kindling fire for cooking food (Exo. 35: 2, 3). On the Sabbath and the day of atonement every kind of civil work was prohibited, even to the kindling of fire for the purpose of cooking (vv. 3, 30, 31, cf. Exo. 20:10; 31:14; 35: 2, 3; Deu. 5:14 and Lev. 16:29; Num. 29: 7); on the other feast-days with a holy convocation, only servile work (vv. 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36, cf. Exo. 12:16, and the explanation on p. 333, and Num. 28:18, 25, 26; 29: 1, 12, 35). To this there is appended a fresh regulation in vv. 9-14, with the repetition of the introductory clause, “*And the Lord spake,*” etc. When the Israelites had come into the land to be given them by the Lord, and had reaped the harvest, they were to bring a sheaf as first-fruits of their harvest to the priest, that he might wave it before Jehovah on the day after the Sabbath, i.e., after the first day of *Mazzoth*. According to *Josephus* and *Philo*, it was a sheaf of barley; but this is not expressly commanded, because it would be taken for granted in Canaan, where the harvest began with the barley. In the warmer parts of Palestine the barley ripens about the middle of April, and is reaped in April or the beginning of May, whereas the wheat ripens two or three weeks later (*Seetzen; Robinson’s* Pal. ii. 263, 278). The priest was to wave the sheaf before Jehovah, i.e., to present it symbolically to Jehovah by the ceremony of waving, without burning any of it upon the altar. The rabbinical rule, viz., to dry a portion of the ears by the fire, and then, after rubbing them out, to burn them on the altar, was an ordinance of the later scribes, who knew not the law, and was based upon Lev. 2:14. For the law in Lev. 2:14 refers to the offerings of first-fruits made by private persons, which are treated of in Num. 18:12, 13, and Deu. 26: 2ff. The sheaf of first-fruits, on the other hand, which was to be offered before Jehovah as a wave-offering in the name of the congregation, corresponded to the two wave-loaves which were leavened and then baked, and were to be presented to the Lord as first-fruits (v. 17). As no portion of these wave-loaves was burned upon the altar, because nothing leavened was to be placed upon it (Lev. 2:11), but they were assigned entirely to the priests, we have only to assume that the same application was intended by the law in the case of the sheaf of first-fruits, since the text only prescribes the waving, and does not contain a word about roasting, rubbing, or burning the grains upon the altar. מֶחֱרַת הַשַּׁבָּת (the morrow after the Sabbath) signifies the next day after the first day of the feast of *Mazzoth*, i.e., the 16th Abib (*Nisan*), not the day of the Sabbath which fell in the seven days’ feast of *Mazzoth*, as the Baethoseans supposed, still less the 22nd of *Nisan*, or the day after the conclusion of the seven days’ feast, which always closed with a Sabbath, as *Hitzig* imagines. ^{f43}

The “Sabbath” does not mean the seventh day of the week, but the day of rest, although the weekly Sabbath was always the seventh or last day of the week; hence not only the seventh day of the week (Exo. 31:15, etc.), but the day of

atonement (the tenth of the seventh month), is called “*Sabbath*,” and “*Shabbath shabbathon*” (v. 32, Lev. 16:31). As a day of rest, on which no laborious work was to be performed (v. 8), the first day of the feast of *Mazzoth* is called “*Sabbath*,” irrespectively of the day of the week upon which it fell; and “*the morrow after the Sabbath*” is equivalent to “the morrow after the Passover” mentioned in Jos. 5:11, where “Passover” signifies the day at the beginning of which the paschal meal was held, i.e., the first day of unleavened bread, which commenced on the evening of the 14th, in other words, the 15th Abib. By offering the sheaf of first-fruits of the harvest, the Israelites were to consecrate their daily bread to the Lord their God, and practically to acknowledge that they owed the blessing of the harvest to the grace of God. They were not to eat any bread or roasted grains of the new corn till they had presented the offering of their God (v. 14). This offering was fixed for the second day of the feast of the Passover, that the connection between the harvest and the Passover might be kept in subordination to the leading idea of the Passover itself (see at Exo. 12:15ff.). But as the sheaf was not burned upon the altar, but only presented symbolically to the Lord by waving, and then handed over to the priests, an altar-gift had to be connected with it, — namely, a yearling sheep as a burnt-offering, a meat-offering of two-tenths of an ephah of fine flour mixed with oil, and a drink-offering of a quarter of a hin of wine, — to give expression to the obligation and willingness of the congregation not only to enjoy their earthly food, but to strengthen all the members of their body for growth in holiness and diligence in good works. The burnt-offering, for which a yearling lamb was prescribed, as in fact for all the regular festal sacrifices, was of course in addition to the burnt-offerings prescribed in Num. 28:19, 20, for every feast-day. The meat-offering, however, was not to consist of one-tenth of an ephah of fine flour, as on other occasions (Exo. 29:40; Num. 28: 9, 13, etc.), but of two-tenths, that the offering of corn at the harvest-feast might be a more plentiful one than usual.

Lev. 23:15-22. The law for the special observance of the *feast of Harvest* (Exo. 23:16) is added here without any fresh introductory formula, to show at the very outset the close connection between the two feasts. Seven whole weeks, or fifty days, were to be reckoned from the day of the offering of the sheaf, and then the *day of first-fruits* (Num. 28:26) or *feast of Weeks* (Exo. 34:22; Deu. 16:10) was to be celebrated. From this reckoning the feast received the name of Pentecost (ἡ πεντηκοστή, Act. 2: 1). That שָׁבֻעוֹת (v. 15) signifies weeks, like שְׁבֻעוֹת in Deu. 16: 9, and τὰ σάββατα in the Gospels (e.g., Mat. 28: 1), is evident from the predicate תְּמִימָה, “complete,” which would be quite unsuitable if Sabbath-days were intended, as a long period might be reckoned by half weeks instead of whole, but certainly not by half Sabbath-

days. Consequently “the morrow after the seventh Sabbath” (v. 16) is the day after the seventh week, not after the seventh Sabbath. On this day, i.e., fifty days after the first day of *Mazzoth*, Israel was to offer a new meat-offering to the Lord, i.e., made of the fruit of the new harvest (Lev. 26:10), “wave-loaves” from its dwellings, two of two-tenths of an ephah of fine flour baked leavened, like the bread which served for their daily food, “as first-fruits unto the Lord,” and of the wheat-harvest (Exo. 34:22), which fell in the second half of May and the first weeks of June (*Robinson, Palestine*), and therefore was finished as a whole by the feast of Weeks. The loaves differed from all the other meat-offerings, being made of leavened dough, because in them their daily bread was offered to the Lord, who had blessed the harvest, as a thank-offering for His blessing. They were therefore only given to the Lord symbolically by waving, and were then to belong to the priests (v. 20). The injunction “out of your habitations” is not to be understood, as *Calvin* and others suppose, as signifying that every householder was to present two such loaves; it simply expresses the idea, that they were to be loaves made for the daily food of a household, and not prepared expressly for holy purposes.

Lev. 23:18, 19. In addition to the loaves, they were to offer seven yearling lambs, one young bullock, and two rams, as burnt-offerings, together with their (the appropriate) meat and drink-offerings, one he-goat as a sin-offering, and two yearling lambs as peace-offerings.

Lev. 23:20. “*The priest shall wave them* (the two lambs of the peace-offerings), *together with the loaves of the first-fruits, as a wave-offering before Jehovah; with the two lambs* (the two just mentioned), *they* (the loaves) *shall be holy to Jehovah for the priest.*” In the case of the peace-offerings of private individuals, the flesh belonged for the most part to the offerer; but here, in the case of a thank-offering presented by the congregation, it was set apart for the priest. The circumstance, that not only was a much more bountiful burnt-offering prescribed than in the offerings of the dedicatory sheaf at the commencement of harvest (v. 12), but a sin-offering and peace-offering also, is to be attributed to the meaning of the festival itself, as a feast of thanksgiving for the rich blessing of God that had just been gathered in. The sin-offering was to excite the feeling and consciousness of sin on the part of the congregation of Israel, that whilst eating their daily leavened bread they might not serve the leaven of their old nature, but seek and implore from the Lord their God the forgiveness and cleansing away of their sin. Through the increased burnt-offering they were to give practical expression to their gratitude for the blessing of harvest, by a strengthened consecration and sanctification of all the members of the whole man to the service of the Lord; whilst through the peace-offering they entered into that fellowship of peace with the Lord to which they were

called, and which they were eventually to enjoy through His blessing in their promised inheritance. In this way the whole of the year's harvest was placed under the gracious blessing of the Lord by the sanctification of its commencement and its close; and the enjoyment of their daily food was also sanctified thereby. For the sake of this inward connection, the laws concerning the wave-sheaf and wave-loaves are bound together into one whole; and by this connection, which was established by reckoning the time for the feast of Weeks from the day of the dedication of the sheaf, the two feasts were linked together into an internal unity. The Jews recognised this unity from the very earliest times, and called the feast of Pentecost *Azqereth* (Greek, Ἀσάρθᾶ), because it was the close of the seven weeks (see at v. 36; *Josephus*, Ant. iii. 10).^{f44}

Lev. 23:21. On this day a holy meeting was to be held, and laborious work to be suspended, just as on the first and seventh days of *Mazzoth*. This was to be maintained as a statute for ever (see v. 14). It was not sufficient, however, to thank the Lord for the blessing of harvest by a feast of thanksgiving to the Lord, but they were not to forget the poor and distressed when gathering in their harvest. To indicate this, the law laid down in Lev. 19: 9, 10 is repeated in v. 22.

Lev. 23:23-25. On the first day of the seventh month there was to be *shabbathon*, rest, i.e., a day of rest (see Exo. 16:23), a *memorial of blowing of trumpets*, a holy convocation, the suspension of laborious work, and the offering of a firing for Jehovah, which are still more minutely described in the calendar of festal sacrifices in Num. 29: 2-6. תְּרוּעָה, a joyful noise, from רָוַע to make a noise, is used in v. 24 for תְּרוּעַת שׁוֹפָר, a blast of trumpets. On this day the *shophar* was to be blown, a blast of trumpets to be appointed for a memorial before Jehovah (Num. 10:10), i.e., to call the congregation into remembrance before Jehovah, that He might turn towards it His favour and grace (see at Exo. 28:12, 29; 30:16); and from this the feast-day is called the day of the trumpet-blast (Num. 19: 1). *Shophar*, a trumpet, was a large horn which produced a dull, far-reaching tone. *Buccina pastoralis est et cornu recurvo efficitur, unde et proprie hebraice sopher, graece κεράτινῃ appellatur* (*Jerome on Hos. 5: 8*).^{f45}

The seventh month of the year, like the seventh day of the week, was consecrated as a Sabbath or sabbatical month, by a holy convocation and the suspension of labour, which were to distinguish the first day of the seventh month from the beginning of the other months or the other new moon days throughout the year. For the whole month was sanctified in the first day, as the beginning or head of the month; and by the sabbatical observance of the commencement, the whole course of the month was raised to a Sabbath. This

was enjoined, not merely because it was the seventh month, but because the seventh month was to secure to the congregation the complete atonement for all its sins, and the wiping away of all the uncleannesses which separated it from its God, viz., on the day of atonement, which fell within this month, and to bring it a foretaste of the blessedness of life in fellowship with the Lord, viz., in the feast of Tabernacles, which commenced five days afterwards. This significant character of the seventh month was indicated by the trumpet-blast, by which the congregation presented the memorial of itself loudly and strongly before Jehovah on the first day of the month, that He might bestow upon them the promised blessings of His grace, for the realization of His covenant. The trumpet-blast on this day was a prelude of the trumpet-blast with which the commencement of the year of jubilee was proclaimed to the whole nation, on the day of atonement of every seventh sabbatical year, that great year of grace under the old covenant (Lev. 25: 9); just as the seventh month in general formed the link between the weekly Sabbath and the sabbatical and jubilee years, and corresponded as a Sabbath month to the year of jubilee rather than the sabbatical year, which had its prelude in the weekly Sabbath-day.

Lev. 23:26-32. On the tenth day of the seventh month the *day of atonement* was to be observed by a holy meeting, by fasting from the evening of the ninth till the evening of the tenth, by resting from all work on pain of death, and with sacrifices, of which the great expiatory sacrifice peculiar to this day had already been appointed in Lev. 16, and the general festal sacrifices are described in Num. 29: 8-11. (For fuller particulars, see at Lev. 16.) By the restrictive **תָּס**, the observance of the day of atonement is represented *a priori* as a peculiar one. The **תָּס** refers less to “the tenth day,” than to the leading directions respecting this feast: “only on the tenth of this seventh month...there shall be a holy meeting to you, and ye shall afflict your souls,” etc.

Lev. 23:32. “Ye shall rest your rest,” i.e., observe the rest that is binding upon you from all laborious work.

Lev. 23:33-43. On the fifteenth of the same month the *feast of Tabernacles* was to be kept to the Lord for seven days: on the first day with a holy meeting and rest from all laborious work, and for seven days with sacrifices, as appointed for every day in Num. 29:13-33. Moreover, on the eighth day, i.e., the 22nd of the month, the closing feast was to be observed in the same manner as on the first day (vv. 34-36). The name, “feast of Tabernacles” (booths), is to be explained from the fact, that the Israelites were to dwell in booths made of boughs for the seven days that this festival lasted (v. 42). **עֶצְרָת**, which is used in v. 36 and Num. 29:35 for the eighth day, which terminated the feast of Tabernacles, and in Deu. 16: 8 for the seventh day of the feast of *Mazzoth*,

signifies the solemn close of a feast of several days, *clausula festi*, from עָצַר to shut in, or close (Gen. 16: 2; Deu. 11:17, etc.), not *a coagendo, congregando populo ad festum*, nor *a cohibitione laboris, ab interdicto opere*, because the word is only applied to the last day of the feasts of *Mazzoth* and *Tabernacles*, and not to the first, although this was also kept with a national assembly and suspension of work. But as these *clausulae festi* were holidays with a holy convocation and suspension of work, it was very natural that the word should be transferred at a later period to feasts generally, on which the people suspended work and met for worship and edification (Joe. 1:14; Isa. 1:13; 2Ki. 10:20). The *azareth*, as the eighth day, did not strictly belong to the feast of *Tabernacles*, which was only to last seven days; and it was distinguished, moreover, from these seven days by a smaller number of offerings (Num. 29:35ff.). The eighth day was rather the solemn close of the whole circle of yearly feasts, and therefore was appended to the close of the last of these feasts as the eighth day of the feast itself (see at Num. 28 seq.). — With v. 36 the enumeration of all the yearly feasts on which holy meetings were to be convened is brought to an end. This is stated in the concluding formula (vv. 37, 38), which answers to the heading in v. 4, in which the Sabbaths are excepted, as they simply belonged to the *moadim* in the more general sense of the word. In this concluding formula, therefore, there is no indication that vv. 2 and 3 and vv. 39-43 are later additions to the original list of feasts which were to be kept with a meeting for worship. לְהַקְרִיב וְגו' (to offer, etc.) is not dependent upon “holy convocations,” but upon the main idea, “feasts of Jehovah.” Jehovah had appointed *moadim*, fixed periods in the year, for His congregation to offer sacrifices; not as if no sacrifices could be or were to be offered except at these feasts, but to remind His people, through these fixed days, of their duty to approach the Lord with sacrifices. אֲשֶׁה is defined by the enumeration of four principal kinds of sacrifice, — burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, slain (i.e., peace-) offerings, and drink-offerings. יָדְבַר יוֹם ב': “every day those appointed for it,” as in Exo. 5:13.

Lev. 23:38. “Beside the Sabbaths:” i.e., the Sabbath sacrifices (see Num. 28: 9, 10), and the gifts and offerings, which formed no integral part of the keeping of the feasts and Sabbaths, but might be offered on those days. מִתְּנוּת, gifts, include all the dedicatory offerings, which were presented to the Lord without being intended to be burned upon the altar; such, for example, as the dedicatory gifts of the tribe-princes (Num. 7), the firstlings and tithes, and other so-called heave-offerings (Num. 18:11, 29). By the “vows” and נְדָבוֹת, “freewill-offerings,” we are to understand not only the votive and freewill slain or peace-offerings, but burnt-offerings also, and meat-offerings, which were offered in consequence of a vow, or from spontaneous impulse (see Jud. 11:31,

where *Jephthah* vows a burnt-offering). — In vv. 39ff. there follows a fuller description of the observance of the last feast of the year, for which the title, “feast of Tabernacles” (v. 34), had prepared the way, as the feast had already been mentioned briefly in Exo. 23:16 and 34:22 as “feast of Ingathering,” though hitherto no rule had been laid down concerning the peculiar manner in which it was to be observed. In connection with this epithet in Exodus, it is described again in v. 39, as in vv. 35, 36, as a seven days’ feast, with sabbatical rest on the first and eighth day; and in vv. 40ff. the following rule is given for its observance: “Take to you fruit of ornamental trees, palm-branches, and boughs of trees with thick foliage, and willows of the brook, and rejoice before the Lord your God seven days, every native in Israel.” If we observe that there are only three kinds of boughs that are connected together by the copula (*vav*) in v. 40, and that it is wanting before **בַּפֶּתַח תָּמִי**, there can hardly be any doubt that **פְּרֵי עֵץ הָדָר** is the generic term, and that the three names which follow specify the particular kinds of boughs. By “the fruits,” therefore, we understand the shoots and branches of the trees, as well as the blossom and fruit that grew out of them. **עֵץ הָדָר**, “trees of ornament:” we are not to understand by these only such trees as the orange and citron, which were placed in gardens for ornament rather than use, as the *Chald.* and *Syr.* indicate, although these trees grow in the gardens of Palestine (*Rob.*, Pal. i. 327, iii. 420). The expression is a more general one, and includes myrtles, which were great favourites with the ancients, on account of their beauty and the fragrant odour which they diffused, olive-trees, palms, and other trees, which were used as booths in Ezra’s time (Neh. 8:15). In the words, “Take fruit of ornamental trees,” it is not expressly stated, it is true, that this fruit was to be used, like the palm-branches, for constructing booths; but this is certainly implied in the context: “Take...and rejoice...and keep a feast...in the booths shall he dwell.” **בַּבֹּסֶתֶת** with the article is equivalent to “in the booths which ye have constructed from the branches mentioned” (cf. *Ges.* § 109, 3). It was in this sense that the law was understood and carried out in the time of Ezra (Neh. 8:15ff.). ^{f46}

The leading character of the feast of Tabernacles, which is indicated at the outset by the emphatic **וְשִׂמְחָה** (v. 39, see at v. 27), was to consist in “joy before the Lord.” As a “feast,” i.e., a feast of joy (**חֵג**, from **חָגַג** = **חָגַג**, denoting the circular motion of the dance, 1Sa. 30:16), it was to be kept for seven days; so that Israel “should be only rejoicing,” and give itself up entirely to joy (Deu. 16:15). Now, although the motive assigned in Deu. is this: “for God will bless thee (Israel) in all thine increase, and in all the work of thine hands;” and although the feast, as a “feast of ingathering,” was a feast of thanksgiving for the gathering in of the produce of the land, “the produce of the floor and wine-press;” and the blessing they had received in the harvested fruits, the oil and

wine, which contributed even more to the enjoyment of life than the bread that was needed for daily food, furnished in a very high degree the occasion and stimulus to the utterance of grateful joy: the origin and true signification of the feast of Tabernacles are not to be sought for in this natural allusion to the blessing of the harvest, but the dwelling in booths was the principal point in the feast; and this was instituted as a law for all future time (v. 41), that succeeding generations might know that Jehovah had caused the children of Israel to dwell in booths when He led them out of Egypt (v. 43). סֹכֶה, a booth or hut, is not to be confounded with אֹהֶל a tent, but comes from סָכַךְ *texuit*, and signifies *casa, umbraculum ex frondibus ramisque consertum* (*Ges. thes. s. v.*), serving as a defence both against the heat of the sun, and also against wind and rain (Psa. 31:21; Isa. 4: 6; Jonah 4: 5). Their dwelling in booths was by no means intended, as *Bähr* supposes, to bring before the minds of the people the unsettled wandering life of the desert, and remind them of the trouble endured there, for the recollection of privation and want can never be an occasion of joy; but it was to place vividly before the eyes of the future generations of Israel a memorial of the grace, care, and protection which God afforded to His people in the great and terrible wilderness (Deu. 8:15). Whether the Israelites, in their journey through the wilderness, not only used the tents which they had taken with them (cf. Lev. 14: 8; Exo. 16, 18: 7; 33: 8ff.; Num. 16:26ff., 24: 5, etc.), but erected booths of branches and bushes in those places of encampment where they remained for a considerable time, as the Bedouins still do sometimes in the peninsula of Sinai (*Burckhardt, Syrien*, p. 858), or not; at all events, the shielding and protecting presence of the Lord in the pillar of cloud and fire was, in the words of the prophet, “a booth (tabernacle) for a shadow in the day-time from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from storm and from rain” (Isa. 4: 6) in the barren wilderness, to those who had just been redeemed out of Egypt. Moreover, the booths used at this feast were not made of miserable shrubs of the desert, but of branches of fruit-trees, palms and thickly covered trees, the produce of the good and glorious land into which God had brought them (Deu. 8: 7ff.); and in this respect they presented a living picture of the plenteous fulness of blessing with which the Lord had enriched His people. This fulness of blessing was to be called to mind by their dwelling in booths; in order that, in the land “wherein they ate bread without scarceness and lacked nothing, where they built goodly houses and dwelt therein; where their herds and flocks, their silver and their gold, and all that they had, multiplied” (Deu. 8: 9, 12, 13), they might not say in their hearts, “My power, and the might of mine hand, hath gotten me this wealth,” but might remember that Jehovah was their God, who gave them power to get wealth (vv. 17, 18), that so their heart might not “be lifted up and forget Jehovah their God, who had led them out of the land of Egypt, the house of bondage.” If, therefore, the foliage

of the booths pointed to the glorious possessions of the inheritance, which the Lord had prepared for His redeemed people in Canaan, yet the natural allusion of the feast, which was superadded to the historical, and subordinate to it, — viz., to the plentiful harvest of rich and beautiful fruits, which they had gathered in from this inheritance, and could now enjoy in peace after the toil of cultivating the land was over, — would necessarily raise their hearts to still higher joy through their gratitude to the Lord and Giver of all, and make this feast a striking figure of the blessedness of the people of God when resting from their labours.

Lev. 23:44. Communication of these laws to the people.

Preparation of the Holy Lamps and Shew-Bread. Punishment of a Blasphemer. — Ch. 24.

Lev. 24: 1-9. The directions concerning the *oil for the holy candlestick* (vv. 1-4) and the preparation of the *shew-bread* (vv. 5-9) lose the appearance of an interpolation, when we consider and rightly understand on the one hand the manner in which the two are introduced in v. 2, and on the other their significance in relation to the worship of God. The introductory formula, “Command the children of Israel that they fetch (bring),” shows that the command relates to an offering on the part of the congregation, a sacrificial gift, with which Israel was to serve the Lord continually. This service consisted in the fact, that in the oil of the lamps of the seven-branched candlestick, which burned before Jehovah, the nation of Israel manifested itself as a congregation which caused its light to shine in the darkness of this world; and that in the shew-bread it offered the fruits of its labour in the field of the kingdom of God, as a spiritual sacrifice to Jehovah. The offering of oil, therefore, for the preparation of the candlestick, and that of fine flour for making the loaves to be placed before Jehovah, formed part of the service in which Israel sanctified its life and labour to the Lord its God, not only at the appointed festal periods, but every day; and the law is very appropriately appended to the sanctification of the Sabbaths and feast-days, prescribed in Lev. 23. The first instructions in vv. 2-4 are a verbal repetition of Exo. 27:20, 21, and have been explained already. Their execution by Aaron is recorded at Num. 8: 1-4; and the candlestick itself was set in order by Moses at the consecration of the tabernacle (Exo. 40:25).

Lev. 24: 5-9. The preparation of the shew-bread and the use to be made of it are described here for the first time; though it had already been offered by the congregation at the consecration of the tabernacle, and placed by Moses upon the table (Exo. 39:36; 40:23). Twelve cakes (*challoth*, 2: 4) were to be made of fine flour, of two-tenths of an ephah each, and placed in two rows, six in each

row, upon the golden table before Jehovah (Exo. 25:23ff.). Pure incense was then to be added to each row, which was to be (to serve) as a memorial (*Azcarah*, see Lev. 2: 2), as a firing for Jehovah. נִתֵּן עַל to give upon, to add to, does not force us to the conclusion that the incense was to be spread upon the cakes; but is easily reconcilable with the Jewish tradition (*Josephus*, Ant. iii. 10, 7; *Mishnah*, *Menach.* xi. 7, 8), that the incense was placed in golden saucers with each row of bread. The number twelve corresponded to the number of the twelve tribes of Israel. The arrangement of the loaves in rows of six each was in accordance with the shape of the table, just like the division of the names of the twelve tribes upon the two precious stones on Aaron's shoulder-dress (Exo. 28:10). By the presentation or preparation of them from the fine flour presented by the congregation, and still more by the addition of incense, which was burned upon the altar every Sabbath on the removal of the loaves as *azcarah*, i.e., as a practical memento of the congregation before God, the laying out of these loaves assumed the form of a bloodless sacrifice, in which the congregation brought the fruit of its life and labour before the face of the Lord, and presented itself to its God as a nation diligent in sanctification to good works. If the shew-bread was a *minchah*, or meat-offering, and even a most holy one, which only the priests were allowed to eat in the holy place (v. 9, cf. Lev. 2: 3 and 6: 9, 10), it must naturally have been unleavened, as the unanimous testimony of the Jewish tradition affirms it to have been. And if as a rule no meat-offering could be leavened, and of the loaves of first-fruits prepared for the feast of Pentecost, which were actually leavened, none was allowed to be placed upon the altar (Lev. 2:11, 12; 6:10); still less could leavened bread be brought into the sanctuary before Jehovah. The only ground, therefore, on which *Knobel* can maintain that those loaves were leavened, is on the supposition that they were intended to represent the daily bread, which could no more fail in the house of Jehovah than in any other well-appointed house (see *Bähr*, *Symbolik* i. p. 410). The process of laying these loaves before Jehovah continually was to be "an everlasting covenant" (v. 8), i.e., a pledge or sign of the everlasting covenant, just as circumcision, as the covenant in the flesh, was to be an everlasting covenant (Gen. 17:13).

Lev. 24:10-23. The account of the Punishment of a Blasphemer is introduced in the midst of the laws, less because "it brings out to view by a clear example the administration of the divine law in Israel, and also introduces and furnishes the reason for several important laws" (*Baumgarten*), than because the historical occurrence itself took place at the time when the laws relating to sanctification of life before the Lord were given, whilst the punishment denounced against the blasphemer exhibited in a practical form, as a warning to the whole nation, the sanctification of the Lord in the despisers of His name. The circumstances were the following: — The son of an Israelitish woman

named Shelomith, the daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan, and of an Egyptian whom the Israelitish woman had married, went out into the midst of the children of Israel, i.e., went out of his tent or place of encampment among the Israelites. As the son of an Egyptian, he belonged to the foreigners who had gone out with Israel (Exo. 12:38), and who probably had their tents somewhere apart from those of the Israelites, who were encamped according to their tribes (Num. 2: 2). Having got into a quarrel with an Israelite, this man scoffed at the name (of Jehovah) and cursed. The cause of the quarrel is not given, and cannot be determined. כָּבַד: to bore, hollow out, then to sting, metaphorically to separate, fix (Gen. 30:28), hence to designate (Num. 1:17, etc.), and to prick *in malam partem*, to taunt, i.e., to *blaspheme, curse*, = כָּבַד Num. 23:11, 25, etc. That the word is used here in a bad sense, is evident from the expression “and cursed,” and from the whole context of vv. 15 and 16. The Jews, on the other hand, have taken the word כָּבַד in this passage from time immemorial in the sense of *επρονόμαζειν* (LXX), and founded upon it the well-known law, against even uttering the name *Jehovah* (see particularly v. 16). “The name” κατ’ ἔξ is the name “Jehovah” (cf. v. 16), in which God manifested His nature. It was this passage that gave rise to the custom, so prevalent among the Rabbins, of using the expression “name,” or “the name,” for *Dominus*, or *Deus* (see *Buxtorf, lex. talmud.* pp. 2432ff.). The blasphemer was brought before Moses and then put into confinement, “to determine for them (such blasphemers) according to the mouth (command) of Jehovah.” שָׁפַט: to separate, distinguish, then to determine exactly, which is the sense both here and in Num. 15:34, where it occurs in a similar connection.

Lev. 24:13-16. Jehovah ordered the blasphemer to be taken out of the camp, and the witnesses to lay their hands upon his head, and the whole congregation to stone him; and published at the same time the general law, that whoever cursed his God should bear (i.e., atone for) his sin (cf. Exo. 22:27), and whoever blasphemed the name of Jehovah should be stoned, the native as well as the foreigner. By laying (resting, cf. 1: 4) their hands upon the head of the blasphemer, the hearers or witnesses were to throw off from themselves the blasphemy which they had heard, and return it upon the head of the blasphemer, for him to expiate. The washing of hands in Deu. 21: 6 is analogous; but the reference made by *Knobel* to Deu. 17: 7, where the witnesses are commanded to turn their hand against an idolater who had been condemned to death, i.e., to stone him, is out of place.

Lev. 24:17-22. The decision asked for from God concerning the crime of the blasphemer, who was the son of an Egyptian, and therefore not a member of the congregation of Jehovah, furnished the occasion for God to repeat those laws respecting murder or personal injury inflicted upon a man, which had hitherto

been given for the Israelites alone (Exo. 21:12ff.), and to proclaim their validity in the case of the foreigner also (vv. 17, 21, 22). To these there are appended the kindred commandments concerning the killing of cattle (vv. 18, 21, 22), which had not been given, it is true, *expressis verbis*, but were contained *implicite* in the rights of Israel (Exo. 21:33ff.), and are also extended to foreigners. **הִכָּה נַפֶּשׁ אָדָם**, to smite the soul of a man, i.e., to put him to death; — the expression “soul of a beast,” in v. 18, is to be understood in the same sense.

Lev. 24:19. “Cause a blemish,” i.e., inflict a bodily injury. This is still further defined in the cases mentioned (*breach, eye, tooth*), in which punishment was to be inflicted according to the *jus talionis* (see at Exo. 21:23ff.).

Lev. 24:23. After these laws had been issued, the punishment was inflicted upon the blasphemer.

Sanctification of the Possession of Land by the Sabbatical and Jubilee Years. — Ch. 25.

Lev. 25. The law for the sabbatical and jubilee years brings to a close the laws given to Moses by Jehovah upon Mount Sinai. This is shown by the words of the heading (v. 1), which point back to Exo. 34:32, and bind together into an inward unity the whole round of laws that Moses received from God upon the mountain, and then gradually announced to the people. The same words are repeated, not only in Lev. 7:38 at the close of the laws of sacrifice, but also at Lev. 26:46, at the close of the promises and threats which follow the law for the sabbatical and jubilee years, and lastly, at Lev. 27:34, after the supplementary law concerning vows. The institution of the jubilee years corresponds to the institution of the day of atonement (Lev. 16). Just as all the sins and uncleannesses of the whole congregation, which had remained unatoned for and uncleansed in the course of the year, were to be wiped away by the all-embracing expiation of the yearly recurring day of atonement, and an undisturbed relation to be restored between Jehovah and His people; so, by the appointment of the year of jubilee, the disturbance and confusion of the divinely appointed relations, which had been introduced in the course of time through the inconstancy of all human or earthly things, were to be removed by the appointment of the year of jubilee, and the kingdom of Israel to be brought back to its original condition. The next chapter (Lev. 26) bears the same relation to the giving of the law upon Sinai as Exo. 23:20-33 to the covenant rights in Exo. 20:22-23:19.

Lev. 25: 2-7. The Sabbatical Year. — When Israel had come into the land which the Lord gave to it, it was to sanctify it to the Lord by the observance of

a Sabbath. As the nation at large, with its labourers and beasts of burden, was to keep a Sabbath or day of rest every seventh day of the week, so the land which they filled was to rest (to keep, שָׁבַת שָׁבַת as in Lev. 23:32) a Sabbath to the Lord. Six years they were to sow the field and cut the vineyard, i.e., cultivate the corn-fields, vineyards, and olive-yards (Exo. 23:11: see the remarks on *cerem* at Lev. 19:10), and gather in their produce; but in the seventh year the land was to keep a Sabbath of rest (*Sabbath sabbathon*, Exo. 31:15), a Sabbath consecrated to the Lord (see Exo. 20:10); and in this year the land was neither to be tilled nor reaped (cf. Exo. 23:10, 11). זָמַר in *Kal* applies only to the cutting of grapes, and so also in *Niphal*, Isa. 5: 6; hence *zemorah*, a vine-branch (Num. 13:23), and *mazmerah*, a pruning-knife (Isa. 2: 4, etc.).¹⁴⁷

The omission of sowing and reaping presupposed that the sabbatical year commenced with the civil year, in the autumn of the sixth year of labour, and not with the ecclesiastical year, on the first of Abib (Nisan), and that it lasted till the autumn of the seventh year, when the cultivation of the land would commence again with the preparation of the ground and the sowing of the seed for the eighth year; and with this the command to proclaim the jubilee year on “the tenth day of the seventh month” throughout all the land (v. 9), and the calculation in vv. 21, 22, fully agree.

Lev. 25: 5. “*That which has fallen out (been shaken out) of thy harvest (i.e., the corn which had grown from the grains of the previous harvest that had fallen out) thou shalt not reap, and the grapes of thine uncut thou shalt not gather.*” נָזִיר, the Nazarite, who let his hair grow freely without cutting it (Num. 6: 5), is used figuratively, both here and in v. 11, to denote a vine not pruned, since by being left to put forth all its productive power it was consecrated to the Lord. The Roman poets employ a similar figure, and speak of the *viridis coma* of the vine (*Tibull.* i. 7, 34; *Propert.* ii. 15, 12).

Lev. 25: 6, 7. “*And the Sabbath of the land (i.e., the produce of the sabbatical year or year of rest, whatever grew that year without cultivation) shall be to you for food, for thee and thy servant,...and for the beasts that are in thy land shall all its produce be for food.*” The meaning is, that what grew of itself was not to be reaped by the owner of the land, but that masters and servants, labourers and visitors, cattle and game, were to eat thereof away from the field (cf. v. 12). The produce arising without tilling or sowing was to be a common good for man and beast. According to Exo. 23:11, it was to belong to the poor and needy; but the owner was not forbidden to partake of it also, so that there can be no discrepancy discovered between this passage and the verse before us. The produce referred to would be by no means inconsiderable, particularly if there had not been a careful gleaning after the harvest, or the corn

had become over-ripe. In the fertile portions of Palestine, especially in the plain of Jezreel and on the table-land of Galilee, as well as in other parts, large quantities of wheat and other cereals are still self-sown from the ripe ears, the over-flowing of which is not gathered by any of the inhabitants of the land. *Strabo* gives a similar account of Albania, viz., that in many parts a field once sown will bear fruit twice and even three times, the first yield being as much as fifty-fold. The intention of his law was not so much to secure the physical recreation of both the land and people, however useful and necessary this might be for men, animals, and land in this sublunary world; but the land was to keep Sabbath to the Lord in the seventh year. In the sabbatical year the land, which the Lord had given to His people, was to observe a period of holy rest and refreshment to its Lord and God, just as the congregation did on the Sabbath-day; and the hand of man was to be withheld from the fields and fruit-gardens from working them, that they might yield their produce for his use. The earth was to be saved from the hand of man exhausting its power for earthly purposes as his own property, and to enjoy the holy rest with which God had blessed the earth and all its productions after the creation. From this, Israel, as the nation of God, was to learn, on the one hand, that although the earth was created for man, it was not merely created for him to draw out its powers for his own use, but also to be holy to the Lord, and participate in His blessed rest; and on the other hand, that the great purpose for which the congregation of the Lord existed, did not consist in the uninterrupted tilling of the earth, connected with bitter labour in the sweat of his brow (Gen. 3:17, 19), but in the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of the earth, which the Lord their God had given them, and would give them still without the labour of their hands, if they strove to keep His covenant and satisfy themselves with His grace. This intention of the sabbatical year comes out still more plainly in the year of jubilee, in which the idea of the sanctification of the whole land as the Lord's property is still more strongly expressed, and whose inward connection with the sabbatical year is indicated by the fact that the time for observing it was regulated by the sabbatical years (v. 8).

Lev. 25: 8-55. The law for the Year of Jubilee refers first of all to its observance (vv. 8-12), and secondly to its effects (*a*) upon the possession of property (vv. 13-34), and (*b*) upon the personal freedom of the Israelites (vv. 35-55).

Lev. 25: 8-12. Keeping the year of jubilee. Vv. 8, 9. Seven Sabbaths of years — i.e., year-Sabbaths or sabbatical years, or seven times seven years, the time of seven year-Sabbaths, that is to say, 49 years — they were to count, and then at the expiration of that time to cause the trumpet of jubilee to go (sound) through the whole land on the tenth of the seventh month, i.e., the day of

atonement, to proclaim the entrance of the year of jubilee. This mode of announcement was closely connected with the idea of the year itself. The blowing of trumpets, or blast of the far-sounding horn (*shophar*, see at Lev. 23:24), was the signal of the descent of the Lord upon Sinai, to raise Israel to be His people, to receive them into His covenant, to unite them to Himself, and bless them through His covenant of grace (Exo. 19:13, 16, 19; 20:18). Just as the people were to come up to the mountain at the sounding of the **יֹבֵל**, or the voice of the *shophar*, to commemorate its union with the Lord, so at the expiration of the seventh sabbatical year the trumpet-blast was to announce to the covenant nation the gracious presence of its God, and the coming of the year which was to bring “liberty throughout the land to all that dwelt therein” (v. 10), — deliverance from bondage (vv. 40ff.), return to their property and family (vv. 10, 13), and release from the bitter labour of cultivating the land (vv. 11, 12). This year of grace as proclaimed and began with the day of atonement of every seventh sabbatical year, to show that it was only with the full forgiveness of sins that the blessed liberty of the children of God could possibly commence. This grand year of grace was to return after seven times seven years; i.e., as is expressly stated in v. 10, every fiftieth year was to be sanctified as a year of jubilee. By this regulation of the time, the view held by *R. Jehuda*, and the chronologists and antiquarians who have followed him, that every seventh sabbatical year, i.e., the 49th year, was to be kept as the year of jubilee, is proved to be at variance with the text, and the fiftieth year is shown to be the year of rest, in which the sabbatical idea attained its fullest realization, and reached its earthly temporal close.

Lev. 25:10. The words, “Ye shall proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof,” are more closely defined by the two clauses commencing with **יֹבֵל הַיָּא** in vv. 10 and 11. “A trumpet-blast shall it be to you, that ye return every one to his own possession, and every one to his family:” a still further explanation is given in vv. 23-34 and 39-55. This was to be the fruit or effect of the blast, i.e., of the year commencing with the blast, and hence the year was called “the year of liberty,” or free year, in Eze. 46:17. **יֹבֵל**, from **יָבַל** to flow with a rushing noise, does not mean jubilation or the time of jubilation (*Ges.*, *Kn.*, and others); but wherever it is not applied to the year of jubilee, it signifies only the loud blast of a trumpet (Exo. 19:13; Jos. 6: 5). This meaning also applies here in vv. 10b, 11 and 12; whilst in vv. 15, 28, 30, 31, 33, 27:18, and Num. 36: 4, it is used as an abbreviated expression for **שָׁנַת יֹבֵל**, the year of the trumpet-blast.

Lev. 25:11, 12. The other effect of the fiftieth year proclaimed with the trumpet-blast consisted in the fact that the Israelites were not to sow or reap,

just as in the sabbatical year (see vv. 4, 5). “For it is **יֹבֵל**,” i.e., not “jubilation or time of jubilation,” but “the time or year of the trumpet-blast, it shall be holy to you,” i.e., a sabbatical time, which is to be holy to you like the day of the trumpet-blast (vv. 23, 24).

Lev. 25:13-34. One of the effects of the year of freedom is mentioned here, viz., the *return of every man to his own possession*; and the way is prepared for it by a warning against overreaching in the sale of land, and the assignment of a reason for this.

Lev. 25:14-17. In the purchase and sale of pieces of land no one was to oppress another, i.e., to overreach him by false statements as to its value and produce. **הוֹנֶה** applies specially to the oppression of foreigners (Lev. 19:33; Exo. 22:20), of slaves (Deu. 23:17), of the poor, widows, and orphans (Jer. 22: 3; Eze. 18: 8) in civil matters, by overreaching them or taking their property away. The *inf. abs.* **קָנָה**: as in Gen. 41:43. The singular suffix in **עַמִּיתָךְ** is to be understood distributively of a particular Israelite.

Lev. 25:15, 16. The purchase and sale were to be regulated by the number of years that had elapsed since the year of jubilee, so that they were only to sell the produce of the yearly revenues up to the next jubilee year, and made the price higher or lower according to the larger or smaller number of the years.

Lev. 25:17ff. Overreaching and oppression God would avenge; they were therefore to fear before Him. On the other hand, if they kept His commandments and judgments, He would take care that they should dwell in the land in safety (*secure*, free from anxiety), and be satisfied with the abundance of its produce. In this way vv. 18-22 fit on exceedingly well to what precedes. ^{f48}

Lev. 25:20ff. Jehovah would preserve them from want, without their sowing or reaping. He would bestow His blessing upon them in the sixth year, so that it should bear the produce of three (**עֲשָׂתָּה** for **עֶשְׂתָּה** as in Gen. 33:11); and when they sowed in the eighth year, they should eat the produce of the old year up to the ninth year, that is to say, till the harvest of that year. It is quite evident from vv. 21 and 22, according to which the sixth year was to produce enough for three years, and the sowing for the ninth was to take place in the eighth, that not only the year of jubilee, but the sabbatical year also, commenced in the autumn, when they first began to sow for the coming year; so that the sowing was suspended from the autumn of the sixth year till the autumn of the seventh, and even till the autumn of the eighth, whenever the jubilee year came round, in which case both sowing and reaping were omitted for two years in succession,

and consequently the produce of the sixth year, which was harvested in the seventh month of that year, must have sufficed for three years, not merely till the sowing in the autumn of the eight or fiftieth year, but till the harvest of the ninth or fifty-first year, as the Talmud and Rabbins of every age have understood the law.

Lev. 25:23-28. What was already implied in the laws relating to the purchase and sale of the year's produce (vv. 15, 16), namely, that the land could not be alienated, is here clearly expressed; and at the same time the rule is laid down, showing how a man, who had been compelled by poverty to sell his patrimony, was to recover possession of it by redemption. In the first place, v. 23 contains the general rule, "the land shall not be sold לְצַמִּיתָהּ" (lit., to annihilation), i.e., so as to vanish away from, or be for ever lost to, the seller. For "*the land belongs to Jehovah:*" the Israelites, to whom He would give it (v. 2), were not actual owners or full possessors, so that they could do what they pleased with it, but "strangers and sojourners with Jehovah" in His land. Consequently (v. 24) throughout the whole of the land of their possession they were to grant נִאֲלָה release, redemption to the land. There were three ways in which this could be done. The first case (v. 25) was this: if a brother became poor and sold his property, his nearest redeemer was to come and release what his brother had sold, i.e., buy it back from the purchaser and restore it to its former possessor. The nearest redeemer was the relative upon whom this obligation rested according to the series mentioned in vv. 48, 49. — The second case (vv. 26, 27) was this: if any one had no redeemer, either because there were no relatives upon whom the obligation rested, or because they were all too poor, and he had earned and acquired sufficient to redeem it, he was to calculate the years of purchase, and return the surplus to the man who had bought it, i.e., as much as he had paid for the years that still remained up to the next year of jubilee, that so he might come into possession of it again. As the purchaser had only paid the amount of the annual harvests till the next year of jubilee, all that he could demand back was as much as he had paid for the years that still remained.

Lev. 25:28. The third case was this: if a man had not earned as much as was required to make compensation for the recovery of the land, what he had sold was to remain in the possession of the buyer till the year of jubilee, and then it was to "go out," i.e., to become free again, so that the impoverished seller could enter into possession without compensation. The buyer lost nothing by this, for he had fully recovered all that he paid for the annual harvests up to the year of jubilee, from the amount which those harvests yielded. Through these legal regulations every purchase of land became simply a lease for a term of years.

Lev. 25:29-34. Alienation and redemption of houses. — Vv. 29, 30. On the sale of a dwelling-house in a wall-town (a town surrounded by a wall) there was to be redemption till the completion of the year of its purchase. יָמִים, “days (i.e., a definite period) shall its redemption be;” that is to say, the right of redemption or repurchase should be retained. If it was not redeemed within the year, it remained to the buyer for ever for his descendants, and did not go out free in the year of jubilee. קָם to arise for a possession, i.e., to become a fixed standing possession, as in Gen. 23:17. אָשַׁר לֹא for אָשַׁר לוֹ as in Lev. 11:21 (see at Exo. 21: 8). This law is founded upon the assumption, that the houses in unwalled towns are not so closely connected with the ownership of the land, as that the alienation of the houses would alter the portion originally assigned to each family for a possession. Having been built by men, they belonged to their owners in full possession, whether they had received them just as they were at the conquest of the land, or had erected them for themselves. This last point of view, however, was altogether a subordinate one; for in the case of “the houses of the villages” (i.e., farm-buildings and villages, see Jos. 13:23, etc.), which had no walls round them, it was not taken into consideration at all.

Lev. 25:31. Such houses as these were to be reckoned as part of the land, and to be treated as landed property, with regard to redemption and restoration at the year of jubilee.

Lev. 25:32. On the other hand, so far as the Levitical towns, viz., the houses of the Levites in the towns belonging to them, were concerned, there was to be eternal redemption for the Levites; that is to say, when they were parted with, the right of repurchase was never lost. עוֹלָם (eternal) is to be understood as a contrast to the year allowed in the case of other houses (vv. 29, 30).

Lev. 25:33. “And whoever (if any one) redeems, i.e., buys, of the Levites, the house that is sold and (indeed in) the town of his possession is to go out free in the year of jubilee; for the houses of the Levitical towns are their (the Levites’) possession among the children of Israel.” The meaning is this: If any one bought a Levite’s house in one of the Levitical towns, the house he had bought was to revert to the Levite without compensation in the year of jubilee. The difficulty connected with the first clause is removed, if we understand the word יִגְאֹל (to redeem, i.e., to buy back), as the Rabbins do, in the sense of קָנָה to buy, acquire. The use of יִגְאֹל for קָנָה may be explained from the fact, that when the land was divided, the Levites did not receive either an inheritance in the land, or even the towns appointed for them to dwell in as their own property. The Levitical towns were allotted to the different tribes in which they were situated, with the simple obligation to set apart a certain number of dwelling-houses for

the Levites, together with pasture-ground for their cattle in the precincts of the towns (cf. Num. 35: 1ff. and my Commentary on Joshua, p. 453 translation). If a non-Levite, therefore, bought a Levite's house, it was in reality a repurchase of property belonging to his tribe, or the redemption of what the tribe had relinquished to the Levites as their dwelling and for their necessities.⁴⁹ The words **וְעִיר אֹהֶל** are an explanatory apposition — “and that in the town of his possession,” — and do not mean “whatever he had sold of his house-property or anything else in his town,” for the Levites had no other property in the town besides the houses, but “the house which he had sold, namely, in the town of his possession.” This implies that the right of reversion was only to apply to the houses ceded to the Levites in their own towns, and not to houses which they had acquired in other towns either by purchase or inheritance. The singular **אִיִּי** is used after a subject in the plural, because the copula agrees with the object (see *Ewald*, § 319c). As the Levites were to have no hereditary property in the land except the houses in the towns appointed for them, it was necessary that the possession of their houses should be secured to them for all time, if they were not to fall behind the other tribes.

Lev. 25:34. The field of the pasture-ground of the Levitical towns was not to be sold. Beside the houses, the Levites were also to receive **מִגְרָשׁ** pasturage for their flocks (from **נָרַשׁ** to drive, to drive out the cattle) round about these cities (Num. 35: 2, 3). These meadows were not to be saleable, and not even to be let till the year of jubilee; because, if they were sold, the Levites would have nothing left upon which to feed their cattle.

Lev. 25:35-55. The *second* effect of the jubilee year, viz., *the return of an Israelite, who had become a slave, to liberty and to his family*, is also introduced with an exhortation to support an impoverished brother (vv. 35-38), and preserve to him his personal freedom.

Lev. 25:35. “If thy brother (countryman, or member of the same tribe) becomes poor, and his hand trembles by thee, thou shalt lay hold of him;” i.e., if he is no longer able to sustain himself alone, thou shalt take him by the arm to help him out of his misfortune. “Let him live with thee as a stranger and sojourner.” **וְחֵי** introduces the apodosis (see *Ges.* § 126, note 1).

Lev. 25:36ff. If he borrowed money, they were not to demand interest; or if food, they were not to demand any addition, any larger quantity, when it was returned (cf. Exo. 22:24; Deu. 23:20, 21), from fear of God, who had redeemed Israel out of bondage, to give them the land of Canaan. In v. 37 **וְחֵי** is an abbreviation of **וְחֵי**, which only occurs here. — From v. 39 onwards there follow the laws relating to the bondage of the Israelite, who had been obliged to

sell himself from poverty. Vv. 36-46 relate to his service in bondage to an (other) Israelite. The man to whom he had sold himself as servant was not to have slave-labour performed by him (Exo. 1:14), but to keep him as a day-labourer and sojourner, and let him serve with him till the year of jubilee. He was then to go out free with his children, and return to his family and the possession of his fathers (his patrimony). This regulation is a supplement to the laws relating to the rights of Israel (Exo. 21: 2-6), though without a contradiction arising, as *Knobel* maintains, between the different rules laid down. In Exo. 21 nothing at all is determined respecting the treatment of an Israelitish servant; it is simply stated that in the seventh year of his service he was to recover his liberty. This limit is not mentioned here, because the chapter before us simply treats of the influence of the year of jubilee upon the bondage of the Israelites. On this point it is decided, that the year of jubilee was to bring freedom even to the Israelite who had been brought into slavery by his poverty, — of course only to the man who was still in slavery when it commenced and had not served seven full years, provided, that is to say, that he had not renounced his claim to be set free at the end of his seven years' service, according to Exo. 21: 5, 6. We have no right to expect this exception to be expressly mentioned here, because it did not interfere with the idea of the year of jubilee. For whoever voluntarily renounced the claim to be set free, whether because the year of jubilee was still so far off that he did not expect to live to see it, or because he had found a better lot with his master than he could secure for himself in a state of freedom, had thereby made a voluntary renunciation of the liberty which the year of jubilee might have brought to him (see *Oehler's* art. in *Herzog's Cycl.*, where the different views on this subject are given).

Lev. 25:42, 43. Because the Israelites were servants of Jehovah, who had redeemed them out of Pharaoh's bondage and adopted them as His people (Exo. 19: 5; 18:10, etc.), they were not to be sold "a selling of slaves," i.e., not to be sold into actual slavery, and no one of them was to rule over another with severity (v. 43, cf. Exo. 1:13, 14). "Through this principle slavery was completely abolished, so far as the people of the theocracy were concerned" (*Oehler*).

Lev. 25:44ff. As the Israelites could only hold in slavery servants and maid-servants whom they had bought of foreign nations, or foreigners who had settled in the land, these they might leave as an inheritance to their children, and "through them they might work," i.e., have slave-labour performed, but not through their brethren the children of Israel (v. 46, cf. v. 43).

Lev. 25:47-55. The servitude of an Israelite to a settler who had come to the possession of property, or a non-Israelite dwelling in the land, was to be redeemable at any time. If an Israelite had sold himself because of poverty to a

foreign settler (גֵּר תוֹשֵׁב, to distinguish the non-Israelitish sojourner from the Israelitish, v. 35), or to a stock of a foreigner, then one of his brethren, or his uncle, or his uncle's son or some one of his kindred, was to redeem him; or if he came into the possession of property, he was to redeem himself. When this was done, the time was to be calculated from the year of purchase to the year of jubilee, and "the money of his purchase was to be according to the number of the years," i.e., the price at which he had sold himself was to be distributed over the number of years that he would have to serve to the year of jubilee; and "according to the days of a day-labourer shall he be with him," i.e., the time that he had worked was to be estimated as that of a day-labourer, and be put to the credit of the man to be redeemed.

Lev. 25:51, 52. According as there were few or many years to the year of jubilee would the redemption-money be paid be little or much. רַבּוֹת בְּשָׁנִים much in years: רַבּוֹת neuter, and בְּ as in Gen. 7:21; 8:17 etc. לְפִיָּהוּ according to the measure of the same.

Lev. 25:53. During the time of service the buyer was to keep him as a day-labourer year by year, i.e., as a labourer engaged for a term of years, and not rule over him with severe oppression. "In thine eyes," i.e., so that thou (the nation addressed) seest it.

Lev. 25:54. If he were not redeemed by these (the relations mentioned in vv. 48, 49), he was to go out free in the year of jubilee along with his children, i.e., to be liberated without compensation. For (v. 55) he was not to remain in bondage, because the Israelites were the servants of Jehovah (cf. v. 42).

But although, through these arrangements, the year of jubilee helped every Israelite, who had fallen into poverty and slavery, to the recovery of his property and personal freedom, and thus the whole community was restored to its original condition as appointed by God, through the return of all the landed property that had been alienated in the course of years to its original proprietor the restoration of the theocratical state to its original condition was not the highest or ultimate object of the year of jubilee. The observance of sabbatical rest throughout the whole land, and by the whole nation, formed part of the liberty which it was to bring to the land and its inhabitants. In the year of jubilee, as in the sabbatical year, the land of Jehovah was to enjoy holy rest, and the nation of Jehovah to be set free from the bitter labour of cultivating the soil, and to live and refresh itself in blessed rest with the blessing which had been given to it by the Lord its God. In this way the year of jubilee became to the poor, oppressed, and suffering, in fact to the whole nation, a year of festivity and grace, which not only brought redemption to the captives and deliverance to the poor out of their distresses, but release to the whole congregation of the

Lord from the bitter labour of this world; a time of refreshing, in which all oppression was to cease, and every member of the covenant nation find his redeemer in the Lord, who brought every one back to his own property and home. Because Jehovah had brought the children of Israel out of Egypt to give them the land of Canaan, where they were to live as His servants and serve Him, in the year of jubilee the nation and land of Jehovah were to celebrate a year of holy rest and refreshing before the Lord, and in this celebration to receive foretaste of the times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord, which were to be brought to all men by One anointed with the Spirit of the Lord, who would come to preach the Gospel to the poor, to bind up the broken-hearted, to bring liberty to the captives and the opening of the prisons to them that were bound, to proclaim to all that mourn a year of grace from the Lord (Isa. 61: 1-3; Luk. 4:17-21); and who will come again from heaven in the times of the restitution of all things to complete the ἀποκατάστασις τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ, to glorify the whole creation into a kingdom of God, to restore everything that has been destroyed by sin from the beginning of the world, to abolish all the slavery of sin, establish the true liberty of the children of God, emancipate every creature from the bondage of vanity, under which it sighs on account of the sin of man, and introduce all His chosen into the kingdom of peace and everlasting blessedness, which was prepared for their inheritance before the foundation of the world (Act. 3:19, 20; Rom. 8:19ff.; Mat. 25:34; Col. 1:12; 1Pe. 1: 4).

Promises and Threats. — Ch. 26.

Lev. 26. Just as the book of the covenant, the kernel containing the fundamental principles of the covenant fellowship, which the Lord established with the children of Israel whom He had adopted as His nation, and the rule of life for the covenant nation (Exo. 20:22-23:19), concluded with promises and threats (Exo. 23:20-33); so the giving of the law at Sinai, as the unfolding of the inner, spiritual side of the whole of the covenant constitution, closes in this chapter with an elaborate unfolding of the blessing which would be secured by a faithful observance of the laws, and the curse which would follow the transgression of them. But whilst the former promises and threats (Exo. 23) related to the conquest of the promised land of Canaan, the promises in this chapter refer to the blessings which were to be bestowed upon Israel when the land was in their possession (vv. 3-13), and the threats to the judgments with which the Lord would visit His disobedient people in their inheritance, and in fact drive them out and scatter them among the heathen (vv. 14-39). When this had been done, then, as is still further proclaimed with a prophetic look into the distant future, would they feel remorse, acknowledge their sin to the Lord, and be once more received into favour by Him, the eternally faithful covenant God

(vv. 40-45).¹⁵⁰ The blessings and curse of the law were impressed upon the hearts of the people in a still more comprehensive manner at the close of the whole law (Deu. 28-30), and on the threshold of the promised land.

Lev. 26: 1, 2. Vv. 1 and 2 form the *introduction*; and the essence of the whole law, the observance of which will bring a rich blessing, and the transgression of it severe judgments, is summed up in two leading commandments, and placed at the head of the blessing and curse which were to be proclaimed. Ye shall not make to you *elilim*, nugatory gods, and set up carved images and standing images for worship, but worship Jehovah your God with the observance of His Sabbaths, and fear before His sanctuary. The prohibition of *elilim*, according to Lev. 19: 4, calls to mind the fundamental law of the decalogue (Exo. 20: 3, 4, cf. Lev. 21:23, Exo. 23:24, 25). To *pesel* (cf. Exo. 20: 4) and *mazzebah* (cf. Exo. 23:24), which were not to be set up, there is added the command not to put אֲבֵן מְשֻׁבֵּית, “figure-stones,” in the land, to worship over (by) them. The “figure-stone” is a stone formed into a figure, and idol of stone, not merely a stone with an inscription or with hieroglyphical figures; it is synonymous with מְשֻׁבֵּית in Num. 33:52, and consequently we are to understand by *pesel* the wooden idol as in Isa. 44:15, etc. The construction of הַשְּׂתַחֲוֹהַ with עַל may be explained on the ground that the worshipper of a stone image placed upon the ground rises above it (for עַל in this sense, see Gen. 18: 2). — In v. 3 the true way to serve God is urged upon the Israelites once more, in words copied verbally from Lev. 19:30.

Lev. 26: 3-13. THE BLESSING OF FIDELITY TO THE LAW. — Vv. 3-5. If the Israelites walked in the commandments of the Lord (for the expression see Lev. 18: 3ff.), the Lord would give fruitfulness to their land, that they should have bread to the full. “*I will give you rain-showers in season.*” The allusion here is to the showers which fall at the two rainy seasons, and upon which the fruitfulness of Palestine depends, viz., the early and latter rain (Deu. 11:14). The former of these occurs after the autumnal equinox, at the time of the winter-sowing of wheat and barley, in the latter half of October or beginning of November. It generally falls in heavy showers in November and December, and then after that only at long intervals, and not so heavily. The latter, or so-called latter rain, fall in March before the beginning of the harvest of the winter crops, at the time of sowing the summer seed, and lasts only a few days, in some years only a few hours (see *Robinson, Pal.* ii. pp. 97ff.). — On vv. 5, 6, see Lev. 25:18, 19.

Lev. 26: 6-8. The Lord would give peace in the land, and cause the beasts of prey which endanger life to vanish out of the land, and suffer no war to come over it, but would put to flight before the Israelites the enemies who attacked

them, and cause them to fall into their sword. **שָׁכַב**, to lie without being frightened up by any one, is a figure used to denote the quiet and peaceable enjoyment of life, and taken from the resting of a flock in good pasture-ground (Isa. 14:30) exposed to no attacks from either wild beasts or men. **מִחְרִיד** is generally applied to the frightening of men by a hostile attack (Mic. 4: 4; Jer. 30:10; Eze. 39:26; Job. 11:19); but it is also applied to the frightening of flocks and animals (Isa. 17: 2; Deu. 28:26; Jer. 7:33, etc.). **חַיָּה רְעָה**: an *evil animal*, for a beast of prey, as in Gen. 37:20. “Sword,” as the principal weapon applied, is used for war. The pursuing of the enemy relates to neighbouring tribes, who would make war upon the Israelites. **נָפַל לְחַרְב** does not mean to be felled by the sword (*Knobel*), but to fall into the sword. The words, “five of you shall put a hundred to flight, and a hundred ten thousand,” are a proverbial expression for the most victorious superiority of Israel over their enemies. It is repeated in the opposite sense and in an intensified form in Deu. 32:30 and Isa. 30:17.

Lev. 26: 9. Moreover the Lord would bestow His covenant blessing upon them without intermission. **פְּנֵה אֵל** signifies a sympathizing and gracious regard (Psa. 25:16; 69:17). The multiplication and fruitfulness of the nation were a constant fulfilment of the covenant promise (Gen. 17: 4-6) and an establishment of the covenant (Gen. 17: 7); not merely the preservation of it, but the continual realization of the covenant grace, by which the covenant itself was carried on further and further towards its completion. This was the real purpose of the blessing, to which all earthly good, as the pledge of the constant abode of God in the midst of His people, simply served as the foundation.

Lev. 26:10. Notwithstanding their numerous increase, they would suffer no want of food. “Ye shall eat that which has become old, and bring out old for new.” *Multiplicabo vos et multiplicabo simul annonam vestram, adeo ut illam prae multitudine et copia absumere non possitis, sed illam diutissime servare adeoque abjicere cogamini, novarum frugum suavitate et copia superveniente* (C. a Lap.). **הוֹצִיא** *vetustum triticum ex horreo et vinum ex cella promere* (Calvin).

Lev. 26:11. “I will make My dwelling among you, and My soul will not despise you.” **מִשְׁכַּן**, applied to the dwelling of God among His people in the sanctuary, involves the idea of satisfied repose.

Lev. 26:12. God’s walking in the midst of Israel does not refer to His accompanying and leading the people on their journeyings, but denotes the walking of God in the midst of His people in Canaan itself, whereby He would continually manifest Himself to the nation as its God and make them a people of

possession, bringing them into closer and closer fellowship with Himself, and giving them all the saving blessings of His covenant of grace.

Lev. 26:13. For He was their God, who had brought them out of the land of the Egyptians, that they might no longer be servants to them, and had broken the bands of their yokes and made them go upright. מַטְתַּעַל, lit., the poles of the yoke (cf. Eze. 34:27), i.e., the poles which are laid upon the necks of beasts of burden (Jer. 27: 2) as a yoke, to bend their necks and harness them for work. It was with the burden of such a yoke that Egypt had pressed down the Israelites, so that they could no longer walk upright, till God by breaking the yoke helped them to walk upright again. As the yoke is a figurative description of severe oppression, so going upright is a figurative description of emancipation from bondage. קוֹמְמִיּוֹת, lit., a substantive, an upright position; here it is an adverb (cf. *Ges.* § 100, 2).

Lev. 26:14-33. THE CURSE FOR CONTEMPT OF THE LAW. — The following judgments are threatened, not for single breaches of the law, but for contempt of all the laws, amounting to inward contempt of the divine commandments and a breach of the covenant (vv. 14, 15), — for presumptuous and obstinate rebellion, therefore, against God and His commandments. For this, severe judgments are announced, which were to be carried to their uttermost in a fourfold series, if the hardening were obstinately continued. If Israel acted in opposition to the Lord in the manner stated, He would act towards them as follows (vv. 16, 17): He would appoint over them בְּהִלָּה terror — a general notion, which is afterwards particularized as consisting of diseases, sowing without enjoying the fruit, defeat in war, and flight before their enemies. Two kinds of disease are mentioned by which life is destroyed: consumption and burning, i.e., burning fever, πυρετός, *febris*, which cause the eyes (the light of this life) to disappear, and the soul (the life itself) to pine away; whereas in Exo. 23:25; 15:26, preservation from diseases is promised for obedience to the law. Of these diseases, consumption is at present very rare in Palestine and Syria, though it occurs in more elevated regions; but burning fever is one of the standing diseases. To these there would be added the invasion of the land by enemies, so that they would labour in vain and sow their seed to no purpose, for their enemies would consume the produce, as actually was the case (e.g., Jud. 6: 3, 4).

Lev. 26:17. Yea, the Lord would turn His face against them, so that they would be beaten by their enemies, and be so thoroughly humbled in consequence, that they would flee when no man pursued (cf. v. 36).

But if these punishments did not answer their purpose, and bring Israel back to fidelity to its God, the Lord would punish the disobedient nation still more severely, and chasten the rebellious for their sin, not simply only, but sevenfold. This He would do, so long as Israel persevered in obstinate resistance, and to this end He would multiply His judgments by degrees. This graduated advance of the judgments of God is so depicted in the following passage, that four times in succession new and multiplied punishments are announced: (1) utter barrenness in their land, — that is to say, *one* heavier punishment (vv. 18-20); (2) the extermination of their cattle by beasts of prey, and childlessness, — *two* punishments (vv. 21, 22); (3) war, plague, and famine, — *three* punishments (vv. 23-26); (4) the destruction of all idolatrous abominations, the overthrow of their towns and holy places, the devastation of the land, and the dispersion of the people among the heathen, — *four* punishments which would bring the Israelites to the verge of destruction (vv. 27-33). In this way would the Lord punish the stiffneckedness of His people. — These divine threats embrace the whole of Israel's future. But the series of judgments mentioned is not to be understood historically, as a prediction of the temporal succession of the different punishments, but as an ideal account of the judgments of God, unfolding themselves with inward necessity in a manner answering to the progressive development of the sin. As the nation would not resist the Lord continually, but times of disobedience and apostasy would alternate with times of obedience and faithfulness, so the judgments of God would alternate with His blessings; and as the opposition would not increase in uniform progress, sometimes becoming weaker and then at other times gaining greater force again, so the punishments would not multiply continuously, but correspond in every case to the amount of the sin, and only burst in upon the incorrigible race in all the intensity foretold, when ungodliness gained the upper hand.

Lev. 26:18-20. FIRST STAGE OF THE AGGRAVATED JUDGMENTS. — If they did not hearken עַד אֲלֵהָ, “up to these” (the punishments named in vv. 16, 17), that is to say, if they persisted in their disobedience even when the judgments reached to this height, God would add a sevenfold chastisement on account of their sins, would punish them seven times more severely, and break down their strong pride by fearful drought. Seven, as the number of perfection in the works of God, denotes the strengthening of the chastisement, even to the height of its full measure (cf. Pro. 24:16). גָּאוֹן עַז, lit., the eminence or pride of strength, includes everything upon which a nation rests its might; then the pride and haughtiness which rely upon earthly might and its auxiliaries (Exo. 30: 6, 18; 33:28); here it signifies the pride of a nation, puffed up by the fruitfulness and rich produce of its land. God would make their heaven (the sky of their land) like iron and their earth like brass, i.e., as hard and dry as metal, so that not a drop of rain and dew would fall from heaven to moisten the earth, and not a

plant could grow out of the earth (cf. Deu. 28:23); and when the land was cultivated, the people would exhaust their strength for nought. תָּנַם, *consumi*.

Lev. 26:21, 22. The *second* stage. — But if the people's resistance amounted to a hostile rebellion against God, He would smite them sevenfold for their sin by sending beasts of prey and childlessness. By beasts of prey He would destroy their cattle, and by barrenness He would make the nation so small that the ways would be deserted, that high roads would cease because there would be no traveller upon them on account of the depopulation of the land (Isa. 33: 8; Zep. 3: 6), and the few inhabitants who still remained would be afraid to venture because of the wild beasts (Eze. 14:15). הִלָּךְ קָרִי עִם ("to go a meeting with a person," i.e., to meet a person in a hostile manner, to fight against him) only occurs here in vv. 21 and 23, and is strengthened in vv. 24, 27, 28, 40, 41 into הִלָּךְ בְּקָרִי עִם, to engage in a hostile encounter with a person. מַכָּה שֶׁבַע, a sevenfold blow. "According to your sins," i.e., answering to them sevenfold. In v. 22 the first clause corresponds to the third, and the second to the fourth, so that Nos. 3 and 4 contain the effects of Nos. 1 and 2.

Lev. 26:23-26. The *third* stage. — But if they would not be chastened by these punishments, and still rose up in hostility to the Lord, He would also engage in a hostile encounter with them, and punish them sevenfold with war, plague, and hunger.

Lev. 26:25. He would bring over them "the sword avenging (i.e., executing) the covenant vengeance." The "covenant vengeance" was punishment inflicted for a breach of the covenant, the severity of which corresponded to the greatness of the covenant blessings forfeited by a faithless apostasy. If they retreated to their towns (fortified places) from the sword of the enemy, the Lord would send a plague over them there, and give those who were spared by the plague into the power of the foe. He would also "break in pieces the staff of bread," and compel them by the force of famine to submit to the foe. The means of sustenance should become so scarce, that ten women could bake their bread in a single oven, whereas in ordinary times every woman would require an oven for herself; and they would have to eat the bread which they brought home by weight, i.e., not as much as every one pleased, but in rations weighed out so scantily, that those who ate would not be satisfied, and would only be able to sustain their life in the most miserable way. Calamities such as these burst upon Israel and Judah more than once when their fortified towns were besieged, particularly in the later times of the kings, e.g., upon Samaria in the reign of Joram (2Ki. 6:25ff.), and upon Jerusalem through the invasions of the Chaldeans (cf. Isa. 3: 1, Jer. 14:18, Eze. 4:16; 5:12).

Lev. 26:27-33. Fourth and severest stage. — If they should still persist in their opposition, God would chastise them with wrathful meeting, yea, punish them so severely in His wrath, that they would be compelled to eat the flesh of their sons and daughters, i.e., to slay their own children and eat them in the extremity of their hunger, — a fact which literally occurred in Samaria in the period of the Syrians (2Ki. 6:28, 29), and in Jerusalem in that of the Chaldeans (Lam. 2:20; 4:10), and in the Roman war of extermination under Titus (*Josephus bell. jud.* v. 10, 3) in the most appalling manner. Eating the flesh of their own children is mentioned first, as indicating the extremity of the misery and wretchedness in which the people would perish; and after this, the judgment, by which the nation would be brought to this extremity, is more minutely described in its four principal features: viz.,

- (1) the destruction of all idolatrous abominations (v. 30);
- (2) the overthrow of the towns and sanctuaries (v. 31);
- (3) the devastation of the land, to the amazement of the enemies who dwelt therein (v. 32); and
- (4) the dispersion of the people among the heathen (v. 33).

The “high places” are altars erected upon heights and mountains in the land, upon which sacrifices were offered both to Jehovah in an unlawful way and also to heathen deities. **הַמִּזְבְּחִים**, sun-pillars, are idols of the Canaanitish nature-worship, either simple pillars dedicated to Baal, or idolatrous statues of the sun-god (cf. *Movers Phönizier* i. pp. 343ff.). “*And I give your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols.*” **גִּלְגָּלִים**, lit., clods, from **גָּלַל** to roll, a contemptuous expression for idols. With the idols the idolaters also were to perish, and defile with their corpses the images, which had also become corpses as it were, through their overthrow and destruction. For the further execution of this threat, see Eze. 6: 4ff. This will be your lot, for “My soul rejects you.” By virtue of the inward character of His holy nature, Jehovah must abhor and reject the sinner.

Lev. 26:31. Their towns and their sanctuaries He would destroy, because He took no pleasure in their sacrificial worship. **מִקְדָּשֵׁי** are the holy things of the worship of Jehovah, the tabernacle and temple, with their altars and the rest of their holy furniture, as in Psa. 68:36; 74: 7. **רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ** (Lev. 1: 9) is the odour of the sacrifice; and **רִיחַ**, to smell, an anthropomorphic designation of divine satisfaction (cf. Amo. 5:21, Isa. 11: 3).

Lev. 26:32, 33. The land was to become a wilderness, so that even the enemies who dwelt therein would be terrified in consequence (cf. Jer. 18:16; 19: 8); and the Israelites would be scattered among the heathen, because Jehovah would

draw out His sword behind them, i.e., drive them away with a drawn sword, and scatter them to all the winds of heaven (cf. Eze. 5: 2, 12; 12:14).

Lev. 26:34-45. OBJECT OF THE DIVINE JUDGMENTS IN RELATION TO THE LAND AND NATION OF ISRAEL. — Vv. 34 and 35. The land would then enjoy and keep its Sabbaths, so long as it was desolate, and Israel was in the land of its foes. כָּל יְמֵי הַשָּׁמָה, during the whole period of its devastation. הַשָּׁמָה inf. *Hophal* with the suffix, in which the *mappik* is wanting, as in Exo. 2: 3 (cf. *Ewald*, § 131e). רָצָה to have satisfaction: with בִּי and an accusative it signifies to take delight, take pleasure, in anything, e.g., in rest after the day's work is done (Job. 14: 6); here also to enjoy rest (not "to pay its debt:" *Ges.*, *Kn.*). The keeping of the Sabbath was not a performance binding upon the land, nor had the land been in fault because the Sabbath was not kept. As the earth groans under the pressure of the sin of men, so does it rejoice in deliverance from this pressure, and participation in the blessed rest of the whole creation. אָשֶׁר וּגְוִי תִשָּׁבֵת אֹתָהּ: the land "will rest (keep) what it has not rested on your Sabbaths and whilst you dwelt in it;" i.e., it will make up the rest which you did not give it on your Sabbaths (daily and yearly). It is evident from this, that the keeping of the Sabbaths and sabbatical years was suspended when the apostasy of the nation increased, — a result which could be clearly foreseen in consequence of the inward dislike of a sinner to the commandments of the holy God, and which is described in 2Ch. 26:31 as having actually occurred.

Lev. 26:36-38. So far as the *nation* was concerned, those who were left when the kingdom was overthrown would find no rest in the land of their enemies, but would perish among the heathen for their own and their fathers' iniquities, till they confessed their sins and bent their uncircumcised hearts under the righteousness of the divine punishments. הַנִּשְׁאָרִים בְּכֶם (nominative abs.): "as for those who are left in (as in Lev. 5: 9), i.e., of, you," who have not perished in the destruction of the kingdom and dispersion of the people, God will bring despair into their heart in the lands of your enemies, that the sound ("voice") of a moving leaf will hunt them to flee as before the sword, so that they will fall in their anxious flight, and stumble one over another, though no one is pursuing. The ἀπ. λεγ. מֵרָדַם from מָרַדַּם, related to מָרַח and מָרַק to rub, rub to pieces, signifies that inward anguish, fear, and despair, which rend the heart and destroy the life, δειλία, *pavor* (LXX, Vulg.), what is described in Deu. 28:65 in even stronger terms as "a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind." There should not be to them תִּקְוָמָה, *standi et resistendi facultas* (*Rosenmüller*), standing before the enemy; but they should perish among the nations. "The land of their enemies will eat them up," sc., by their falling under

the pressure of the circumstances in which they were placed (cf. Num. 13:32; Eze. 36:13).

Lev. 26:39. But those who still remained under this oppression would pine away in their iniquities (יִמְקוּ, lit., to rot, moulder away), and “also in the iniquities of their fathers with them.” אָהָם refers to עֲוֹנוֹת, “which are with them,” which they carry with them and must atone for (see at Exo. 20: 5),

Lev. 26:40-43. In this state of pining away under their enemies, they would confess to themselves their own and their fathers’ sins, i.e., would make the discovery that their sufferings were a punishment from God for their sins, and acknowledge that they were suffering what they had deserved, through their unfaithfulness to their God and rebellion against Him, for which He had been obliged to set Himself in hostility to them, and bring them into the land of their enemies; or rather their uncircumcised hearts would then humble themselves, and they would look with satisfaction upon this fruit of their sin. The construction is the following: וְיִכְרְתוּ (v. 42) corresponds to הִתְנַדְּדוּ (v. 40) as the apodosis; so that, according to the more strictly logical connection, which is customary in our language, we may unite vv. 40, 41 in one period with v. 42. “If they shall confess their iniquity...or rather their uncircumcised heart shall humble itself...I will remember My covenant.” With בְּמַעַלְמֵם a parenthetical clause is introduced into the main sentence explanatory of the iniquity, and reaches as far as “into the land of their enemies.” With אִם-יִבְנֶע, “or if, etc.,” the main sentence is resumed. או, “or rather” (as in 1Sa. 29: 3), bringing out the humiliation of the heart as the most important result to which the confession of sin ought to deepen itself. The heart is called “uncircumcised” as being unsanctified, and not susceptible to the manifestations of divine grace. רְצוּ אֶת-עֲוֹנֵם ἔσδοκῆσουσι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν (LXX), they will take pleasure, rejoice in their misdeeds, i.e., in the consequences and results of them — that their misdeed have so deeply humbled them, and brought them to the knowledge of the corruption into which they have fallen: a bold and, so to speak, paradoxical expression for their complete change of heart, which we may render thus: “they will enjoy their misdeeds,” as רָצָה may be rendered in the same way in v. 43 also. ¹⁵¹

But where punishment bears such fruit, God looks upon the sinner with favour again. When Israel had gone so far, He would remember His covenant with the fathers (“My covenant with Jacob,” בְּרִיתִי יַעֲקֹב: the suffix is attached to the governing noun, as in Lev. 6: 3, because the noun governed, being a proper name, could not take the suffix), and remember the land (including its inhabitants), which, as is repeated again in v. 43, would be left by them (become

desolate) and enjoy its Sabbaths whilst it was waste (depopulated) from (i.e., away from, without) them; and they would enjoy their iniquity, because they had despised the judgments of the Lord, and their soul had rejected His statutes.

Lev. 26:44. “And yet, even with regard to this, when they shall be in the land of their enemies, have I not despised them.” That is to say, if it shall have come even so far as that they are in the land of their enemies (the words **גַּם-זָאֵת** stand first in an absolute sense, and are strengthened or intensified by **וְאֵף** and more fully explained by **בְּהִיּוֹתָם וְגוֹי**), I have not rejected them, to destroy them and break My covenant with them. For I am Jehovah their God, who, as the absolutely existing and unchangeably faithful One, keeps His promises and does not repent of His calling (Rom. 11:29).

Lev. 26:45. He would therefore remember the covenant with the forefathers, whom He had brought out of Egypt before the eyes of the nations, to be a God to them; and He would renew the covenant with the fathers to them (the descendants), to gather them again out of the heathen, and adopt them again as His nation (cf. Deu. 30: 3-5). In this way the judgment would eventually turn to a blessing, if they would bend in true repentance under the mighty hand of their God.

Lev. 26:46. V. 46 contains the close of the entire book, or rather of the whole of the covenant legislation from Exo. 25 onwards, although the expression “in Mount Sinai” points back primarily to Lev. 25: 1.

Of Vows. — Ch. 27.

Lev. 27. The directions concerning vows follow the express termination of the Sinaitic lawgiving (Lev. 26:46), as an appendix to it, because vows formed no integral part of the covenant laws, but were a freewill expression of piety common to almost all nations, and belonged to the modes of worship current in all religions, which were not demanded and might be omitted altogether, and which really lay outside the law, though it was necessary to bring them into harmony with the demands of the law upon Israel. Making a vow, therefore, or dedicating anything to the Lord by vowing, was not commanded, but was presupposed as a manifestation of reverence for God, sanctified by ancient tradition, and was simply regulated according to the principle laid down in Deu. 23:22-24, that it was not a sin to refrain from vowing, but that every vow, when once it had been made, was to be conscientiously and inviolably kept (cf. Pro. 20:25, Ecc. 5: 3-5), and the neglect to keep it to be atoned for with a sin-offering (Lev. 5: 4). — The objects of a vow might be persons (vv. 2-8), cattle (vv. 9-13), houses (vv. 14, 15), and land (vv. 16-25), all of which might be

redeemed with the exception of sacrificial animals; but not the first-born (v. 26), nor persons and things dedicated to the Lord by the ban (vv. 28, 29), nor tithes (vv. 30-33), because all of these were to be handed over to the Lord according to the law, and therefore could not be redeemed. This followed from the very idea of the vow. For a vow was a promise made by any one to dedicate and give his own person, or a portion of his property, to the Lord for averting some danger and distress, or for bringing to his possession some desired earthly good. — Besides ordinary vowing or promising to give, there was also vowing away, or the vow of renunciation, as is evident from Num. 30. The chapter before us treats only of ordinary vowing, and gives directions for redeeming the thing vowed, in which it is presupposed that everything vowed to the Lord would fall to His sanctuary as *corban*, an offering (Mar. 7:11); and therefore, that when it was redeemed, the money would also be paid to His sanctuary. — (On the vow, see my *Archaeologie*, § 96; *Oehler* in *Herzog's Cycl.*)

Lev. 27: 2-8. THE VOWING OF PERSONS. — “If any one make a special vow, souls shall be to the Lord according to thy valuation.” **הַפְּלִיא נָדַר** does not mean to dedicate or set apart a vow, but to make a special vow (see at Lev. 22:21). The words **בְּעֵרְכֶךָ**, “according to thy (Moses’) valuation,” it is more simple to regard as an apodosis, so as to supply to **לִיהוָה** the substantive verb **תִּהְיֶינָה**, than as a fuller description of the protasis, in which case the apodosis would follow in v. 3, and the verb **יִקְדִּישׁ** would have to be supplied. But whatever may be the conclusion adopted, in any case this thought is expressed in the words, that souls, i.e., persons, were to be vowed to the Lord according to Moses’ valuation, i.e., according to the price fixed by Moses. This implies clearly enough, that whenever a person was vowed, redemption was to follow according to the valuation. Otherwise what was the object of valuing them? Valuation supposes either redemption or purchase. But in the case of men (i.e., Israelites) there could be no purchasing as slaves, and therefore the object of the valuing could only have been for the purpose of redeeming, buying off the person vowed to the Lord, and the fulfilment of the vow could only have consisted in the payment into the sanctuary of the price fixed by the law. ¹⁵²

Lev. 27: 3-7. This was to be, for persons between twenty and thirty years of age, 50 shekels for a man and 30 for a woman; for a boy between 5 and 20, 20 shekels, for a girl of the same age 10 shekels; for a male child from a month to five years 5 shekels, for a female of the same age 3 shekels; for an old man above sixty 15 shekels, for an old woman of that age 10; the whole to be in shekels of the sanctuary (see at Exo. 30:15). The valuation price was regulated, therefore, according to capacity and vigour of life, and the female sex, as the weaker vessel (1Pe. 3: 7), was only appraised at half the amount of the male.

Lev. 27: 8. But if the person making the vow was “poor before thy valuation,” i.e., too poor to be able to pay the valuation price fixed by the law, he was to be brought before the priest, who would value him according to the measure of what his hand could raise (see *Lev. 5:11*), i.e., what he was able to pay. This regulation, which made it possible for the poor man to vow his own person to the Lord, presupposed that the person vowed would have to be redeemed. For otherwise a person of this kind would only need to dedicate himself to the sanctuary, with all his power for work, to fulfil his vow completely.

Lev. 27: 9-13. When *animals* were vowed, of the cattle that were usually offered in sacrifice, everything that was given to Jehovah of these (i.e., dedicated to Him by vowing) was to be holy and not changed, i.e., exchanged, a good animal for a bad, or a bad one for a good. But if such an exchange should be made, the animal first dedicated and the one substituted were both to be holy (vv 9, 10). The expression “it shall be holy” unquestionably implies that an animal of this kind could not be redeemed; but if it was free from faults, it was offered in sacrifice: if, however, it was not fit for sacrifice on account of some blemish, it fell to the portion of the priests for their maintenance like the first-born of cattle (cf. v. 33).

Lev. 27:11, 12. Every unclean beast, however, — an ass for example, — which could not be offered in sacrifice, was to be placed before the priest for him to value it “between good and bad,” i.e., neither very high as if it were good, nor very low as if it were bad, but at a medium price; and it was to be according to this valuation, i.e., to be worth the value placed upon it (הַפְּדוּתָא בְּעֵרְבֶךָ according to thy, the priest’s, valuation), namely, when sold for the good of the sanctuary and its servants.

Lev. 27:13. But if the person vowing wanted to redeem it, he was to add a fifth above the valuation price, as a kind of compensation for taking back the animal he had vowed (cf. *Lev. 5:16*).

Lev. 27:14, 15. When a *house* was vowed, the same rules applied as in the case of unclean cattle. *Knobel’s* supposition, that the person making the vow was to pay the valuation price if he did not wish to redeem the house, is quite a groundless supposition. The house that was not redeemed was sold, of course, for the good of the sanctuary.

Lev. 27:16-25. With regard to the vowing of *land*, a difference was made between a field inherited and one that had been purchased.

Lev. 27:16. If any one sanctified to the Lord “of the field of his possession,” i.e., a portion of his hereditary property, the valuation was to be made

according to the measure of the seed sown; and an omer of barley was to be appraised at fifty shekels, so that a field sown with an omer of barley would be valued at fifty shekels. As an omer was equal to ten ephahs (Eze. 45:11), and, according to the calculation made by *Thenius*, held about 225 lbs., the fifty shekels cannot have been the average value of the yearly produce of such a field, but must be understood, as it was by the Rabbins, as the value of the produce of a complete jubilee period of 49 or 50 years; so that whoever wished to redeem the field had to pay, according to *Mishnah, Erachin* vii. 1, a shekel and a fifth *per annum*.

Lev. 27:17, 18. If he sanctified his field from the year of jubilee, i.e., immediately after the expiration of that year, it was to “stand according to thy valuation,” i.e., no alteration was to be made in the valuation. But if it took place after the year of jubilee, i.e., some time or some years after, the priest was to estimate the value according to the number of years to the next year of jubilee, and “*it shall be abated from thy valuation,*” sc., *praeteritum tempus*, the time that has elapsed since the year of jubilee. Hence, for example, if the field was vowed ten years after the year of jubilee, the man who wished to redeem it had only forty shekels to pay for the forty years remaining up to the next year of jubilee, or, with the addition of the fifth, 48 shekels. The valuation was necessary in both cases, for the hereditary field was inalienable, and reverted to the original owner or his heirs in the year of jubilee without compensation (cf. v. 21 and Lev. 25:13, 23ff.); so that, strictly speaking, it was not the field itself, but the produce of its harvests up to the next year of jubilee, that was vowed, whether the person making the vow left it to the sanctuary *in natura* till the year of jubilee, or wished to redeem it again by paying the valuation price. In the latter case, however, he had to put a fifth over and above the valuation price (v. 19, like vv. 13 and 15), that it might be left to him.

Lev. 27:20, 21. In case he did not redeem it, however, namely, before the commencement of the next year of jubilee, or sold it to another man, i.e., to a man not belonging to his family, he could no longer redeem it; but on its going out, i.e., becoming free in the year of jubilee (see Lev. 25:28), it was to be holy to the Lord, like a field under the ban (see v. 28), and to fall to the priests as their property. *Hinc colligere est, redimendum fuisse ante Jubilaeum consecratum agrum, nisi quis vellet eum plane abalienari (Clericus).* According to the distinct words of the text (observe the correspondence of אֶרֶץ...אֶרֶץ), the field, that had been vowed, fell to the sanctuary in the jubilee year not only when the owner had sold it in the meantime, but also when he had not previously redeemed it. The reason for selling the field at a time when he had vowed it to the sanctuary, need not be sought for in caprice and dishonesty, as it is by *Knobel*. If the field was vowed in this sense, that it was not handed

over to the sanctuary (the priesthood) to be cultivated, but remained in the hands of the proprietor, so that every year he paid to the sanctuary simply the valuation price, — and this may have been the rule, as the priests whose duties lay at the sanctuary could not busy themselves about the cultivation of the field, but would be obliged either to sell the piece of land at once, or farm it, — the owner might sell the field up to the year of jubilee, to be saved the trouble of cultivating it, and the purchaser could not only live upon what it yielded over and above the price to be paid every year to the sanctuary, but might possibly realize something more. In such a case the fault of the seller, for which he had to make atonement by the forfeiture of his field to the sanctuary in the year of jubilee, consisted simply in the fact that he had looked upon the land which he vowed to the Lord as though it were his own property, still and entirely at his own disposal, and therefore had allowed himself to violate the rights of the Lord by the sale of his land. At any rate, it is quite inadmissible to supply a different subject to **מִכְר** from that of the parallel **יָנַחַל**, viz., the priest.

Lev. 27:22-24. If on the other hand any one dedicated to the Lord a “field of his purchase,” i.e., a field that had been bought and did not belong to his patrimony, he was to give the amount of the valuation as estimated by the priest up to the year of jubilee “on that day,” i.e., immediately, and all at once. This regulation warrants the conclusion, that on the dedication of hereditary fields, the amount was not paid all at once, but year by year. In the year of jubilee the field that had been vowed, if a field acquired by purchase, did not revert to the buyer, but to the hereditary owner from whom it had been bought, according to the law in Lev. 25:23-28.

Lev. 27:25. All valuations were to be made according to the shekel of the sanctuary.

Lev. 27:26-29. What belonged to the Lord by law could not be dedicated to Him by a vow, especially the first-born of clean cattle (cf. Exo. 13: 1, 2). The first-born of unclean animals were to be redeemed according to the valuation of the priest, with the addition of a fifth; and if this was not done, it was to be sold at the estimated value. By this regulation the earlier law, which commanded that an ass should either be redeemed with a sheep or else be put to death (Exo. 13:13; 34:20), was modified in favour of the revenues of the sanctuary and its servants.

Lev. 27:28, 29. Moreover, nothing put under the ban, nothing that a man had devoted (banned) to the Lord of his property, of man, beast, or the field of his possession, was to be sold or redeemed, because it was most holy (see at Lev. 2: 3). The man laid under the ban was to be put to death. According to the words of v. 28, the individual Israelite was quite at liberty to ban, not only his

cattle and field, but also men who belonged to him, that is to say, slaves and children. **קָדַשׁ** signifies to dedicate something to the Lord in an unredeemable manner, as *cherum*, i.e., ban, or banned. **קָרַח** (to devote, or ban), judging from the cognate words in the Arabic, signifying *prohibere, vetare, illicitum facere, illicitum, sacrum*, has the primary signification “to cut off,” and denotes that which is taken away from use and abuse on the part of men, and surrendered to God in an irrevocable and unredeemable manner, viz., human beings by being put to death, cattle and inanimate objects by being either given up to the sanctuary for ever or destroyed for the glory of the Lord. The latter took place, no doubt, only with the property of idolaters; at all events, it is commanded simply for the infliction of punishment on idolatrous towns (Deu. 13:13ff.). It follows from this, however, that the vow of banning could only be made in connection with persons who obstinately resisted that sanctification of life which was binding upon them; and that an individual was not at liberty to devote a human being to the ban simply at his own will and pleasure, otherwise the ban might have been abused to purposes of ungodliness, and have amounted to a breach of the law, which prohibited the killing of any man, even though he were a slave (Exo. 21:20). In a manner analogous to this, too, the owner of cattle and fields was only allowed to put them under the ban when they had been either desecrated by idolatry or abused to unholy purposes. For there can be no doubt that the idea which lay at the foundation of the ban was that of a compulsory dedication of something which resisted or impeded sanctification; so that in all cases in which it was carried into execution by the community or the magistracy, it was an act of the judicial holiness of God manifesting itself in righteousness and judgment.

Lev. 27:30-33. Lastly, the tenth of the land, both of the seed of the land — i.e., not of what was sown, but of what was yielded, the produce of the seed (Deu. 14:22), the harvest reaped, or “corn of the threshing-floor,” Num. 18:27 — and also of the fruit of the tree, i.e., “the fulness of the press” (Num. 18:27), the wine and oil (Deu. 14:23), belonged to the Lord, were holy to Him, and could not be dedicated to Him by a vow. At the same time they could be redeemed by the addition of a fifth beyond the actual amount.

Lev. 27:32. With regard to all the tithes of the flock and herd, of all that passed under the rod of the herdsman, the tenth (animal) was to be holy to the Lord. No discrimination was to be made in this case between good and bad, and no exchange to be made: if, however, this did take place, the tenth animal was to be holy as well as the one for which it was exchanged, and could not be redeemed. The words “whatsoever passeth under the rod” may be explained from the custom of numbering the flocks by driving the animals one by one past the shepherd, who counted them with a rod stretched out over them (cf.

Jer. 33:13, Eze. 20:37). They mean everything that is submitted to the process of numbering, and are correctly explained by the Rabbins as referring to the fact that every year the additions to the flock and herd were tithed, and not the whole of the cattle. In these directions the tithe is referred to as something well known. In the laws published hitherto, it is true that no mention has been made of it; but, like the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and peace-offerings, it formed from time immemorial an essential part of the worship of God; so that not only did Jacob vow that he would tithe for the Lord all that He should give him in a foreign land (Gen. 28:22), but Abraham gave a tenth of his booty to Melchizedek the priest (Gen. 14:20). Under these circumstances, it was really unnecessary to enjoin upon the Israelites for the first time the offering of tithe to Jehovah. All that was required was to incorporate this in the covenant legislation, and bring it into harmony with the spirit of the law. This is done here in connection with the holy consecrations; and in Num. 18:20-32 instructions are given in the proper place concerning their appropriation, and further directions are added in Deu. 12: 6, 11; 14:22ff. respecting a second tithe. — The laws contained in this chapter are brought to a close in v. 34 with a new concluding formula (see Lev. 26:46), by which they are attached to the law given at Sinai.

FOOTNOTES

- ^{ft1} Works relating to the sacrifices: *Guil. Outram de sacrificiis libri duo, Amst.* 1688; *Bähr, Symbolik des mos. Cultus* ii. pp. 189ff.; *Kurtz on the Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament* (Clark, 1863); and *Oehler, in Herzog's Cyclopaedia*. The rabbinical traditions are to be found in the two talmudical tractates *Sebachim* and *Menachoth*, and a brief summary of them is given in *Otho lex. rabbin. philol.* pp. 631ff.
- ^{ft2} When *Knobel*, in his *Commentary on Leviticus* (p. 347), endeavours to set aside the validity of these proofs, by affirming that sacrificial worship in the earliest times is merely a fancy of the *Jehovist*; apart altogether from the untenable character of the Elohistic and Jehovistic hypothesis, there is a sufficient proof that this subterfuge is worthless, in the fact that the so-called *Elohist*, instead of pronouncing Moses the originator of the sacrificial worship of the Hebrews, introduces his laws of sacrifice with this formula, "If any man of you bring an offering of cattle unto the Lord," and thus stamps the presentation of animal sacrifice as a traditional custom. *Knobel* cannot adduce any historical testimony in support of his assertion, that, according to the opinion of the ancients, there were no animal sacrifices offered to the gods in the earliest times, but only meal, honey, vegetables, and flowers, roots, leaves, and fruit; all that he does is to quote a few passages from *Plato, Plutarch, and Porphyry*, in which these philosophers, who were much too young to answer the question, express their ideas and conjectures respecting the rise and progress of sacrificial worship among the nations.
- ^{ft3} *Outram* (*l. c.* p. 213) draws the following conclusion from Hos. 14: 3: "Prayer was a certain kind of sacrifice, and sacrifice a certain kind of prayer. Prayers were, so to speak, spiritual sacrifices, and sacrifices *symbolical* prayers."
- ^{ft4} The notion, which is still very widely spread, that the burnt-offerings of Abel, Noah, and the patriarchs were expiatory sacrifices, in which the slaying of the sacrificial animals set forth the fact, that the sinner was deserving of death in the presence of the holy God, not only cannot be proved from the Scriptures, but is irreconcilable with the attitude of a Noah, an Abraham and other patriarchs, towards the Lord God. And even *Kahnis's* explanation, "The man felt that his own *ipse* must die, before it could enter into union with the Holy One, but he had also his surmises, that another life might possibly bear this death for him, and in this obscure feeling he took away the

life of an animal that was physically clean,” is only true and to the point so far as the deeper forms of the development of the heathen consciousness of God are concerned, and not in the sphere of revealed religion, in which the expiatory sacrifices did not originate in any dim consciousness on the part of the sinner that he was deserving of death, but were appointed for the first time by God at Sinai, for the purpose of awakening and sharpening this feeling. There is no historical foundation for the arguments adduced by *Hofmann* in support of the opinion, that there were sin-offerings before the Mosaic law; and the assertion, that sin-offerings and trespass-offerings were not really introduced by the law, but were presupposed as already well known, just as much as the burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, is obviously at variance with Lev. 4 and 5.

^{ft5} This is the view expressed by *Knobel* in his Commentary on Leviticus, p. 346, where the idea is carried out in the following manner: in the dedication of animals they preferred to give the offering the form of a meal, which was provided for God, and of which flesh formed the principal part, though bread and wine could not be omitted. These meals of animal food were prepared every day in the daily burnt-offerings, just as the more respectable classes in the East eat animal food every day, and give the preference to food of this kind; and the daily offering of incense corresponded to the oriental custom of fumigating rooms, and burning perfumes in honour of a guest. At the same time *Knobel* also explains, that the Hebrews hardly attributed any wants of a sensual kind of Jehovah; or, at any rate, that the educated did not look upon the sacrifice as food for Jehovah, or regard the festal sacrifices as festal meals for Him, but may simply have thought of the fact that Jehovah was to be worshipped at all times, and more especially at the feasts, and that in this the prevailing and traditional custom was to be observed.

^{ft6} Hence *Knobel's* assertion (at Lev. 7: 2), that the laying on of the hand upon the head of the animal, which is prescribed in the case of all the other sacrifices, was omitted in that of the trespass-offering alone, needs correction, and there is no foundation for the conclusion, that it did not take place in connection with the trespass-offering.

^{ft7} This was the view held by some of the Rabbins and of the earlier theologians, e.g., *Calovius, bibl. ill. ad Lev. i. 4, Lundius* and others, but by no means by “most of the Rabbins, some of the fathers, and most of the earlier archaeologists and doctrinal writers,” as is affirmed by *Bähr* (ii. p. 336), who supports his assertion by passages from *Outram*, which refer to the sin-offering only, but which *Bähr* transfers without reserve to all the bleeding sacrifices, thus confounding substitution with the imputation of sin, in his antipathy to the orthodox doctrine of satisfaction. *Outram's* general view of

this ceremony is expressed clearly enough in the following passages: “*ritus erat ea notandi ac designandi, quae vel morti devota erant, vel Dei gratiae commendata, vel denique gravi alicui muneri usuique sacro destinata. Eique ritui semper adhiberi solebant verba aliqua explicata, quae rei susceptae rationi maxime congruere viderentur*” (l.c. 8 and 9). With reference to the words which explained the imposition of hands he observes: “*ita ut sacris piacularibus culparum potissimum confessiones cum poenae deprecatione junctas, voluntariis bonorum preces, eucharisticas autem et votivis post res prosperas impetratas periculave depulsa factis laudes et gratiarum actiones, omnique denique victimarum generi ejusmodi preces adjunctas putem, quae cuique maxime conveniebant*” (c. 9).

^{ft8} The meaning “to make atonement” lies at the foundation in every passage in which the word is used metaphorically, such as Gen. 32:21, where Jacob seeks to *expiate* the face of his angry brother, i.e., to appease his wrath, with a present; or Pro. 16:14, “the wrath of a king is as messengers of death, but a wise man *expiates* it, i.e., softens, pacifies it;” Isa. 47:11, “Mischief (destruction) will fall upon thee, thou will not be able to *expiate* it,” that is to say, to avert the wrath of God, which has burst upon thee in the calamity, by means of an expiatory sacrifice. Even in Isa. 28:18, “and your covenant with death is disannulled” (annihilated) (כִּפֵּר), the use of the word כִּפֵּר is to be explained from the fact that the guilt, which brought the judgment in its train, could be cancelled by a sacrificial expiation (cf. Isa. 6: 7 and 22:14); so that there is no necessity to resort to a meaning which is altogether foreign to the word, viz., that of covering up by blotting over. When *Hofmann* therefore maintains that there is no other way of explaining the use of the word in these passages, than by the supposition that, in addition to the verb כִּפֵּר to cover, there was another denominative verb, founded upon the word כִּפֵּר a covering, or payment, the stumblingblock in the use of the word lies simply this, that *Hofmann* has taken a one-sided view of the idea of expiation, through overlooking the fact, that the expiation had reference to the wrath of God which hung over the sinner and had to be averted from him by means of expiation, as is clearly proved by Exo. 32:30 as compared with vv. 10 and 22. The meaning of expiation which properly belongs to the verb כִּפֵּר is not only retained in the nouns *cippurim* and *capporeth*, but lies at the root of the word *copher*, which is formed from the *Kal*, as we may clearly see from Exo. 30:12-16, where the Israelites are ordered to pay a *copher* at the census, to *expiate* their souls, i.e., to cover their souls from the death which threatens the unholy, when he draws near without expiation to a holy God. Vid., *Oehler* in Herzog’s Cycl.

^{ft9} This is the rendering adopted by *Onkelos*. The LXX, on the contrary, render it ἀφελεῖ τὸν πρόλοβον σὺν τοῖς πτεροῖς, and this rendering is followed by Luther (and the English Version, Tr.), “its crop with its feathers.” But the Hebrew for this would have been וְנִצְחָרוּ. In *Mishnah, Sebach.* vi. 5, the instructions are the following: “*et removet ingluviem et pennas et viscera egredientia cum illa.*” This interpretation may be substantially correct, although the reference of בְּנִצְחָרָהּ to the feathers of the pigeon cannot be sustained on the ground assigned. For if the bird’s crop was taken out, the intestines with their contents would unquestionably come out along with it. The plucking off of the feathers, however, follows from the analogy of the flaying of the animal. Only, in the text neither intestines nor feathers are mentioned; they are passed over as subordinate matters, that could readily be understood from the analogy of the other instructions.

^{ft10} The Greeks and Romans also regarded salt as indispensable to a sacrifice. *Maxime in sacris intelligitur auctoritas salis, quando nulla conficiuntur sine mola salsa. Plin. h. n. 31, 7, (cf. 41).*

^{ft11} Cf. *Hengstenberg*, *Dissertations.* *Outram*’s explanation is quite correct: *Sacrificia salutaria in sacris litteris shelamim dicta, ut quae semper de rebus prosperis fieri solerent, impetratis utique aut impetrandis.*

^{ft12} The most holy character of the flesh of the sin-offering (Lev. 6:18ff.) furnishes no valid argument against the correctness of this explanation of the burning; for, in the first place, there is an essential difference between real or inherent sin, and sin imputed or merely transferred; and secondly, the flesh of the sin-offering was called most holy, not in a moral, but only in a liturgical or ritual sense, as subservient to the most holy purpose of wiping away sin; on which account it was to be entirely removed from all appropriation to earthly objects. Moreover, the idea that sin was imputed to the sin-offering, that it was made sin by the laying on of the hand, has a firm basis in the sacrifice of the red cow (Num. 19), and also occurs among the Greeks (see *Oehler* in *Herzog*’s *Cycl.*).

^{ft13} In the correct editions נֶעְלַם has dagesh both here and in Lev. 5: 2, 4, as Delitzsch informs me, according to an old rule in pointing, which required that every consonant which followed a syllable terminating with a guttural should be pointed with dagesh, if the guttural was to be read with a quiescent sheva and not with chateph. This is the case in וַיִּאָסֶר in Gen. 46:29, Exo. 14: 6, תַּעֲלִים in Psa. 10: 1, and other words in the critical edition of the Psalter which has been carefully revised by Bär according to the Masora, and published with an introduction by Delitzsch. In other passages, such as בְּכַל־לְבִי Psa. 9: 2, עַל־לִשְׁנוֹ Psa. 15: 3, etc., the dagesh is introduced to prevent the second letter from being lost in the preceding

one through the rapidity of reading. — Ewald's conjectures and remarks about this "dagesh, which is found in certain MSS," is a proof that he was not acquainted with this rule which the Masora recognises.

^{ft14} From the instructions to offer two pigeons in order to obtain expiation, it is perfectly evident that the eating of the flesh of the sin-offering on the part of the priest formed an essential part of the act of expiation, and was not merely a kind of honourable tribute, which God awarded to His servants who officiated at the sacrifice.

^{ft15} In the original the division of verses in the Hebrew text is followed; but we have thought it better to keep to the arrangement adopted in our English version. — Tr.

^{ft16} For the different views, see *Bähr's Symbolik*; *Winer's bibl. R. W.*; *Kurtz on Sacrificial Worship*; *Riehm, theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1854, pp. 93ff.; *Rinck, id.* 1855, p. 369; *Oehler* in Herzog's *Cycl.*

^{ft17} Even in the case of the trespass-offering, which those who had taken heathen wives offered at Ezra's instigation (*Ezr.* 10:18ff.), it had reference to a trespass (cf. vv. 2 and 10), an act of unfaithfulness to Jehovah, which demanded satisfaction. And so again the Philistines (*1Sa.* 6: 3ff.), when presenting gifts as a trespass-offering for Jehovah, rendered satisfaction for the robbery committed upon Him by the removal of the ark of the covenant.

^{ft18} Vid., *Lundius, jüd. Heiligthümer*, B. 3, c 9, § 17 and 19; *Thalhofer ut supra*, p. 139; and *Delitzsch* on the Epistle to the Hebrews. The text evidently enjoins the offering of this *minchah* upon Aaron alone; for though Aaron and his sons are mentioned in v. 13, as they were consecrated together, in v. 15 the priest anointed of his sons in Aaron's stead, i.e., the successor of Aaron in the high-priesthood, is commanded to offer it. Consequently the view maintained by *Maimonides*, *Abarbanel*, and others, which did not become general even among the Rabbins, viz., that every ordinary priest was required to offer this meat-offering when entering upon his office, has no solid foundation in the law (see *Selden de success. in pontif.* ii. c. 9; *L'Empereur ad Middoth* 1, 4, Not. 8; and *Thalhofer*, p. 150).

^{ft19} There is no foundation for *Knobel's* assertion, that in *Lev.* 19: 5ff. another early lawgiver introduces a milder regulation with regard to the thank-offering, and allows all the thank-offerings to be eaten on the second day. For *Lev.* 19: 5ff. does not profess to lay down a universal rule with regard to all the thank-offerings, but presupposes our law, and simply enforces its regulations with regard to the vow and freewill-offerings, and threatens transgressors with severe punishment.

^{ft20} The etymology of the word is obscure. According to *Winer*, *Gesenius*, and others, it signifies *adspectui patens*; whilst *Meier* and *Knobel* regard it as

meaning literally the division, or middle-piece; and *Dietrich* attributes to it the fundamental signification, “to be moved,” viz., the breast, as being the part moved by the heart.

^{ft21} In the Talmud (cf. *Gemar. Kiddush* 36, 2, *Gem. Succa* 37, 2, and *Tosaphta Menach.* 7, 17), which *Maimonides* and *Rashi* follow, *tenuphah* is correctly interpreted *ducebat et reducebat*; but some of the later Rabbins (vid., *Outram ut sup.*) make it out to have been a movement in the direction of the four quarters of the heavens, and *Witsius* and others find an allusion in this to the omnipresence of God, — an allusion which is quite out of character with the occasion.

^{ft22} In the instructions in *Exo.* 29:21 this ceremony is connected with the sprinkling of the blood upon the altar; but here, on the contrary, it is mentioned after the burning of the flesh. Whether because it was not performed till after this, or because it is merely recorded here in a supplementary form, it is difficult to decide. The latter is the more probable, because the blood upon the altar would soon run off; so that if *Moses* wanted to take any of it off, it could not be long delayed.

^{ft23} It no more follows from the omission of express instructions concerning the repetition of the ceremony in the case of every priest who had to be consecrated, that the future priests were not invested, anointed, and in all respects formally consecrated, than the fact that the anointing is not mentioned in *v.* 13 proves that the priests were not anointed at all.

^{ft24} *C. a Lapide* has given this correct interpretation of the passage: “*ut scilicet cum hostiis populi pro peccato simul etiam populi peccata in vos quasi recipiatis, ut illa expiatis.*” There is no foundation for the objection offered by *Oehler*, that the actual removal of guilt and the atonement itself were effected by the offering of the blood. For it by no means follows from *Lev.* 17:11, that the blood, as the soul of the sacrificial animal, covered or expiated the soul of the sinner, and that the removal and extinction of the sin had already taken place with the covering of the soul before the holy God, which involved the forgiveness of the sin and the reception of the sinner to mercy.

^{ft25} Upon this mistaken view of the excuse furnished by *Aaron*, *Knobel* has founded his assertion, that “this section did not emanate from the *Elohist*, because he could not have written in this way,” an assertion which falls to the ground when the words are correctly explained.

^{ft26} See *Shaw*, iii. p. 301; *Seetzen*, ii. p. 228; *Robinson’s Biblical Researches*, p. 387; and *Roediger on Gesenius thesaurus*, p. 1467.

^{ft27} The list is “hardly intended to be exhaustive, but simply mentions those which were eaten by others, and in relation to which, therefore, it was

necessary that the Israelites should receive a special prohibition against eating them” (*Knobel*). Hence in Deuteronomy Moses added the **רִאֵה** and enumerated twenty-one varieties; and on doubt, under other circumstances, he could have made the list still longer. In Deu. 14:11 **צִפּוֹר** is used, as synonymous with **עוֹר** in v. 20.

^{ft28} *Oedmann* (v. 58ff.), *Knobel*, and others follow the Greek translation of Leviticus and the Psalms, and the *Vulgate* rendering of Leviticus, the Psalms, and Job, and suppose the reference to be to the **ἑρωδιός**, *herodius*, the heron: but the name *chasidah* points decidedly to the stork, which was generally regarded by the ancients as *pietatis cultrix* (*Petron.* 55, 6), whereas, with the exception of the somewhat indefinite passage in *Aelian* (*Nat. an.* 3, 23), **καὶ τοὺς ἑρωδιούς ἀκούω ποιεῖν ταῦτόν** (i.e., feed their young by spitting out their food) **καὶ τοὺς πελεκᾶνας μέντοι**, nothing is said about the parental affection of the heron. And the testimony of *Bellonius*, “*Ciconiae quae aetate in Europa sunt, magna hyemis parte ut in Aegypto sic etiam circa Antiochiam et juxta Amanum montem degunt,*” is a sufficient answer to *Knobel’s* assertion, that according to *Seetzen* there are not storks in Mount Lebanon.

^{ft29} On account of the omission of **וְאֵת** *Knobel* would connect **הַאֲנַפָּה** as an adjective with **הַחֲסִידָה**, and explain **אֵת** as derived from **עֵנָף** *frons*, **עֵנָף** *frondens*, and signifying bushy. The herons were called “the bushy *chasidah*,” he supposes, because they have a tuft of feathers at the back of their head, or long feathers hanging down from their neck, which are wanting in the other marsh-birds, such as the flamingo, crane, and ibis. But there is this important objection to the explanation, that the change of **א** for **ע** in such a word as **עֵנָף** *frons*, which occurs as early as Lev. 23:40, and has retained its **ע** even in the Aramaean dialects, is destitute of all probability. In addition to this, there is the improbability of the *chasidah* being restricted by *anaphah* to the different species of heron, with three of which the ancients were acquainted (*Aristot. h. an.* 9, 2; *Plin. h. n.* 10, 60). If *chasidah* denoted the heron generally, or the white heron, the epithet *anaphah* would be superfluous. It would be necessary to assume, therefore, that *chasidah* denotes the whole tribe of marsh-birds, and that Moses simply intended to prohibit the heron or bushy marsh-bird. But either of these is very improbable: the former, because in every other passage of the Old Testament *chasidah* stands for one particular kind of bird; the latter, because Moses could hardly have excluded storks, ibises, and other marsh-birds that live on worms, from his prohibition. All that remains, therefore, is to separate *ha-anaphah* from the preceding word, as in Deuteronomy, and to understand it as denoting the plover (?) or heron, as there were several

species of both. Which is intended, it is impossible to decide, as there is nothing certain to be gathered from either the ancient versions or the etymology. *Bochart's* reference of the word to a fierce bird, viz., a species of eagle, which the Arabs call *Tammaj*, is not raised into a probability by a comparison with the similarly sounding ἀνοπαῖα of Od. 1, 320, by which *Aristarchus* understands a kind of eagle.

^{ft30} In Deu. 14:19 the edible kinds of locusts are passed over, because it was not the intention of Moses to repeat every particular of the earlier laws in these addresses. But when *Knobel* (on Lev. pp. 455 and 461) gives this explanation of the omission, that the eating of locusts is prohibited in Deuteronomy, and the Deuteronomist passes them over because in his more advanced age there was apparently no longer any necessity for the prohibition, this arbitrary interpretation is proved to be at variance with historical truth by the fact that locusts were eaten by John the Baptist, inasmuch as this proves at all events that a more advanced age had not given up the custom of eating locusts.

^{ft31} The large ו in וְיָרֵךְ (v. 42) shows that this *vav* is the middle letter of the Pentateuch.

^{ft32} “In its direct and deep insight into the entire *nexus* of the physical, psychical, and spiritual world, into the secret correspondences of the *cosmos* and *nomos*, this sense for nature anticipated discoveries which we shall never make with our ways of thinking, but which a purified humanity, when looking back from the new earth, will fully understand, and will no longer only ‘see through a glass darkly.’” — *Leyrer, Herzog's Cycl.*

^{ft33} At the present day there are pest-houses specially set apart for lepers outside the towns. In Jerusalem they are situated against the Zion-gate (see *Robinson*, Pal. i.p. 364).

^{ft34} Others, e.g., *Riehm* and *Oehler*, regard this trespass-offering also as a kind of *mulcta*, or satisfaction rendered for the fact, that during the whole period of his sickness, and so long as he was excluded from the congregation, the leper had failed to perform his theocratical duties, and Jehovah had been injured in consequence. But if this was the idea upon which the trespass-offering was founded, the law would necessarily have required that trespass-offerings should be presented on the recovery of persons who had been affected with diseased secretions; for during the continuance of their disease, which often lasted a long time, even as much as 12 years (Luk. 8:43), they were precluded from visiting the sanctuary or serving the Lord with sacrifices, because they were unclean, and therefore could not perform their theocratical duties.

- ^{ft35} Cf. *Sommer* (p. 220), who says, “The crust of many of these lichens is so marvellously thin, that they simply appear as coloured spots, for the most part circular, which gradually spread in a concentric form, and can be rubbed off like dust. Some species have a striking resemblance to eruptions upon the skin. There is one genus called *spiloma* (spots); and another very numerous genus bears the name of *lepraria*. ”
- ^{ft36} *V. Hofmann*’s objection to this rests upon the erroneous supposition that a double act of expiation was required for the congregation, and only a single one for the priesthood, whereas, according to the distinct words of the text, a double sprinkling was performed with the blood of both the sin-offerings, and therefore a double expiation effected.
- ^{ft37} The distinction, that in the case of all the other sacrifices *the (one) hand* is ordered to be laid upon the victim, whilst here *both hands* are ordered to be laid upon the goat, does not constitute an essential difference, as *Hofmann* supposes; but the laying on of both hands rendered the act more solemn and expressive, in harmony with the solemnity of the whole proceeding.
- ^{ft38} On the truth which lay at the foundation of this idea of the unity of the soul and blood, which others of the ancients shared with the Hebrews, particularly the early Greek philosophers, see *Delitzsch’s bibl. Psychol.* pp. 242ff. “It seems at first sight to be founded upon no other reason, than that a sudden diminution of the quantity of the blood is sure to cause death. But this phenomenon rests upon the still deeper ground, that all the activity of the body, especially that of the nervous and muscular systems, is dependent upon the circulation of the blood; for if the flow of blood is stopped from any part of the body, all its activity ceases immediately; a sensitive part loses all sensation in a very few minutes, and muscular action is entirely suspended.... The blood is really the basis of the physical life; and so far the soul, as the vital principle of the body, is pre-eminently in the blood” (p. 245).
- ^{ft39} The marriage laws and customs were much more lax among the Gentiles. With the Egyptians it was lawful to marry sisters and half-sisters (*Diod. Sic.* i. 27), and the licentiousness of the women was very great among them (see at Gen. 39: 6ff.). With the Persians marriage was allowed with mother, daughter, and sister (*Clem. Al. strom.* iii. p. 431; *Eusebii praep. ev.* vi. 10); and this is also said to have been the case with the Medians, Indians, and Ethiopians, as well as with the Assyrians (*Jerome adv. Jovin.* ii. 7; *Lucian, Sacrif.* 5); whereas the Greeks and Romans abhorred such marriages, and the Athenians and Spartans only permitted marriages with half-sisters (cf. *Selden de jure nat. et gent.* v. 11, pp. 619ff.). The ancient Arabs, before the time of Mohammed, were very strict in this respect, and would not allow of marriage with a mother, daughter, or aunt on either the father’s or mother’s

side, or with two sisters at the same time. The only cases on record of marriage between brothers and sisters are among the Arabs of Marbat (*Seetzen, Zach's Mon. Corresp.* Oct. 1809). This custom Mohammed raised into a law, and extended it to nieces, nurses, foster-sisters, etc. (*Koran, Sure* iv. 20ff.).

^{ft40} In explanation of these words *Knobel* very properly remarks, that with the Greeks the sacrificial animal was required to be ἀφελής (*Pollux* i. 1, 26), upon which *Hesychius* observes, μήτε πλεονάζων μήτε δέων τι τοῦ σώματος.

^{ft41} For this reason the following rule was also laid down by the Romans: *Suis faetus sacrificio die quinto purus est, pecoris die octavo, bovis tricesimo* (*Plin.* h. n. 8, 51).

^{ft42} Partly on account of his repetition, and partly because of the supposed discrepancy observable in the fact, that holy meetings are not prescribed for the Sabbath in the list of festal sacrifices in Num. 28 and 29, *Hupfield* and *Knobel* maintain that the words of vv. 2 and 3, from יהיה to מושבתים, notwithstanding their Elohist expression, were not written by the Elohist, but are an interpolation of the later editor. The repetition of the heading, however, cannot prove anything at all with the constant repetitions that occur in the so-called Elohist groundwork, especially as it can be fully explained by the reason mentioned in the text. And the pretended discrepancy rests upon the perfectly arbitrary assumption, that Num. 28 and 29 contain a complete codex of all the laws relating to all the feasts. How totally this assumption is at variance with the calendar of feasts, is clear enough from the fact, that no rule is laid down there for the observance of the Sabbath, with the exception of the sacrifices to be offered upon it, and that even rest from labour is not commanded. Moreover *Knobel* is wrong in identifying the “holy convocation” with a journey to the sanctuary, whereas appearance at the tabernacle to hold the holy convocations (for worship) was not regarded as necessary either in the law itself or according to the later orthodox custom, but, on the contrary, holy meetings for edification were held on the Sabbath in every place in the land, and it was out of this that the synagogues arose.

^{ft43} The view advocated by the Baethoseans, which has been lately supported by *W. Schultz*, is refuted not only by Jos. 5:11, but by the definite article used, השבת, which points back to one of the feast-days already mentioned, and still more decisively by the circumstance, that according to v. 15 the seven weeks, at the close of which the feast of Pentecost was to be kept, were to be reckoned from this Sabbath; and if the Sabbath was not fixed, but might fall upon any day of the seven days' feast of Mazzoth, and therefore as

much as give or six days after the Passover, the feast of Passover itself would be forced out of the fundamental position which it occupied in the series of annual festivals (cf. *Ranke*, Pentateuch ii. 108). *Hitzig's* hypothesis has been revived by *Hupfeld* and *Knobel*, without any notice of the conclusive refutation given to it by *Bähr* and *Wieseler*; only *Knobel* makes "the Sabbath" not the concluding but the opening Sabbath of the feast of Passover, on the ground that "otherwise the festal sheaf would not have been offered till the 22nd of the month, and therefore would have come *post festum*." But this hypothesis, which renders it necessary that the commencement of the ecclesiastical year should always be assigned to a Saturday (Sabbath), in order to gain weekly Sabbaths for the 14th and 21st of the month, as the opening and close of the feast of Passover, gives such a form to the Jewish year as would involve its invariably closing with a broken week; a hypothesis which is not only incapable of demonstration, but, from the holiness attached to the Jewish division of weeks, is *a priori* improbable, and in fact inconceivable. The Mosaic law, which gave such sanctity to the division of time into weeks, as founded upon the history of creation, by the institution of the observance of the Sabbath, that it raised the Sabbath into the groundwork of a magnificent festal cycle, could not possibly have made such an arrangement with regard to the time for the observance of the Passover, as would involve almost invariably the mutilation of the last week of the year, and an interruption of the old and sacred weekly cycle with the Sabbath festival at its close. The arguments by which so forced a hypothesis is defended, must be very conclusive indeed, to meet with any acceptance. But neither *Hitzig* nor his followers have been able to adduce any such arguments as these. Besides the word "Sabbath" and Jos. 5:11, which prove nothing at all, the only other argument adduced by *Knobel* is, that "it is impossible to see why precisely the second day of the *azyma*, when the people went about their ordinary duties, and there was no meeting at the sanctuary, should have been distinguished by the sacrificial gift which was the peculiar characteristic of the feast," — an argument based upon the fallacious principle, that anything for which I can see no reason, cannot possibly have occurred.

^{ft44} A connection between the feast of Pentecost and the giving of the law, which *Maimonides* (A.D. †1205) was the first to discover, is not only foreign to the Mosaic law, but to the whole of the Jewish antiquity; and even *Abarbanel* expressly denies it.

^{ft45} The word **תְּרוּעָה** is also used in Num. 10: 5, 6 to denote the blowing with the silver trumpets; but there seems to be no ground for supposing these trumpets to be intended here, not only because of the analogy between the seventh day of the new moon as a jubilee day and the jubilee year

(Lev. 25: 9, 10), but also because the silver trumpets are assigned to a different purpose in Num. 10: 2-10, and their use is restricted to the blowing at the offering of the burnt-offerings on the feast-days and new moons. To this we have to add the Jewish tradition, which favours with perfect unanimity the practice of blowing with horns (the horns of animals).

^{ft46} Even in the time of the Maccabees, on the other hand (cf. 2 Macc. 10: 6, 7), the feast of the Purification of the Temple was celebrated by the Jews after the manner of the Tabernacles (*κατὰ σκηνωμάτων τρόπον*); so that they offered songs of praise, holding (*ἔχοντες*, carrying?) leafy poles (*θύρσους*, not branches of ivy, cf. *Grimm. ad l.c.*) and beautiful branches, also palms; in the time of Christ it was the custom to have sticks or poles (staves) of palm-trees and citron-trees (*θύρσους ἐκ φοινίκων καὶ κιτρώων*: *Josephus, Ant.* xiii. 13, 5), or to carry in the hand a branch of myrtle and willow bound round with wool, with palms at the top and an apple of the *περσέα* (peach or pomegranate?) upon it (*ἔιρεσιώνην μυρσίνης καὶ ἰτέας σὺν κράδῃ φοίνικος πεποιημένην τοῦ μήλου τοῦ τῆς Περσέας προσόντος*). This custom, which was still further developed in the Talmud, where a bunch made of palm, myrtle, and willow boughs is ordered to be carried in the right hand, and a citron or orange in the left, has no foundation in the law: it sprang rather out of an imitation of the Greek harvest-feast of the *Pyanepsia* and Bacchus festivals, from which the words *θύρσοι* and *ἔιρεσιώνη* were borrowed by *Josephus*, and had been tacked on by the scribes to the text of the Bible (v. 40) in the best way they could. See *Bähr, Symbol.* ii. p. 625, and the innumerable trivial laws in *Mishna Succa* and *Succa Codex talm. babyl. sive de tabernaculorum festo ed. Dachs. Utr.* 1726, 4.

^{ft47} The meaning to sin and play, which is peculiar to the *Piel*, and is derived from *zamar*, to hum, has hardly anything to do with this. At all events the connection has not yet been shown to be a probable one. See *Hupfeld, Psa.* 4 pp. 421-2, note.

^{ft48} To prove that this verse is an interpolation made by the Jehovist into the Elohist writings, *Knobel* is obliged to resort to two groundless assumptions: viz., (1) to regard vv. 23 and 24, which belong to what follows (vv. 25ff.) and lay down the general rule respecting the possession and redemption of land, as belonging to what precedes and connected with vv. 14-17; and (2) to explain vv. 18-22 in the most arbitrary manner, as a supplementary clause relating to the *sabbatical year*, whereas the promise that the sixth year should yield produce enough for three years (vv. 21, 22) shows as clearly as possible that they treat of the *year of jubilee* together with the seventh sabbatical year which preceded it, and in v. 20 the seventh

year is mentioned simply as the beginning of the two years' Sabbath which the land was to keep without either sowing or reaping.

^{ft49} This is the way in which it is correctly explained by *Hiskuni*: *Utitur scriptura verbo redimendi non emendi, quia quidquid Levitae vendunt ex Israelitarum haereditate est, non ex ipsorum haereditate. Nam ecce non habent partes in terra, unde omnis qui accipit aut emit ab illis est acsi redimeret, quoniam ecce initio ipsius possessio fuit.* On the other hand, the proposal made by *Ewald*, *Knobel*, etc., after the example of the *Vulgate*, to supply **ל** before **לְיִשְׂרָאֵל** is not only an unnecessary conjecture, but is utterly unsuitable, inasmuch as the words “if one of the Levites does not redeem it” would restrict the right to the Levites without any perceptible reason; just as if a blood-relation on the female side, belonging to any other tribe, might not have done this.

^{ft50} When modern critics, who are carried away by naturalism, maintain that Moses was not the author of these exhortations and warnings, because of their prophetic contents, and assign them to the times of the kings, the end of the eighth, or beginning of the seventh century (see *Ewald*, *Gesch.* i. 156), they have not considered, in their antipathy to any supernatural revelations from God in the Old Testament, that even apart from any higher illumination, the fundamental idea of these promises and threats must have presented itself to the mind of the lawgiver Moses. It required but a very little knowledge of the nature of the human heart, and a clear insight into the spiritual and ethical character of the law, to enable him to foresee that the earthly-minded, unholy nation would not fulfil the solemn demand of the law that their whole life should be sanctified to the Lord God, that they would transgress in many ways, and rebel against God and His holy laws, and therefore that in any case times of fidelity and the corresponding blessing would alternate with times of unfaithfulness and the corresponding curse, but that, for all that, at the end the grace of God would obtain the victory over the severely punished and deeply humbled nation, and bring the work of salvation to a glorious close. It is true, the concrete character of this chapter cannot be fully explained in this way, but it furnishes the clue to the psychological interpretation of the conception of this prophetic discourse, and shows us the subjective points of contact for the divine revelation which Moses has announced to us here. For, as *Auberlen* observes, “there is a marvellous and grand display of the greatness of God in the fact, that He holds out before the people, whom He has just delivered from the hands of the heathen and gathered round Himself, the prospect of being scattered again among the heathen, and that, even before the land is taken by the Israelites, He predicts its return to desolation. These words could only be spoken by One who has the future really before His mind,

who sees through the whole depth of sin, and who can destroy His own work, and yet attain His end. But so much the more adorable and marvellous is the grace, which nevertheless begins its work among such sinners, and is certain of victory notwithstanding all retarding and opposing difficulties.” The peculiar character of this revelation, which must deeply have affected Moses, will explain the peculiarities observable in the style, viz., the heaping up of unusual words and modes of expression, several of which never occur again in the Old Testament, whilst others are only used by the prophets who followed the Pentateuch in their style.

^{ft51} *Luther* has translated עוֹן in this sense, “punishment of iniquity,” and observes in the marginal notes, — “(Pleasure), i.e., just as they had pleasure in their sins and felt disgust at My laws, so they would now take pleasure in their punishment and say, ‘We have just what we deserve. This is what we have to thank our cursed sin for. It is just, O God, quite just.’ And these are thoughts and words of earnest repentance, hating itself from the bottom of the heart, and crying out, Shame upon me, what have I done? This pleases God, so that He becomes gracious once more.”

^{ft52} *Saalschütz* adopts this explanation in common with the *Mishnah*. *Oehler* is wrong in citing 1Sa. 2:11, 22, 28 as a proof of the opposite. For the dedication of Samuel did not consist of a simple vow, but was a dedication as a Nazarite for the whole of his life, and Samuel was thereby vowed to service at the sanctuary, whereas the law says nothing about attachment to the sanctuary in the case of the simple vowing of persons. But because redemption in the case of persons was not left to the pleasure or free-will of the person making the vow as in the case of material property, no addition is made to the valuation price as though for a merely possible circumstance.]