



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines


Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.


About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



MAR

1886



BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

ON

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY

C. F. KEIL, D.D., AND F. DELITZSCH, D.D.,
PROFESSORS OF THEOLOGY.

VOLUME II.

THE PENTATEUCH.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY THE

REV. JAMES MARTIN, B.A.,

NOTTINGHAM.

EDINBURGH:

T. AND T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO. DUBLIN: JOHN ROBERTSON & CO.

MDCCCLXIV.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

DK18.

K 27

(2)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

THE SECOND BOOK OF MOSES (EXODUS).

	Page
Consecration of Israel as the Covenant Nation. Deliverance from Egypt (Chap. xii.-xiii. 16),	9
Journey from Succoth, and Passage through the Red Sea (Chap. xiii. 17-xiv. 31),	38
Moses' Song at the Red Sea (Chap. xv. 1-21),	49
Israel conducted from the Red Sea to the Mountain of God (Chap. xv. 22.-xvii. 7),	57
Conflict with Amalek (Chap. xvii. 8-16),	77
Jethro the Midianite in the Camp of Israel (Chap. xviii.),	83
Arrival at Sinai, and Preparation for the Covenant (Chap. xix.),	88
The Ten Words of Jehovah (Chap. xx. 1-21),	105
The Leading Features in the Covenant Constitution (Chap. xx. 22- xxiv. 2),	126
Conclusion of the Covenant (Chap. xxiv. 3-18),	156
Directions concerning the Sanctuary and Priesthood (Chap. xxv.- xxxi.),	161
The Covenant Broken and Renewed (Chap. xxxii.-xxxiv.),	220
Erection of the Tabernacle, and Preparation of the Apparatus of Worship (Chap. xxxv.-xxxix.),	245
Erection and Consecration of the Tabernacle, (Chap. xl.),	255

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES (LEVITICUS).

INTRODUCTION.

	Page
Contents and Plan of Leviticus,	261

EXPOSITION.

I. Laws and Ordinances determining the Covenant Fellowship between the Lord and Israel (Chap. i.-xvi.) :—	
The Laws of Sacrifice (Chap. i.-vii.),	264
1. General Rules for the Sacrifices (Chap. i.-v.),	271
2. Special Instructions concerning the Sacrifices for the Priests (Chap. vi. and vii.),	317
Induction of Aaron and his Sons into the Priestly Office (Chap. viii.-x.),	333
Laws relating to Clean and Unclean Animals (Chap. xi.). (Cf. Deut. xiv. 3-20),	357
Laws of Purification (Chap. xii.-xv.),	372
The Day of Atonement (Chap. xvi.),	394
II. Laws for the Sanctification of Israel in the Covenant Fellowship of its God (Chap. xvii.-xxv.) :—	
Holiness of Conduct on the part of the Israelites (Chap. xvii.- xx.),	407
Holiness of the Priests, of the Holy Gifts, and of Sacrifices (Chap. xxi. and xxii.),	428
Sanctification of the Sabbath and the Feasts of Jehovah (Chap. xxiii.),	437
Preparation of the Holy Lamps and Shew-Bread. Punishment of a Blasphemer (Chap. xxiv.),	451
Sanctification of the Possession of Land by the Sabbatical and Jubilee Years (Chap. xxv.),	455
Promises and Threats (Chap. xxvi.),	467
Of Vows (Chap. xxvii.),	479

THE SECOND BOOK OF MOSES.

(EXODUS.)

CONSECRATION OF ISRAEL AS THE COVENANT NATION.
DELIVERANCE FROM EGYPT.—CHAP. XII.—XIII. 16.



CHAP. xii. 1-28. INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.—
The deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt was at hand; also their adoption as the nation of Jehovah (chap. vi. 6, 7). But for this a divine consecration was necessary, that their outward severance from the land of Egypt might be accompanied by an inward severance from everything of an Egyptian or heathen nature. This consecration was to be imparted by the Passover—a festival which was to lay the foundation for Israel's birth (Hos. ii. 5) into the new life of grace and fellowship with God, and to renew it perpetually in time to come. This festival was therefore instituted and commemorated before the exodus from Egypt. Vers. 1-28 contain the directions for the Passover: viz. vers. 1-14 for the keeping of the feast of the Passover before the departure from Egypt, and vers. 15-20 for the seven days' feast of unleavened bread. In vers. 21-27 Moses communicates to the elders of the nation the leading instructions as to the former feast, and the carrying out of those instructions is mentioned in ver. 28.

Vers. 1 and 2. By the words, "*in the land of Egypt,*" the law of the Passover which follows is brought into connection with the giving of the law at Sinai and in the fields of Moab, and is distinguished in relation to the former as the first or foundation law for the congregation of Jehovah. The creation of

Israel as the people of Jehovah (Isa. xliii. 15) commenced with the institution of the Passover. As a proof of this, it was preceded by the appointment of a new era, fixing the commencement of the congregation of Jehovah. "*This month*" (i.e. the present in which ye stand) "*be to you the head* (i.e. the beginning) *of the months, the first let it be to you for the months of the year;*" i.e. let the numbering of the months, and therefore the year also, begin with it. Consequently the Israelites had hitherto had a different beginning to their year, probably only a civil year, commencing with the sowing, and ending with the termination of the harvest (cf. xxiii. 16); whereas the Egyptians most likely commenced their year with the overflowing of the Nile at the summer solstice (cf. *Lepsius, Chron.* 1, pp. 148 sqq.). The month which was henceforth to be the first of the year, and is frequently so designated (chap. xl. 2, 17; Lev. xxiii. 5, etc.), is called *Abib* (the ear-month) in chap. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18, Deut. xvi. 1, because the corn was then in ear; after the captivity it was called *Nisan* (Neh. ii. 1; Esth. iii. 7). It corresponds very nearly to our April.

Vers. 3-14. *Arrangements for the Passover.*—"All the congregation of Israel" was the nation represented by its elders (cf. ver. 21, and my bibl. Arch. ii. p. 221). "*On the tenth of this* (i.e. the first) *month, let every one take to himself* אֶת (a lamb, lit. a young one, either sheep or goats; ver. 5, and Deut. xiv. 4), *according to fathers' houses*" (vid. vi. 14), i.e. according to the natural distribution of the people into families, so that only the members of one family or family circle should unite, and not an indiscriminate company. In ver. 21 *mishpachoth* is used instead. "*A lamb for the house,*" בַּיִת, i.e. the family forming a household.—Ver. 4. But if "*the house be too small for a lamb*" (lit. "*small from the existence of a lamb,*" מִן comparative: הֵיחָת מִשֶּׁהוּ is an existence which receives its purpose from the lamb, which answers to that purpose, viz. the consumption of the lamb, i.e. if a family is not numerous enough to consume a lamb), "*let him* (the house-father) *and his nearest neighbour against his house take* (sc. a lamb) *according to the calculation of the persons.*" מְבַרְרָה *computatio* (Lev. xxvii. 23), from בָּרַם *computare*; and מְבַרְרָה, the calculated amount or number (Num. xxxi. 28): it only occurs in the Pentateuch. "*Every one according to the measure of his eating shall ye reckon for the lamb:*" i.e. in deciding whether

several families had to unite, in order to consume one lamb, they were to estimate how much each person would be likely to eat. Consequently more than two families might unite for this purpose, when they consisted simply of the father and mother and little children. A later custom fixed *ten* as the number of persons to each paschal lamb; and *Jonathan* has interpolated this number into the text of his Targum.—Ver. 5. The kind of lamb: קָדוֹשׁ *integer*, uninjured, without bodily fault, like all the sacrifices (Lev. xxii. 19, 20); a male like the burnt-offerings (Lev. i. 3, 11); שְׁנָתוֹ בָּן one year old (*ἐνιαύσιος*, LXX). This does not mean “standing in the first year, viz. from the eighth day of its life to the termination of the first year” (*Rabb. Cler.*, etc.), a rule which applied to the other sacrifices only (chap. xxii. 29; Lev. xxii. 27). The opinion expressed by *Ewald* and others, that oxen were also admitted at a later period, is quite erroneous, and cannot be proved from Deut. xvi. 2, or 2 Chron. xxx. 24 and xxxv. 7 sqq. As the lamb was intended as a sacrifice (ver. 27), the characteristics were significant. Freedom from blemish and injury not only befitted the sacredness of the purpose to which they were devoted, but was a symbol of the moral integrity of the person represented by the sacrifice. It was to be a male, as taking the place of the male first-born of Israel; and a year old, because it was not till then that it reached the full, fresh vigour of its life. “*Ye shall take it out from the sheep or from the goats:*” i.e., as *Theodoret* explains it, “He who has a sheep, let him slay it; and he who has no sheep, let him take a goat.” Later custom restricted the choice to the lamb alone; though even in the time of *Josiah* kids were still used as well (2 Chron. xxxv. 7).

Ver. 6. “*And it shall be to you for preservation (ye shall keep it) until the fourteenth day, and then . . . slay it at sunset.*” Among the reasons commonly assigned for the instruction to choose the lamb on the 10th, and keep it till the 14th, which *Jonathan* and *Rashi* supposed to refer to the Passover in Egypt alone, there is an element of truth in the one given most fully by *Fagius*, “that the sight of the lamb might furnish an occasion for conversation respecting their deliverance from Egypt, . . . and the mercy of God, who had so graciously looked upon them;” but this hardly serves to explain the interval of exactly four days. *Hofmann* supposes it to refer to the four *doroth*

(Gen. xv. 16), which had elapsed since Israel was brought to Egypt, to grow into a nation. The probability of such an allusion, however, depends upon just what *Hofmann* denies without sufficient reason, viz. upon the lamb being regarded as a sacrifice, in which Israel consecrated itself to its God. It was to be slain by "the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel:" not by the whole assembled people, as though they gathered together for this purpose, for the slaughtering took place in every house (ver. 7); the meaning is simply, that the entire congregation, without any exception, was to slay it at the same time, viz. "between the two evenings" (Num. ix. 3, 5, 11), or "in the evening at sunset" (Deut. xvi. 6). Different opinions have prevailed among the Jews from a very early date as to the precise time intended. *Aben Ezra* agrees with the Caraites and Samaritans in taking the first evening to be the time when the sun sinks below the horizon, and the second the time of total darkness; in which case, "between the two evenings" would be from 6 o'clock to 7.20. *Kimchi* and *Rashi*, on the other hand, regard the moment of sunset as the boundary between the two evenings, and *Hitzig* has lately adopted their opinion. According to the rabbinical idea, the time when the sun began to descend, viz. from 3 to 5 o'clock, was the first evening, and sunset the second; so that "between the two evenings" was from 3 to 6 o'clock. Modern expositors have very properly decided in favour of the view held by *Aben Ezra* and the custom adopted by the Caraites and Samaritans, from which the explanation given by *Kimchi* and *Rashi* does not materially differ. It is true that this argument has been adduced in favour of the rabbinical practice, viz. that "only by supposing the afternoon to have been included, can we understand why the day of Passover is always called the 14th (Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. ix. 3, etc.);" and also, that "if the slaughtering took place after sunset, it fell on the 15th Nisan, and not the 14th."¹ But both arguments are based upon an untenable assumption. For it is obvious from Lev. xxiii. 32, where the fast prescribed for the day of atonement, which fell upon the 10th of the 7th month, is ordered to commence on the evening of the 9th day, "from even to even," that although the Israelites reckoned the day of 24 hours from the evening sunset to sunset, in numbering the days they followed the natural day, and numbered each day according to the period

between sunrise and sunset. Nevertheless there is no formal disagreement between the law and the rabbinical custom. The expression in Deut. xvi. 6, "at (towards) sunset," is sufficient to show that the boundary line between the two evenings is not to be fixed precisely at the moment of sunset, but only somewhere about that time. The daily evening sacrifice and the incense offering were also to be presented "between the two evenings" (chap. xxix. 39, 41, xxx. 8; Num. xxviii. 4). Now as this was not to take place exactly at the same time, but to precede it, they could not both occur at the time of sunset, but the former must have been offered before that. Moreover, in later times, when the paschal lamb was slain and offered at the sanctuary, it must have been slain and offered before sunset, if only to give sufficient time to prepare the paschal meal, which was to be over before midnight. It was from these circumstances that the rabbinical custom grew up in the course of time, and the lax use of the word evening, in Hebrew as well as in every other language, left space enough for this. For just as we do not confine the term morning to the time before sunset, but apply it generally to the early hours of the day, so the term evening is not restricted to the period after sunset. If the sacrifice prescribed for the morning could be offered after sunrise, the one appointed for the evening might in the same manner be offered before sunset.

Ver. 7. Some of the blood was to be put (שָׁפַךְ as in Lev. iv. 18, where שָׁפַךְ is distinguished from הִשָּׁקֵף, to sprinkle, in ver. 17) upon the two posts and the lintel of the door of the house in which the lamb was eaten. This blood was to be to them a sign (ver. 13); for when Jehovah passed through Egypt to smite the first-born, He would see the blood, and would spare these houses, and not permit the destroyer to enter them (vers. 13, 23). The two posts with the lintel represented the door (ver. 23), which they surrounded; and the doorway through which the house was entered stood for the house itself, as we may see from the frequent expression "in thy gates," for in thy towns (chap. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14, xii. 17, etc.). The threshold, which belonged to the door quite as much as the lintel, was not to be smeared with blood, in order that the blood might not be trodden under foot. By the smearing of the door-posts and lintel with blood, the house was expiated and consecrated on an altar. That the

smearing with blood was to be regarded as an act of expiation, is evident from the simple fact, that a hyssop-bush was used for the purpose (ver. 22); for sprinkling with hyssop is never prescribed in the law, except in connection with purification in the sense of expiation (Lev. xiv. 49 sqq.; Num. xix. 18, 19). In Egypt the Israelites had no common altar; and for this reason, the houses in which they assembled for the Passover were consecrated as altars, and the persons found in them were thereby removed from the stroke of the destroyer. In this way the smearing of the door-posts and lintel became a sign to Israel of their deliverance from the destroyer. Jehovah made it so by His promise, that He would see the blood, and pass over the houses that were smeared with it. Through faith in this promise, Israel acquired in the sign a firm pledge of its deliverance. The smearing of the doorway was relinquished, after Moses (not Josiah, as *Vaihinger* supposes, cf. Deut. xvi. 5, 6) had transferred the slaying of the lambs to the court of the sanctuary, and the blood had been ordered to be sprinkled upon the altar there.

Vers. 8, 9. With regard to the preparation of the lamb for the meal, the following directions were given: "*They shall eat the lamb in that night*" (i.e. the night following the 14th), and none of it נָח ("underdone" or raw), or בָּשָׁל ("boiled,"—lit. done, viz. מְבֻשָּׁל בַּמַּיִם, done in water, i.e. boiled, as בָּשָׁל does not mean to be boiled, but to become ripe or done, Joel iii. 13); "*but roasted with fire, even its head on (along with) its thighs and entrails;*" i.e., as *Rashi* correctly explains it, "undivided or whole, so that neither head nor thighs were cut off, and not a bone was broken (ver. 46), and the viscera were roasted in the belly along with the entrails," the latter, of course, being first of all cleansed. On פְּרָעִים and קָרֵב see Lev. i. 9. These regulations are all to be regarded from one point of view. The first two, neither underdone nor boiled, were connected with the roasting of the animal whole. As the roasting no doubt took place on a spit, since the Israelites while in Egypt can hardly have possessed such ovens of their own, as are prescribed in the Talmud and are met with in Persia, the lamb would be very likely to be roasted imperfectly, or underdone, especially in the hurry that must have preceded the exodus (ver. 11). By boiling, again, the integrity of the animal would have been destroyed, partly through the fact that it could never have been got into a pot whole, as the Israel-

ites had no pots or kettles sufficiently large, and still more through the fact that, in boiling, the substance of the flesh is more or less dissolved. For it is very certain that the command to roast was not founded upon the hurry of the whole procedure, as a whole animal could be quite as quickly boiled as roasted, if not even more quickly, and the Israelites must have possessed the requisite cooking utensils. It was to be roasted, in order that it might be placed upon the table undivided and essentially unchanged. "Through the unity and integrity of the lamb given them to eat, the participants were to be joined into an undivided unity and fellowship with the Lord, who had provided them with the meal" (cf. 1 Cor. x. 17).¹ They were to eat it with מצות (ἄζυμα, *azymi panes*; LXX., *Vulg.*), i.e. (not sweet, or parched, but) *pure loaves*, not fermented with leaven; for leaven, which sets the dough in fermentation, and so produces impurity, was a natural symbol of moral corruption, and was excluded from the sacrifices therefore as defiling (Lev. ii. 11). "Over (upon) bitter herbs they shall eat it." מרורים, *πικρίδες* (LXX.), *lactuca agrestes* (*Vulg.*), probably refers to various kinds of bitter herbs. Πικρίς, according to *Aristot. Hist. an.* 9, 6, and *Plin. h. n.* 8, 41, is the same as *lactuca silvestris*, or wild lettuce; but in *Dioscor.* 2, 160, it is referred to as the wild σέρις or κυχόριον, i.e. wild endive, the *intubus* or *intubum* of the Romans. As lettuce and endive are indigenous in Egypt, and endive is also met with in Syria from the beginning of the winter months to the end of March, and lettuce in April and May, it is to these herbs of bitter flavor that the term *merorim* chiefly applies;

¹ See my *Archäologie* i. p. 386. *Baehr* (*Symb.* 2, 635) has given the true explanation: "By avoiding the breaking of the bones, the animal was preserved in complete integrity, undisturbed and entire (Ps. xxxiv. 20). The sacrificial lamb to be eaten was to be thoroughly and perfectly whole, and at the time of eating was to appear as a perfect whole, and therefore as one; for it is not what is dissected, divided, broken in pieces, but only what is whole, that is *eo ipso* one. There was no other reason for this, than that all who took part in this one whole animal, i.e. all who ate of it, should look upon themselves as one whole, one community, like those who eat the New Testament Passover, the body of Christ (1 Cor. v. 7), of whom the apostle says (1 Cor. x. 17), "There is one bread, and so we, being many, are one body: for we are all partakers of one body." The preservation of Christ, so that not a bone was broken, had the same signification; and God ordained this that He might appear as the true paschal lamb, that was slain for the sins of the world."

though others may also be included, as the Arabs apply the same term to *Scorzonera orient.*, *Picris scabra*, *Sonchus oler.*, *Hieracium uniflor.*, and others (*Forsk. flor.* cxviii. and 143); and in the *Mishnah*, Pes. 2, 6, five different varieties of bitter herbs are reckoned as *merorim*, though it is difficult to determine what they are (cf. *Bochart, Hieroz.* 1, pp. 691 sqq., and *Cels. Hierobot.* ii. p. 727). By לַי (upon) the bitter herbs are represented, both here and in Num. ix. 11, not as an accompaniment to the meat, but as the basis of the meal. לַי does not signify along with, or indicate accompaniment, not even in chap. xxxv. 22; but in this and other similar passages it still retains its primary signification, *upon* or *over*. It is only used to signify accompaniment in cases where the ideas of protection, meditation, or addition are prominent. If, then, the bitter herbs are represented in this passage as the basis of the meal, and the unleavened bread also in Num. ix. 11, it is evident that the bitter herbs were not intended to be regarded as a savoury accompaniment, by which more flavour was imparted to the sweeter food, but had a more profound signification. The bitter herbs were to call to mind the bitterness of life experienced by Israel in Egypt (i. 14), and this bitterness was to be overpowered by the sweet flesh of the lamb. In the same way the unleavened loaves are regarded as forming part of the substance of the meal in Num. ix. 11, in accordance with their significance in relation to it (*vid.* ver. 15). There is no discrepancy between this and Deut. xvi. 3, where the *mazzoth* are spoken of as an accompaniment to the flesh of the sacrifice; for the allusion there is not to the eating of the paschal lamb, but to sacrificial meals held during the seven days' festival.

Ver. 10. The lamb was to be all eaten wherever this was possible; but if any was left, it was to be burned with fire the following day,—a rule afterwards laid down for all the sacrificial meals, with one solitary exception (*vid.* Lev. vii. 15). They were to eat it בְּפָנָיָם, “in anxious flight” (from פָּנָה *trepidare*, Ps. xxxi. 23; to flee in terror, Deut. xx. 3, 2 Kings vii. 15); in travelling costume therefore,—with “the loins girded,” that they might not be impeded in their walking by the long flowing dress (2 Kings iv. 29),—with “shoes (sandals) on their feet,” that they might be ready to walk on hard, rough roads, instead of bare-footed, as they generally went (cf. Josh. ix. 5, 13; *Bynæus de*

calceis ii. 1, 7; and *Bochart, Hieroz.* i. pp. 686 sqq.), and “*staff in hand*” (Gen. xxxii. 11). The directions in ver. 11 had reference to the paschal meal in Egypt only, and had no other signification than to prepare the Israelites for their approaching departure. But though “this preparation was intended to give the paschal meal the appearance of a support for the journey, which the Israelites were about to take,” this by no means exhausts its signification. The divine instructions close with the words, “*it is פסח to Jehovah;*” *i.e.* what is prescribed is a *pesach* appointed by Jehovah, and to be kept for Him (cf. chap. xx. 10, “*Sabbath to Jehovah;*” xxxii. 5, “*feast to Jehovah*”). The word פסח, *Aram.* ספספ, *Gr.* πᾶσχα, is derived from פסח, lit. to leap or hop, from which these two meanings arise: (1) to limp (1 Kings xviii. 21; 2 Sam. iv. 4, etc.); and (2) to pass over, *transire* (hence *Tiphseh*, a passage over, 1 Kings iv. 24). It is for the most part used figuratively for *ὑπερβαίνειν*, to pass by or spare; as in this case, where the destroying angel passed by the doors and houses of the Israelites that were smeared with blood. From this, *pesach* (*ὑπέρβασις*, *Aquil.* in ver. 11; *ὑπερβασία*, *Joseph. Ant.* ii. 14, 6) came afterwards to be used for the lamb, through which, according to divine appointment, the passing by or sparing had been effected (vers. 21, 27; 2 Chron. xxxv. 1, 13, etc.); then for the preparation of the lamb for a meal, in accordance with the divine instructions, or for the celebration of this meal (thus here, ver. 11; Lev. xxiii. 5; Num. ix. 7, etc.); and then, lastly, it was transferred to the whole seven days’ observance of the feast of unleavened bread, which began with this meal (Deut. xvi. 1), and also to the sacrifices which were to be offered at that feast (Deut. xvi. 2; 2 Chron. xxxv. 1, 7, etc.). The killing of the lamb appointed for the *pesach* was a זבח, *i.e.* a slain-offering, as Moses calls it when making known the command of God to the elders (ver. 27); consequently the eating of it was a sacrificial feast (“the sacrifice of the feast of the Passover,” chap. xxxiv. 25). For זבח is never applied to slaying alone, as טשׁ is. Even in Prov. xvii. 1 and 1 Sam. xxviii. 24, which *Hofmann* adduces in support of this meaning, it signifies “to sacrifice” only in a figurative or transferred sense. At the first Passover in Egypt, it is true, there was no presentation (הקריב), because Israel had no altar there. But the presentation took place at the very first

repetition of the festival at Sinai (Num. ix. 7). The omission of this in Egypt, on account of the circumstances in which they were placed, constituted no essential difference between the first "sacrifice of the Passover" and the repetitions of it; for the choice of the lamb four days before it was slain, was a substitute for the presentation, and the sprinkling of the blood, which was essential to every sacrifice, was effected in the smearing of the door-posts and lintel. The other difference upon which *Hofmann* lays stress, viz. that at all subsequent Passovers the fat of the animal was burned upon the altar, is very questionable. For this custom cannot be proved from the Old Testament, though it is prescribed in the *Mishnah*.¹ But even if the burning of the fat of the paschal lamb had taken place shortly after the giving of the law, on the ground of the general command in Lev. iii. 17, vii. 23 sqq. (for this is not taken for granted in Ex. xxiii. 18, as we shall afterwards show), this difference could also be accounted for from the want of an altar in Egypt, and would not warrant us in refusing to admit the sacrificial character of the first Passover. For the appointment of the paschal meal by God does not preclude the idea that it was a religious service, nor the want of an altar the idea of sacrifice, as *Hofmann* supposes. All the sacrifices of the Jewish nation were minutely prescribed by God, so that the presentation of them was the consequence of divine instructions. And even though the Israelites, when holding the first Passover according to the command of God, merely gave expression to their desire to participate in the deliverance from destruction and the redemption from Egypt, and also to their faith in the word and promise of God, we must neither measure the signification of this divine institution by that fact, nor restrict it to

¹ In the elaborate account of the Passover under Josiah, in 2 Chron. xxxv., we have, it is true, an allusion to the presentation of the burnt-offering and fat (ver. 14); but the boiling of the offerings in pots, caldrons, and pans is also mentioned, along with the roasting of the Passover (ver. 13); from which it is very obvious, that in this account the offering of burnt and slain-offerings is associated with the preparation of the paschal lamb, and the paschal meal is not specially separated from the sacrificial meals of the seven days' feast; just as we find that the king and the princes give the priests and Levites not only lambs and kids, but oxen also, for the sacrifices and sacrificial meals of this festival. (See my *Archäologie*, § 81, 8).

this alone, inasmuch as it is expressly described as a sacrificial meal.

In vers. 12 and 13 the name *pesach* is explained. In that night Jehovah would pass through Egypt, smite all the first-born of man and beast, execute judgment upon all the gods of Egypt, and *pass over* (חַסַּף) the Israelites. In what the judgment upon all the gods of Egypt consisted, it is hard to determine. The meaning of these words is not exhausted by Calvin's remark: "God declared that He would be a judge against the false gods, because it was most apparent then, how little help was to be found in them, and how vain and fallacious was their worship." The gods of Egypt were spiritual authorities and powers, *δαίμονια*, which governed the life and spirit of the Egyptians. Hence the judgment upon them could not consist of the destruction of idols, as *Ps. Jonathan's* paraphrase supposes: *idola fusa colliquescent, lapidea concidentur, testacea confringentur, lignea in cinerem redigentur*. For there is nothing said about this; but in ver. 29 the death of the first-born of men and cattle alone is mentioned as the execution of the divine threat; and in Num. xxxiii. 4 also the judgment upon the gods is connected with the burial of the first-born, without special reference to anything besides. From this it seems to follow pretty certainly, that the judgments upon the gods of Egypt consisted in the slaying of the first-born of man and beast. But the slaying of the first-born was a judgment upon the gods, not only because the impotence and worthlessness of the fancied gods were displayed in the consternation produced by this stroke, but still more directly in the fact, that in the slaying of the king's son and many of the first-born animals, the gods of Egypt, which were worshipped both in their kings and also in certain sacred animals, such as the bull Apis and the goat Nendes, were actually smitten themselves.—Ver. 13. To the Israelites, on the other hand, the blood upon the houses in which they were assembled would be a sign and pledge that Jehovah would spare them, and no plague should fall upon them to destroy (cf. Ezek. xxi. 36; not "for the destroyer," for there is no article with לְמַשְׁחִית).—Ver. 14. That day (the evening of the 14th) Israel was to keep "for a commemoration as a feast to Jehovah," consecrated for all time, as an "eternal ordinance," לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם "in your generations," i.e. for all ages, דֹּרֹת denoting the succession of future generations (*vid.*

ver. 24). As the divine act of Israel's redemption was of eternal significance, so the commemoration of that act was to be an eternal ordinance, and to be upheld as long as Israel should exist as the redeemed people of the Lord, *i.e.* to all eternity, just as the new life of the redeemed was to endure for ever. For the Passover, the remembrance of which was to be revived by the constant repetition of the feast, was the celebration of their birth into the new life of fellowship with the Lord. The preservation from the stroke of the destroyer, from which the feast received its name, was the commencement of their redemption from the bondage of Egypt, and their elevation into the nation of Jehovah. The blood of the paschal lamb was atoning blood; for the Passover was a sacrifice, which combined in itself the signification of the future sin-offerings and peace-offerings; in other words, which shadowed forth both expiation and quickening fellowship with God. The smearing of the houses of the Israelites with the atoning blood of the sacrifice set forth the reconciliation of Israel and its God, through the forgiveness and expiation of its sins; and in the sacrificial meal which followed, their communion with the Lord, *i.e.* their adoption as children of God, was typically completed. In the meal the *sacrificium* became a *sacramentum*, the flesh of the sacrifice a means of grace, by which the Lord adopted His spared and redeemed people into the fellowship of His house, and gave them food for the refreshing of their souls.

Vers. 15-20. Judging from the words "*I brought out*" in ver. 17, Moses did not receive instructions respecting the *seven days' feast of Mazzoth* till after the exodus from Egypt; but on account of its internal and substantial connection with the Passover, it is placed here in immediate association with the institution of the paschal meal. "*Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread, only (אֶת) on the first day (i.e. not later than the first day) ye shall cause to cease (i.e. put away) leaven out of your houses.*" The first day was the 15th of the month (cf. Lev. xxiii. 6; Num. xxviii. 17). On the other hand, when אֶת־אֲשֵׁר is thus defined in ver. 18, "on the 14th day of the month at even," this may be accounted for from the close connection between the feast of Mazzoth and the feast of Passover, inasmuch as unleavened bread was to be eaten with the paschal lamb, so that the leaven had to be cleared away before this meal.

The significance of this feast was in the eating of the *mazzoth*, *i.e.* of pure unleavened bread (see ver. 8). As bread, which is the principal means of preserving life, might easily be regarded as the symbol of life itself, so far as the latter is set forth in the means employed for its own maintenance and invigoration, so the *mazzoth*, or unleavened loaves, were symbolical of the new life, as cleansed from the leaven of a sinful nature. But if the eating of mazzoth was to shadow forth the new life into which Israel was transferred, any one who ate leavened bread at the feast would renounce this new life, and was therefore to be cut off from Israel, *i.e.* "from the congregation of Israel" (ver. 19).—Ver. 16. On the first and seventh days, a holy meeting was to be held, and labour to be suspended. מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ is not *indictio sancti*, *proclamatio sanctitatis* (*Vitringa*), but a *holy assembly*, *i.e.* a meeting of the people for the worship of Jehovah (Ezek. xlvi. 3, 9). מִקְרָא, from קָרָא to call, is that which is called, *i.e.* the assembly (Isa. iv. 5; Neh. viii. 8). No work was to be done upon these days, except what was necessary for the preparation of food; on the Sabbath, even this was prohibited (chap. xxxv. 2, 3). Hence in Lev. xxiii. 7, the "work" is called "servile work," ordinary handicraft.—Ver. 17. "Observe the Mazzoth" (*i.e.* the directions given in vers. 15 and 16 respecting the feast of Mazzoth), "for on this very day I have brought your armies out of the land of Egypt." This was effected in the night of the 14th-15th, or rather at midnight, and therefore in the early morning of the 15th Abib. Because Jehovah had brought Israel out of Egypt on the 15th Abib, therefore Israel was to keep Mazzoth for seven days. Of course it was not merely a commemoration of this event, but the exodus formed the groundwork of the seven days' feast, because it was by this that Israel had been introduced into a new vital element. For this reason the Israelites were to put away all the leaven of their Egyptian nature, the leaven of malice and wickedness (1 Cor. v. 8), and by eating pure and holy bread, and meeting for the worship of God, to show that they were walking in newness of life. This aspect of the feast will serve to explain the repeated emphasis laid upon the instructions given concerning it, and the repeated threat of extermination against either native or foreigner, in case the law should be disobeyed (vers. 18-20). To eat leavened bread at this feast, would have been a denial of the divine act,

by which Israel was introduced into the new life of fellowship with Jehovah. גֵּר, a stranger, was a non-Israelite who lived for a time, or possibly for his whole life, in the midst of the Israelitish nation, but without being incorporated into it by circumcision. אֲזִיבָה הָאָרֶץ, a tree that grows upon the soil in which it was planted; hence *indigena*, the native of a country. This term was applied to the Israelites, "because they had sprung from Isaac and Jacob, who were born in the land of Canaan, and had received it from God as a permanent settlement" (*Clericus*). The feast of *Mazzoth*, the commemoration of Israel's creation as the people of Jehovah (Isa. xliii. 15-17), was fixed for seven days, to stamp upon it in the number seven the seal of the covenant relationship. This heptad of days was made holy through the sanctification of the first and last days by the holding of a holy assembly, and the entire suspension of work. The beginning and the end comprehended the whole. In the eating of unleavened bread Israel laboured for meat for the new life (John vi. 27), whilst the seal of worship was impressed upon this new life in the holy convocation, and the suspension of labour was the symbol of rest in the Lord.

Vers. 21-28. Of the directions given by Moses to the elders of the nation, the leading points only are mentioned here, viz. the slaying of the lamb and the application of the blood (vers. 21, 22). The reason for this is then explained in ver. 23, and the rule laid down in vers. 24-27 for its observance in the future.—Ver. 21. "Withdraw and take:" שָׁמַח is intransitive here, to draw away, withdraw, as in Judg. iv. 6, v. 14, xx. 37. אֲזִיבָה אֲזִיבָה: a bunch or bundle of hyssop: according to *Maimonides*, "quantum quis comprehendit manu sua." אֲזִיבָה (*ὑσσώπος*) was probably not the plant which we call hyssop, the *hyssopus officinalis*, for it is uncertain whether this is to be found in Syria and Arabia, but a species of *origanum* resembling hyssop, the Arabian *zâter*, either wild marjoram or a kind of thyme, *Thymus serpyllum*, mentioned in *Forsk. flora Aeg.* p. 107, which is very common in Syria and Arabia, and is called *zâter*, or *zatureya*, the pepper or bean plant. "That is in the bason;" viz. the bason in which the blood had been caught when the animal was killed. וְהִנְעִיחָם, "and let it reach to, i.e. strike, the lintel:" in ordinary purifications the blood was sprinkled with the bunch of hyssop (Lev. xiv. 51; Num. xix. 18). The reason

for the command not to go out of the door of the house was, that in this night of judgment there would be no safety anywhere except behind the blood-stained door.—Ver. 23 (cf. ver. 13). “*He will not suffer (פִּי) the destroyer to come into your houses :*” Jehovah effected the destruction of the first-born through מַשְׁחֵה הַיְרֵבָה, the destroyer, or destroying angel, ὁ ὄλοθρεύων (Heb. xi. 28), *i.e.* not a fallen angel, but the angel of Jehovah, in whom Jehovah revealed Himself to the patriarchs and Moses. This is not at variance with Ps. lxxviii. 49 ; for the writer of this psalm regards not only the slaying of the first-born, but also the pestilence (Ex. ix. 1-7), as effected through the medium of angels of evil : though, according to the analogy of 1 Sam. xiii. 17, מַשְׁחֵה הַיְרֵבָה might certainly be understood collectively as applying to a company of angels. Ver. 24. “*This word,*” *i.e.* the instructions respecting the Passover, they were to regard as an institution for themselves and their children for ever (עַד עָד in the same sense as עַד עָד, Gen. xvii. 7, 13) ; and when dwelling in the promised land, they were to explain the meaning of this service to their sons. The ceremony is called עֲבֹדָה, “service,” inasmuch as it was the fulfilment of a divine command, a performance demanded by God, though it promoted the good of Israel.—Ver. 27. After hearing the divine instructions, the people, represented by their elders, bowed and worshipped ; not only to show their faith, but also to manifest their gratitude for the deliverance which they were to receive in the Passover.—Ver. 28. They then proceeded to execute the command, that through the obedience of faith they might appropriate the blessing of this “service.”

Vers. 29-36. DEATH OF THE FIRST-BORN, AND RELEASE OF ISRAEL.—The last blow announced to Pharaoh took place in “the half of the night,” *i.e.* at midnight, when all Egypt was lying in deep sleep (Matt. xxv. 5, 6), to startle the king and his people out of their sleep of sin. As all the previous plagues rested upon a natural basis, it might seem a probable supposition that this was also the case here, whilst the analogy of 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, 16 might lead us to think of a pestilence as the means employed by the destroying angel. In that case we should find the heightening of the natural occurrence into a miracle in the fact, that the first-born both of man and beast, and they alone,

were all suddenly slain, whilst the Israelites remained uninjured in their houses. This view would be favoured, too, by the circumstance, that not only are pestilences of frequent occurrence in Egypt, but they are most fatal in the spring months. On a closer examination, however, the circumstances mentioned tell against rather than in favour of such a supposition. In 2 Sam. xxiv. 15, the pestilence is expressly alluded to; here it is not. The previous plagues were nearly all brought upon Egypt by Moses' staff, and with most of them the natural sources are distinctly mentioned; but the last plague came direct from Jehovah without the intervention of Moses, certainly for no other reason than to make it apparent that it was a purely supernatural punishment inflicted by His own omnipotence. The words, "*There was not a house where there was not one dead,*" are to be taken literally, and not merely "as a general expression;" though, of course, they are to be limited, according to the context, to all the houses in which there were first-born of man or beast. The term "first-born" is not to be extended so far, however, as to include even heads of families who had children of their own, in which case there might be houses, as *Lapide* and others suppose, where the grandfather, the father, the son, and the wives were all lying dead, provided all of them were first-born. The words, "*From the son of Pharaoh, who will sit upon his throne, to the son of the prisoners in the prison*" (ver. 29 compared with chap. xiii. 15), point unquestionably to those first-born sons alone who were not yet fathers themselves. But even with this limitation the blow was so terrible, that the effect produced upon Pharaoh and his people is perfectly intelligible.

Ver. 30. The very same night Pharaoh sent for Moses and Aaron, and gave them permission to depart with their people, their children, and their cattle. The statement that Pharaoh sent for Moses and Aaron is not at variance with chap. x. 28, 29; and there is no necessity to resort to *Calvin's* explanation, "Pharaoh himself is said to have sent for those whom he urged to depart through the medium of messengers from the palace." The command never to appear in his sight again did not preclude his sending for them under totally different circumstances. The permission to depart was given unconditionally, *i.e.* without involving an obligation to return. This is evident from the words, "Get you forth from among my people," com-

pared with chap. x. 8, 24, "Go ye, serve Jehovah," and viii. 25, "Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land." If in addition to this we bear in mind, that although at first, and even after the fourth plague (chap. viii. 27), Moses only asked for a three days' journey to hold a festival, yet Pharaoh suspected that they would depart altogether, and even gave utterance to this suspicion, without being contradicted by Moses (chap. viii. 28, and x. 10); the words "Get you forth from among my people" cannot mean anything else than "depart altogether." Moreover, in chap. xi. 1 it was foretold to Moses that the result of the last blow would be, that Pharaoh would let them go, or rather drive them away; so that the effect of this blow, as here described, cannot be understood in any other way. And this is really implied in Pharaoh's last words, "Go, and bless me also;" whereas on former occasions he had only asked them to intercede for the removal of the plagues (chap. viii. 8, 28, ix. 28, x. 17). בָּרַךְ, to bless, indicates a final leave-taking, and was equivalent to a request that on their departure they would secure or leave behind the blessing of their God, in order that henceforth no such plague might ever befall him and his people. This view of the words of the king is not at variance either with the expression "as ye have said" in ver. 31, which refers to the words "serve the Lord," or with the same words in ver. 32, for there they refer to the flock and herds, or lastly, with the circumstance that Pharaoh pursued the Israelites after they had gone, with the evident intention of bringing them back by force (chap. xiv. 5 sqq.), because this resolution is expressly described as a change of mind consequent upon renewed hardening (chap. xiv. 4, 5).

Ver. 33. "And Egypt urged the people strongly (לְעֵץ רָחֵץ to press hard, *κατεβιάζοντο*, LXX.) to make haste, to send them out of the land;" i.e. the Egyptians urged the Israelites to accelerate their departure, "for they said (sc. to themselves), We are all dead," i.e. exposed to death. So great was their alarm at the death of the first-born.—Ver. 34. This urgency of the Egyptians compelled the Israelites to take the dough, which they were probably about to bake for their journey, before it was leavened, and also their kneading-troughs bound up in their clothes (cloths) upon their shoulders. חֲבֻטָּה, *ἰμάτιον*, was a large square piece of stuff or cloth, worn above the under-clothes, and could be easily used for tying up different things together. The Israelites had in-

tended to leaven the dough, therefore, as the command to eat unleavened bread for seven days had not been given to them yet. But under the pressure of necessity they were obliged to content themselves with unleavened bread, or, as it is called in Deut. xvi. 3, "the bread of affliction," during the first days of their journey. But as the troubles connected with their departure from Egypt were merely the introduction to the new life of liberty and grace, so according to the counsel of God the bread of affliction was to become a holy food to Israel; the days of their exodus being exalted by the Lord into a seven days' feast, in which the people of Jehovah were to commemorate to all ages their deliverance from the oppression of Egypt. The long-continued eating of unleavened bread, on account of the pressure of circumstances, formed the historical preparation for the seven days' feast of Mazzoth, which was instituted afterwards. Hence this circumstance is mentioned both here and in ver. 39. On vers. 35 and 36, see chap. iii. 21, 22.

Vers. 37–42. *Departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt.*—The starting-point was *Raēmses*, from which they proceeded to *Succoth* (ver. 37), thence to *Etham* at the end of the desert (chap. xiii. 20), and from that by a curve to *Hachiroth*, opposite to the Red Sea, from which point they passed through the sea (chap. xiv. 2, 21 sqq.). Now, if we take these words simply as they stand, Israel touched the border of the desert of Arabia by the second day, and on the third day reached the plain of Suez and the Red Sea. But they could not possibly have gone so far, if *Raēmses* stood upon the site of the modern *Belbeis*. For though the distance from *Belbeis* to Suez by the direct road past *Rejūm el Khail* is only a little more than 15 geographical miles, and a caravan with camels could make the journey in two days, this would be quite impossible for a whole nation travelling with wives, children, cattle, and baggage. Such a procession could never have reached *Etham*, on the border of the desert, on their second day's march, and then on the third day, by a circuitous course "of about a day's march in extent," have arrived at the plain of Suez between *Ajirud* and the sea. This is admitted by *Kurtz*, who therefore follows *v. Raumer* in making a distinction between a stage and a day's journey, on the ground that 𐤀𐤁𐤁 signifies the station or place of encampment, and not a day's journey. But the word neither means station nor place of en-

campment. It is derived from נָדַד to tear out (*sc.* the pegs of the tent), hence to take down the tent; and denotes removal from the place of encampment, and the subsequent march (*cf.* Num. xxxiii. 1). Such a march might indeed embrace more than a day's journey; but whenever the Israelites travelled more than a day before pitching their tents, it is expressly mentioned (*cf.* Num. x. 33, and xxxiii. 8, with Ex. xv. 22). These passages show very clearly that the stages from Raëmses to Succoth, thence to Etham, and then again to Hachiroth, were a day's march each. The only question is, whether they only rested for one night at each of these places. The circumstances under which the Israelites took their departure favour the supposition, that they would get out of the Egyptian territory as quickly as possible, and rest no longer than was absolutely necessary; but the gathering of the whole nation, which was not collected together in one spot, as in a camp, at the time of their departure, and still more the confusion, and interruptions of various kinds, that would inevitably attend the migration of a whole nation, render it probable that they rested longer than one night at each of the places named. This would explain most simply, how Pharaoh was able to overtake them with his army at Hachiroth. But whatever our views on this point may be, so much is certain, that Israel could not have reached the plain of Suez in a three days' march from Belbeis with the circuitous route by Etham, and therefore that their starting-point cannot have been Belbeis, but must have been in the neighbourhood of Heröopolis; and there are other things that favour this conclusion. There is, first, the circumstance that Pharaoh sent for Moses the very same night after the slaying of the first-born, and told him to depart. Now the Pentateuch does not mention Pharaoh's place of abode, but according to Ps. lxxviii. 12 it was *Zoan, i.e. Tanis*, on the eastern bank of the Tanitic arm of the Nile. *Abu Keishib* (or *Heroopolis*) is only half as far from Tanis as Belbeis, and the possibility of Moses appearing before the king and returning to his own people between midnight and the morning is perfectly conceivable, on the supposition that Moses was not in Heroopolis itself, but was staying in a more northerly place, with the expectation that Pharaoh would send a message to him, or send for him, after the final blow. Again, *Abu Keishib* was on the way to Gaza; so that the Israelites might take the road towards the

country of the Philistines, and then, as this was not the road they were to take, *turn round* at God's command by the road to the desert (chap. xiii. 17, 18). Lastly, Etham could be reached in two days from the starting-point named.¹ On the situation of *Succoth* and *Etham*, see chap. xiii. 20.

The Israelites departed, "about 600,000 on foot that were men." רגלי (as in Num. xi. 21, the infantry of an army) is added, because they went out as an army (ver. 41), and none are numbered but those who could bear arms, from 20 years old and upwards; and לְבָר מִטְּפָח because of מִטְּפָח, "beside the little ones," which follows. אָח is used here in its broader sense, as in Gen. xlvii. 12, Num. xxxii. 16, 24, and applies to the entire family, including the wife and children, who did not travel on foot, but on beasts of burden and in carriages (Gen. xxxi. 17). The number given is an approximative one. The numbering at Sinai gave 603,550 males of 20 years old and upwards (Num. i. 46), and 22,000 male Levites of a month old and upwards (Num. iii. 39). Now if we add the wives and children, the total number of the people may have been about two million souls. The multiplication of the seventy souls, who went down with Jacob to Egypt, into this vast multitude, is not so disproportionate to the 430 years of their sojourn there, as to render it at all necessary to assume that the numbers given included not only the descendants of the seventy souls who went down with Jacob, but also those of "several thousand man-servants and maid-servants" who accompanied them. For, apart from the fact, that we are not warranted in concluding, that because Abraham had 318 fighting servants, the twelve sons of Jacob had several thousand, and took them with them into Egypt; even if the servants had been received into the religious fellowship of Israel by circumcision, they cannot have reckoned among the 600,000 who went out, for the simple reason that they are not included in the seventy souls who went down to Egypt; and in chap. i. 5 the number of those who came out is placed in unmistakable connection with the number of those who went in. If we deduct from the 70 souls the patriarch Jacob, his 12 sons, Dinah, Asher's daughter Zerah, the three

¹ The different views as to the march of the Israelites from Raemeses to their passage through the sea, are to be found in the *Studien und Kritiken*, 1850, pp. 328 sqq., and in *Kurtz*, ii. pp. 361 sqq.

sons of Levi, the four, grandsons of Judah and Benjamin, and those grandsons of Jacob who probably died without leaving any male posterity, since their descendants are not mentioned among the families of Israel (cf. i. 372), there remain 41 grandsons of Jacob who founded families, in addition to the Levites. Now, if we follow 1 Chron. vii. 20 sqq., where ten or eleven generations are mentioned between Ephraim and Joshua, and reckon 40 years as a generation, the tenth generation of the 41 grandsons of Jacob would be born about the year 400 of the sojourn in Egypt, and therefore be over 20 years of age at the time of the exodus. Let us assume, that on an average there were three sons and three daughters to every married couple in the first six of these generations, two sons and two daughters in the last four, and we shall find, that in the tenth generation there would be 478,224 sons about the 400th year of the sojourn in Egypt, who would therefore be above 20 years of age at the time of the exodus, whilst 125,326 men of the ninth generation would be still living, so that there would be $478,224 + 125,326$, or 603,550 men coming out of Egypt, who were more than 20 years old. But though our calculation is based upon no more than the ordinary number of births, a special blessing from God is to be discerned not only in this fruitfulness, which we suppose to have been uninterrupted, but still more in the fact, that the presumed number of children continued alive, and begot the same number of children themselves; and the divine grace was peculiarly manifest in the fact, that neither pestilence nor other evils, nor even the measures adopted by the Pharaohs for the suppression of Israel, could diminish their numbers or restrain their increase. If the question be asked, how the land of Goshen could sustain so large a number, especially as the Israelites were not the only inhabitants, but lived along with Egyptians there, it is a sufficient reply, that according to both ancient and modern testimony (cf. *Robinson*, Pal. i. p. 78), this is the most fertile province in all Egypt, and that we are not so well acquainted with the extent of the territory inhabited by the Israelites, as to be able to estimate the amount of its produce.

Ver. 38. In typical fulfilment of the promise in Gen. xii. 3, and no doubt induced by the signs and wonders of the Lord in Egypt to seek their good among the Israelites, a great crowd of mixed people (עַרְבֵי רַב) attached themselves to them, whom Israel


could not shake off, although they afterwards became a snare to them (Num. xi. 4). רָעָה : *lit.* a mixture, *ἐπίμικτος* *sc.* λαός (LXX.), a swarm of foreigners; called $\text{הָרְעָה$ in Num. xi. 4, a medley, or crowd of people of different nations. According to Deut. xxix. 10, they seem to have occupied a very low position among the Israelites, and to have furnished the nation of God with hewers of wood and drawers of water.—On ver. 39, see ver. 34.—Vers. 40, 41. The sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt had lasted 430 years. This number is not critically doubtful, nor are the 430 years to be reduced to 215 by an arbitrary interpolation, such as we find in the LXX., *ἡ δὲ κατοίκησις τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, ἦν κατῴκησαν* (*Cod. Alex. αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν*) *ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν γῆ Χαναάν, κ.τ.λ.* This chronological statement, the genuineness of which is placed beyond all doubt by *Onkelos*, the *Syriac*, *Vulgate*, and other versions, is not only in harmony with the prediction in Gen. xv. 13, where the round number 400 is employed in prophetic style, but may be reconciled with the different genealogical lists, if we only bear in mind that the genealogies do not always contain a complete enumeration of all the separate links, but very frequently intermediate links of little historical importance are omitted, as we have already seen in the genealogy of Moses and Aaron (chap. vi. 18–20). For example, the fact that there were more than the four generations mentioned in chap. vi. 16 sqq. between Levi and Moses, is placed beyond all doubt, not only by what has been adduced at chap. vi. 18–20, but by a comparison with other genealogies also. Thus, in Num. xxvi. 29 sqq., xxvii. 1, Josh. xvii. 3, we find six generations from Joseph to Zelophehad; in Ruth iv. 18 sqq., 1 Chron. ii. 5, 6, there are also six from Judah to Nahshon, the tribe prince in the time of Moses; in 1 Chron. ii. 18 there are seven from Judah to Bezaleel, the builder of the tabernacle; and in 1 Chron. vii. 20 sqq., nine or ten are given from Joseph to Joshua. This last genealogy shows most clearly the impossibility of the view founded upon the Alexandrian version, that the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt lasted only 215 years; for ten generations, reckoned at 40 years each, harmonize very well with 430 years, but certainly not with 215.¹ The statement in ver. 41, “the self-same day,”

¹ The Alexandrian translators have arbitrarily altered the text to suit the genealogy of Moses in chap. vi. 16 sqq., just as in the genealogies of

is not to be understood as relating to the first day after the lapse of the 430 years, as though the writer supposed that it was on the 14th Abib that Jacob entered Egypt 430 years before, but points back to the day of the exodus, mentioned in ver. 14, as compared with vers. 11 sqq., *i.e.* the 15th Abib (cf. ver. 51 and chap. xiii. 4). On "the hosts of Jehovah," see chap. vii. 4.—Ver. 42. This day therefore was לַיְלֵי שְׁמֵרִים, "a preservation-night of the Lord, to bring them out of the land of Egypt." The *apax legomenon* שְׁמֵרִים does not mean "celebration, from שָׁמַר to observe, to honour" (*Knobel*), but "preservation," from שָׁמַר to keep, to preserve; and לַיהוָה is the same as in ver. 27. "This same night is (consecrated) to the Lord as a preservation for all children of Israel in their families." Because Jehovah had preserved the children of Israel that night from the destroyer, it was to be holy to them, *i.e.* to be kept by them in all future ages to the glory of the Lord, as a preservation.

Vers. 43-50. REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PASSOVER.—These regulations, which were supplementary to the law of the Passover in vers. 3-11, were not communicated before the exodus; because it was only by the fact that a crowd of foreigners attached themselves to the Israelites, that Israel was brought into a connection with foreigners, which needed to be clearly defined, especially so far as the Passover was concerned, the festival of Israel's birth as the people of God. If the Passover was still to retain this signification, of course no foreigner could participate in it. This is the first regulation. But as it was by virtue of a divine call, and not through natural descent, that Israel had become the people of Jehovah, and as it was destined in that capacity to be a blessing to all nations, the attitude assumed towards foreigners was not to be an altogether repelling one. Hence the further directions in ver. 44: purchased servants, who had been politically incorporated as Israel's property, were to be entirely incorporated by circumcision, so as even to take part in the

the patriarchs in Gen. v. and xi. The view held by the Seventy became traditional in the synagogue, and the Apostle Paul followed it in Gal. iii. 17, where he reckoned the interval between the promise to Abraham and the giving of the law as 430 years, the question of chronological exactness having no bearing upon his subject at the time.



Passover. But settlers, and servants working for wages, were not to eat of it, for they stood in a purely external relation, which might be any day dissolved. אָכַל בְּ, *lit.* to eat at anything, to take part in the eating (Lev. xxii. 11). The deeper ground for this was, that in this meal Israel was to preserve and celebrate its unity and fellowship with Jehovah. This was the meaning of the regulations, which were repeated in vers. 46 and 47 from vers. 4, 9, and 10, where they had been already explained. If, therefore, a foreigner living among the Israelites wished to keep the Passover, he was first of all to be spiritually incorporated into the nation of Jehovah by circumcision (ver. 48). 'וַעֲשֶׂה פֶסַח : "And he has made (i.e. made ready) a passover to Jehovah, let every male be circumcised to him (i.e. he himself, and the male members of his house), and then he may draw near (sc. to Jehovah) to keep it." The first עֲשֶׂה denotes the wish or intention to do it, the second, the actual execution of the wish. The words בְּדֹנְכָר, גֵּר, תוֹשֵׁב, and שָׂכִיר, are all indicative of non-Israelites. בְּדֹנְכָר was applied quite generally to any foreigner springing from another nation; גֵּר was a foreigner living for a shorter or longer time in the midst of the Israelites; תוֹשֵׁב, *lit.* a dweller, settler, was one who settled permanently among the Israelites, without being received into their religious fellowship; שָׂכִיר was the non-Israelite, who worked for an Israelite for wages.—Ver. 49. There was one law with reference to the Passover which was applicable both to the native and the foreigner: no uncircumcised man was to be allowed to eat of it.—Ver. 50 closes the instructions concerning the Passover with the statement that the Israelites carried them out, viz. in after times (*e.g.* Num. ix. 5); and in ver. 51 the account of the exodus from Egypt is also brought to a close. All that Jehovah promised to Moses in chap. vi. 6 and 26 had now been fulfilled. But although ver. 51 is a concluding formula, and so belongs to the account just closed, *Abenezra* was so far right in wishing to connect this verse with the commencement of the following chapter, that such concluding formulæ generally serve to link together the different incidents, and therefore not only wind up what goes before, but introduce what has yet to come.

Chap. xiii. 1–16. SANCTIFICATION OF THE FIRST-BORN, AND PROMULGATION OF THE LAW FOR THE FEAST OF MAZZOTH.

—Vers. 1, 2. The sanctification of the first-born was closely connected with the Passover. By this the deliverance of the Israelitish first-born was effected, and the object of this deliverance was their sanctification. Because Jehovah had delivered the first-born of Israel, they were to be sanctified to Him. If the Israelites completed their communion with Jehovah in the Passover, and celebrated the commencement of their divine standing in the feast of unleavened bread, they gave uninterrupted effect to their divine sonship in the sanctification of the first-born. For this reason, probably, the sanctification of the first-born was commanded by Jehovah at Succoth, immediately after the exodus, and contemporaneously with the institution of the seven days' feast of Mazzoth (cf. chap. ii. 15), so that the place assigned it in the historical record is the correct one; whereas the divine appointment of the feast of Mazzoth had been mentioned before (chap. xii. 15 sqq.), and the communication of that appointment to the people was all that remained to be mentioned here.—Ver. 2. Every first-born of man and beast was to be sanctified to Jehovah, *i.e.* given up to Him for His service. As the expression, “all the first-born,” applied to both man and beast, the explanation is added, “*everything that opens the womb among the Israelites, of man and beast.*” כָּל־פֶּטֶר לְפֶתֶחַם כָּל־פֶּטֶר (ver. 12): לֵל is placed like an adjective after the noun, as in Num. viii. 16, כָּל־בְּכוֹר לְבָכֹר, διανοῦγον πᾶσαν μήτραν for πᾶν διανοῦγον μήτραν (ver. 12, LXX.). לִי הוּא: “*it is Mine,*” it belongs to Me. This right to the first-born was not founded upon the fact, that “Jehovah was the Lord and Creator of all things, and as every created object owed its life to Him, to Him should its life be entirely devoted,” as Kurtz maintains, though without scriptural proof; but in Num. iii. 13 and viii. 17 the ground of the claim is expressly mentioned, viz. that on the day when Jehovah smote all the first-born of Egypt, He sanctified to Himself all the first-born of the Israelites, both of man and beast. Hence the sanctification of the first-born rested not upon the deliverance of the first-born sons from the stroke of the destroyer through the atoning blood of the paschal lamb, but upon the fact that God sanctified them for Himself at that time, and therefore delivered them. But Jehovah sanctified the first-born of Israel to Himself by adopting Israel as His first-born son (chap. iv. 22), or as His possession. Because Israel had been chosen

as the nation of Jehovah, its first-born of man and beast were spared, and for that reason they were henceforth to be sanctified to Jehovah. In what way, is more clearly defined in vers. 12 sqq.

Vers. 3-10. The directions as to the seven days' feast of unleavened bread (chap. xii. 15-20) were made known by Moses to the people on the day of the exodus, at the first station, namely, Succoth; but in the account of this, only the most important points are repeated, and the yearly commemoration is enjoined. In ver. 3, Egypt is called a "slave-house," inasmuch as Israel was employed in slave-labour there, and treated as a slave population (cf. chap. xx. 2; Deut. v. 6, vi. 12, etc.). *חֵזק יָד* "strength of hand," in vers. 3, 14, and 16, is more emphatic than the more usual *יָד הַחֵזקָה* (chap. iii. 19, etc.).—On ver. 5, see chap. iii. 8, and xii. 25. In ver. 6, the term "feast to Jehovah" points to the keeping of the seventh day by a holy convocation and the suspension of work (chap. xii. 16). It is only of the seventh day that this is expressly stated, because it was understood as a matter of course that the first was a feast of Jehovah.—Ver. 8. "Because of that which Jehovah did to me" (*הֵן* in a relative sense, *is qui*, for *אֲשֶׁר*, see *Ewald*, § 331): *sc.* "I eat unleavened bread," or, "I observe this service." This completion of the imperfect sentence follows readily from the context, and the whole verse may be explained from chap. xii. 26, 27.—Ver. 9. The festival prescribed was to be to Israel "for a sign upon its hand, and for a memorial between the eyes." These words presuppose the custom of wearing mnemonic signs upon the hand and forehead; but they are not to be traced to the heathen custom of branding soldiers and slaves with marks upon the hand and forehead. For the parallel passages in Deut. vi. 8 and xi. 18, "bind them for a sign upon your hand," are proofs that the allusion is neither to branding nor writing on the hand. Hence the sign upon the hand probably consisted of a bracelet round the wrist, and the *ziccaron* between the eyes, of a band worn upon the forehead. The words are then used figuratively, as a proverbial expression employed to give emphasis to the injunction to bear this precept continually in mind, to be always mindful to observe it. This is still more apparent from the reason assigned, "that the law of Jehovah may be in thy mouth." For it was not by mnemonic slips upon the hand and forehead that a law was so placed in the mouth as to be talked of continually (Deut. vi. 7,

xi. 19), but by the reception of it into the heart and its continual fulfilment. (See also ver. 16.) As the origin and meaning of the festival were to be talked of in connection with the eating of unleavened bread, so conversation about the law of Jehovah was introduced at the same time, and the obligation to keep it renewed and brought vividly to mind.—Ver. 10. This ordinance the Israelites were to keep לְמִעֲרָה, “at its appointed time” (i.e. from the 15th to the 21st Abib),—“from days to days,” i.e. as often as the days returned, therefore from year to year (cf. Judg. xi. 40, xxi. 19; 1 Sam. i. 3, ii. 19).

In vers. 11-16, Moses communicated to the people the law briefly noticed in ver. 2, respecting the sanctification of the first-born. This law was to come into force when Israel had taken possession of the promised land. Then everything which opened the womb was to be given up to the Lord. הָעֵבִיר לַיהוָה: to cause to pass over to Jehovah, to consecrate or give up to Him as a sacrifice (cf. Lev. xviii. 21). In “all that openeth the womb” the first-born of both man and beast are included (ver. 2). This general expression is then particularized in three clauses, commencing with וְכֹל: (a) בְּהֵמָה cattle, i.e. oxen, sheep, and goats, as clean domestic animals, but only the males; (b) אֲסֵס, as the most common of the unclean domestic animals, instead of the whole of these animals, Num. xviii. 15; (c) the first-born of the children of Israel. The female first-born of man and beast were exempted from consecration. Of the clean animals the first-born male (פֶּטֶר רְחִים abbreviated from פֶּטֶר רְחִים, and שֵׁנֶר from the Chaldee שֵׁנֶר to throw, the dropped young one) was to belong to Jehovah, i.e. to be sacrificed to Him (ver. 15, and Num. xviii. 17). This law is still further explained in chap. xxii. 29, where it is stated that the sacrificing was not to take place till the eighth day after the birth; and in Deut. xv. 21, 22, it is still further modified by the command, that an animal which had any fault, and was either blind or lame, was not to be sacrificed, but to be slain and eaten at home, like other edible animals. These two rules sprang out of the general instructions concerning the sacrificial animals. The first-born of the ass was to be redeemed with a male lamb or kid (שֵׁה, as at chap. xii. 3); and if not redeemed, it was to be killed. עֶרֶף: from עֶרֶף the nape, to break the neck (Deut. xxi. 4, 6). The first-born sons of Israel were also to be consecrated to Jehovah as a sacrifice; not indeed in

the manner of the heathen, by slaying and burning upon the altar, but by presenting them to the Lord as living sacrifices, devoting all their powers of body and mind to His service. Inasmuch as the first birth represented all the births, the whole nation was to consecrate itself to Jehovah, and present itself as a priestly nation in the consecration of the first-born. But since this consecration had its foundation, not in nature, but in the grace of its call, the sanctification of the first birth cannot be deduced from the separation of the first-born to the priesthood. This view, which was very prevalent among early writers, has been thoroughly overthrown by *Outram (de Sacrif. 1, c. 4)* and *Vitringa (observ. ii. c. 2, pp. 272 sqq.)*. As the priestly character of the nation did not give a title in itself to the administration of the priesthood within the theocracy, so the first-born were not *eo ipso* chosen as priests through their consecration to Jehovah. In what way they were to consecrate their life to the Lord, depended upon the appointment of the Lord, which was, that they were to perform the non-priestly work of the sanctuary, to be servants of the priests in their holy service. Even this work was afterwards transferred to the Levites (Num. iii.). At the same time the obligation was imposed upon the people to redeem their first-born sons from the service which was binding upon them, but was now transferred to the Levites, who were substituted for them; in other words, to pay five shekels of silver *per head* to the priesthood (Num. iii. 47, xviii. 16). In anticipation of this arrangement, which was to be introduced afterwards, the *redemption* (פְּדוּת) of the male first-born is already established here.—On ver. 14, see chap. xii. 26. מָחָר: *to-morrow*, for the future generally, as in Gen. xxx. 33. מָה־זֶּאת: *what does this mean?* *quid sibi vult hoc præceptum ac primogenitura* (Jonathan).—Ver. 15. הִקְשָׁה לְשֵׁלְחָנוּ: “*he made hard*” (*sc.* his heart, cf. chap. vii. 3) “*to let us go.*” The sanctification of the first-born is enforced in ver. 16 in the same terms as the keeping of the feast of Mazzoth in ver. 9, with this exception, that instead of לִזְכֹּרֵנוּ we have לְמוֹטְפָתָנוּ, as in Deut. vi. 8, and xi. 18. The word מוֹטְפָתָנוּ signifies neither amulet nor στίγματα, but “binding” or headbands, as is evident from the Chaldee מוֹטְפָתָנוּ armlet (2 Sam. i. 10), מוֹטְפָתָנוּ tiara (Esth. viii. 15; Ezek. xxiv. 17, 23). This command was interpreted literally by the Talmudists, and the use of *tephillim*, phylacteries (Matt. xxiii. 5), founded upon

it;¹ the Caraites, on the contrary, interpreted it figuratively, as a proverbial expression for constant reflection upon, and fulfilment of, the divine commands. The correctness of the latter is obvious from the words themselves, which do not say that the commands are to be written upon scrolls, but only that they are to be to the Israelites for signs upon the hand, and for bands between the eyes, *i.e.* they are to be kept in view like memorials upon the forehead and the hand. The expression in Deut. vi. 8, "Thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes," does not point at all to the symbolizing of the divine commands by an outward sign to be worn upon the hand, or to bands with passages of the law inscribed upon them, to be worn on the forehead between the eyes; nor does the "advance in Deut. vi. 8 from heart to word, and from word to hand or act," necessarily lead to the peculiar notion of *Schultz*, that "the sleeve and turban were to be used as reminders of the divine commands, the former by being fastened to the hand in a peculiar way, the latter by an end being brought down upon the forehead." The line of thought referred to merely expresses the idea, that the Israelites were not only to retain the commands of God in their hearts, and to confess them with the mouth, but to fulfil them with the hand, or in act and deed, and thus to show themselves in their whole bearing as the guardians and observers of the law. As the hand is the medium of action, and carrying in the hand represents handling, so the space between the eyes, or the forehead, is that part of the body which is generally visible, and what is worn there is worn to be seen. This figurative interpretation is confirmed and placed beyond doubt by such parallel passages as Prov. iii. 3, "Bind them (the commandments) about thy neck; write them upon the tables of thine heart" (cf. vers. 21, 22, iv. 21, vi. 21, 22, vii. 3).

¹ Possibly these scrolls were originally nothing more than a literal compliance with the figurative expression, or a change of the figure into a symbol, so that the custom did not arise from a pure misunderstanding; though at a later period the symbolical character gave place more and more to the casual misinterpretation. On the phylacteries generally, see my *Archæologie* and *Herzog's Cycl.*

JOURNEY FROM SUCCOTH, AND PASSAGE THROUGH THE RED SEA.—CHAP. XIII. 17—XIV. 31.

Chap. xiii. 17–22. JOURNEY FROM SUCCOTH TO ETHAM.—Succoth, Israel's first place of encampment after their departure, was probably the rendezvous for the whole nation, so that it was from this point that they first proceeded in an orderly march. The shortest and most direct route from Egypt to Canaan would have been by the road to Gaza, in the land of the Philistines; but God did not lead them by this road, lest they should repent of their movement as soon as the Philistines opposed them, and so desire to return to Egypt. מִן: מָה, after מָה to say (to himself), *i.e.* to think, with the subordinate idea of anxiety. The Philistines were very warlike, and would hardly have failed to resist the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, of which they had taken possession of a very large portion. But the Israelites were not prepared for such a conflict, as is sufficiently evident from their despair, in chap. xiv. 10 sqq. For this reason God made them turn round (כָּבַד for כָּבַד, see *Ges.* § 67) by the way of the desert of the Red Sea. Previous to the account of their onward march, it is still further stated in vers. 18, 19, that they went out equipped, and took Joseph's bones with them, according to his last request. מְשֻׁמֵּן, from מְשֻׁמֵּן *lumbus*, *lit. lumbis accincti*, signifies equipped, as a comparison of this word as it is used in Josh. i. 14, iv. 12, with מְשֻׁמֵּן in Num. xxxii. 30, 32, Deut. iii. 18, places beyond all doubt; that is to say, not "armed," καθωπλισμένοι (*Sym.*), but prepared for the march, as contrasted with fleeing in disorder like fugitives. For this reason they were able to fulfil Joseph's request, from which fact *Calvin* draws the following conclusion: "In the midst of their adversity the people had never lost sight of the promised redemption. For unless the celebrated adjuration of Joseph had been a subject of common conversation among them all, Moses would never have thought of it."—Ver. 20. From Succoth they went to Etham. With regard to the situation of *Succoth* (from סֻכּוֹת huts, probably a shepherd encampment), only so much can be determined, that this place was to the south-east of Raëmses, on the way to Etham. *Etham* was "at the end of the desert," which is called the desert of *Etham* in Num. xxxiii. 8, and the desert of *Shur* (*Jifar*, see

Gen. xvi. 7) in Ex. xv. 22 ; so that it was where Egypt ends and the desert of Arabia begins, in a line which curves from the northern extremity of the Gulf of Arabia up to the *Birket Temseh*, or Crocodile Lake, and then on to Lake *Menzalet*. According to the more precise statements of travellers, this line is formed from the point of the gulf northwards, by a broad sandy tract of land to the east of *Ajrud*, which never rises more than about three feet above the water-mark (*Robinson*, Pal. i. p. 80). It takes in the banks of the old canal, which commence about an hour and a half to the north of *Suez*, and run northwards for a distance which *Seetzen* accomplished in 4 hours upon camels (*Rob. Pal. i. p. 548* ; *Seetzen*, R. iii. pp. 151, 152). Then follow the so-called Bitter Lakes, a dry, sometimes swampy basin, or deep white salt plain, the surface of which, according to the measurements of French engineers, is 40 or 50 feet lower than the ordinary water-mark at *Suez*. On the north this basin is divided from the *Birket Temseh* by a still higher tract of land, the so-called Isthmus of *Arbek*. Hence "Etham at the end of the desert" is to be sought for either on the Isthmus of *Arbek*, in the neighbourhood of the later *Serapeum*, or at the southern end of the Bitter Lakes. The distance is a conclusive argument against the former, and in favour of the latter ; for although *Seetzen* travelled from *Suez* to *Arbek* in 8 hours, yet according to the accounts of the French *savan*, *du Bois Aymé*, who passed through this basin several times, from the northern extremity of the Bitter Lakes to *Suez* is 60,000 mètres (16 hours' journey),—a distance so great, that the children of Israel could not possibly have gone from *Etham* to *Hachiroth* in a day's march. Hence we must look for *Etham* at the southern extremity of the basin of the Bitter Lake,¹ which Israel might reach in two days from *Abu Keishib*, and then on the third day arrive at the plain of *Suez*, between *Ajrud* and the sea. *Succoth*, therefore, must be sought on the

¹ There is no force in the objection to this situation, that according to different geognostic indications, the Gulf of *Suez* formerly stretched much farther north, and covered the basin of the Bitter Lake ; for there is no evidence that it reached as far as this in the time of *Moses* ; and the statements of early writers as to the position of *Heroopolis* in the inner corner of the Arabian Gulf, and not far to the north of *Klyasma*, furnish no clear evidence of this, as *Knobel* has already observed.

western border of the Bitter Lake.—Vers. 21, 22. From *Etham*, at the edge of the desert which separates Egypt from Asia, the Israelites were to enter the pathless desert, and leave the inhabited country. Jehovah then undertook to direct the march, and give them a safe-conduct, through a miraculous token of His presence. Whilst it is stated in vers. 17, 18, that *Elohim* led them and determined the direction of their road, to show that they did not take the course, which they pursued, upon their own judgment, but by the direction of God; in vers 21, 22, it is said that “**JEHOVAH** went before them by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light, to go by day and night,” i.e. that they might march at all hours.¹ To this sign of the divine presence and guidance there was a natural analogon in the caravan fire, which consisted of small iron vessels or grates, with wood fires burning in them, fastened at the end of long poles, and carried as a guide in front of caravans, and, according to *Curtius* (*de gestis Alex. M. V.* 2, 7), in trackless countries in the front of armies also, and by which the direction of the road was indicated in the day-time by the smoke, and at night by the light of the fire. There was a still closer analogy in the custom of the ancient Persians, as described by *Curtius* (iii. 3, 9), of carrying fire, “which they called sacred and eternal,” in silver altars, in front of the army. But the pillar of cloud and fire must not be confounded with any such caravan and army fire, or set down as nothing more than a mythical conception, or a dressing up of this natural custom. The cloud was not produced by an ordinary caravan fire, nor was it “a mere symbol of the presence of God, which derived all its majesty from the belief of the Israelites, that Jehovah was there in the midst of them,” according to *Köster’s* attempt to idealize the rationalistic explanation; but it had a miraculous origin and a supernatural character. We are not to regard the phenomenon as consisting of two different pillars, that appeared alternately, one of cloud, and the other of fire.

¹ *Knobel* is quite wrong in affirming, that according to the primary work, the cloud was first instituted after the erection of the tabernacle. For in the passages cited in proof of this (chap. xl. 34 sqq.; Num. ix. 15 sqq., x. 11, 12, cf. xvii. 7), the cloud is invariably referred to, with the definite article, as something already known, so that all these passages refer to ver. 21 of the present chapter.

There was but one pillar of both cloud *and* fire (chap. xiv. 24); for even when shining in the dark, it is still called the pillar of cloud (chap. xiv. 19), or the cloud (Num. ix. 21); so that it was a cloud with a dark side and a bright one, causing darkness and also lighting the night (xiv. 20), or "a cloud, and fire in it by night" (xl. 38). Consequently we have to imagine the cloud as the covering of the fire, so that by day it appeared as a dark cloud in contrast with the light of the sun, but by night as a fiery splendour, "a fire-look" (בְּסֵרֵד־אֵשׁ, Num. ix. 15, 16). When this cloud went before the army of Israel, it assumed the form of a column; so that by day it resembled a dark column of smoke rising up towards heaven, and by night a column of fire, to show the whole army what direction to take. But when it stood still above the tabernacle, or came down upon it, it most probably took the form of a round globe of cloud; and when it separated the Israelites from the Egyptians at the Red Sea, we have to imagine it spread out like a bank of cloud, forming, as it were, a dividing wall. In this cloud Jehovah, or the Angel of God, the visible representative of the invisible God under the Old Testament, was really present with the people of Israel, so that He spoke to Moses and gave him His commandments out of the cloud. In this, too, appeared "the glory of the Lord" (chap. xvi. 10, xl. 34; Num. xvii. 7), the Shechinah of the later Jewish theology. The fire in the pillar of cloud was the same as that in which the Lord revealed Himself to Moses out of the bush, and afterwards descended upon Sinai amidst thunder and lightning in a thick cloud (chap. xix. 16, 18). It was a symbol of the "zeal of the Lord," and therefore was enveloped in a cloud, which protected Israel by day from heat, sunstroke, and pestilence (Isa. iv. 5, 6, xlix. 10; Ps. xci. 5, 6, cxxi. 6), and by night lighted up its path by its luminous splendour, and defended it from the terrors of the night and from all calamity (Ps. xxvii. 1 sqq., xci. 5, 6); but which also threatened sudden destruction to those who murmured against God (Num. xvii. 10), and sent out a devouring fire against the rebels and consumed them (Lev. x. 2; Num. xvi. 35). As *Sartorius* has aptly said, "We must by no means regard it as a mere appearance or a poetical figure, and just as little as a mere mechanical clothing of elementary forms, such, for example, as storm-clouds or natural fire. Just as little, too, must we sup-

pose the visible and material part of it to have been an element of the divine nature, which is purely spiritual. We must rather regard it as a dynamic conformation, or a higher corporeal form, composed of the earthly sphere and atmosphere, through the determining influence of the personal and specific (*speciem faciens*) presence of God upon the earthly element, which corporeal form God assumed and pervaded, that He might manifest His own real presence therein."¹—Ver. 22. This sign of the presence of God did not depart from Israel so long as the people continued in the wilderness.

Chap. xiv. PASSAGE OF THE ISRAELITES THROUGH THE RED SEA; DESTRUCTION OF PHARAOH AND HIS ARMY.—Vers. 1, 2. At Etham God commanded the Israelites to turn (שׁוּב) and encamp by the sea, before *Pihachiroth*, between *Migdol* and the sea, before *Baalzephon*, opposite to it. In Num. xxxiii. 7, the march is described thus: on leaving Etham they turned up to (לְעַד) *Pihachiroth*, which is before (לְפָנֵי) in the front of) *Baalzephon*, and encamped before *Migdol*. The only one of these places that can be determined with any certainty is *Pihachiroth*, or *Hachiroth* (Num. xxxiii. 8, *pi* being simply the Egyptian article), which name has undoubtedly been preserved in the *Ajrud* mentioned by *Edrisi* in the middle of the twelfth century. At present this is simply a fort, with a well 250 feet deep, the water of which is so bitter, however, that camels can hardly drink it. It stands on the pilgrim road from Kahira to Mecca, four hours' journey to the north-west of Suez (*vid.* Robinson, Pal. i. p. 65). A plain, nearly ten miles long and about as many broad, stretches from *Ajrud* to the sea to the west of

¹ "This is done," *Sartorius* proceeds to say, "not by His making His own invisible nature visible, nor yet merely figuratively or ideally, but by His rendering it objectively perceptible through the energy it excites, and the glorious effects it produces. The curtain (*velum*) of the natural which surrounds the Deity is moved and lifted (*revelatur*) by the word of His will, and the corresponding intention of His presence (*per dextram Dei*). But this is effected not by His causing the light of His countenance, which is unapproachable, to burst forth unveiled, but by His weaving out of the natural element a holy, transparent veil, which, like the fiery cloud, both shines and throws a shade, veils and unveils, so that it is equally true that God dwells in light and that He dwells in darkness (2 Chron. vi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 16), as true that He can be found as that He must always be sought."

Suez, and from the foot of Atâkah to the arm of the sea on the north of Suez (*Robinson*, Pal. i. 65). This plain most probably served the Israelites as a place of encampment, so that they encamped before, *i.e.* to the east of, Ajrud towards the sea. The other places must also be sought in the neighbourhood of Hachiroth (Ajrud), though no traces of them have been discovered yet. *Migdol* cannot be the Migdol twelve Roman miles to the south of Pelusium, which formed the north-eastern boundary of Egypt (*Ezek.* xxix. 10), for according to Num. xxxiii. 7, Israel encamped *before* Migdol; nor is it to be sought for in the hill and mountain-pass called *Montala* by *Burckhardt*, *el Muntala* by *Robinson* (pp. 63, 64), two hours' journey to the north-west of *Ajrud*, as *Knobel* supposes, for this hill lies too far to the west, and when looked at from the sea is almost behind *Ajrud*; so that the expression "encamping before Migdol" does not suit this situation, not to mention the fact that a tower (מגדל) does not indicate a watch-tower (מצודה). *Migdol* was probably to the south of *Ajrud*, on one of the heights of the Atâkah, and near it, though more to the south-east, *Baalzephon* (*locus Typhonis*), which *Michaelis* and *Forster* suppose to be *Heroopolis*, whilst *Knobel* places it on the eastern shore, and others to the south of Hachiroth. If Israel therefore did not go straight into the desert from Etham, on the border of the desert, but went southwards into the plain of Suez, to the west of the head of the Red Sea, they were obliged to bend round, *i.e.* "to turn" from the road they had taken first. The distance from Etham to the place of encampment at Hachiroth must be at least a six hours' journey (a tolerable day's journey, therefore, for a whole nation), as the road from Suez to Ajrud takes four hours (*Robinson*, i. p. 66).

Vers. 3-9. This turn in their route was not out of the way for the passage through the Red Sea; but apart from this, it was not only out of the way, but a very foolish way, according to human judgment. God commanded Moses to take this road, that He might be honoured upon Pharaoh, and show the Egyptians that He was Jehovah (cf. vers. 30, 31). Pharaoh would say of the Israelites, They have *lost their way*; they are wandering about in confusion; the desert has shut them in, as in a prison upon which the door is shut (סָגַר עַל as in *Job* xii. 14); and in his obduracy he would resolve to go after them with his army, and

bring them under his sway again.—Vers. 4 sqq. When it was announced that Israel had fled, “*the heart of Pharaoh and his servants turned against the people,*” and they repented that they had let them go. When and whence the information came, we are not told. The common opinion, that it was brought after the Israelites changed their route, has no foundation in the text. For the change in Pharaoh’s feelings towards the Israelites, and his regret that he had let them go, were caused not by their supposed mistake, but by their flight. Now the king and his servants regarded the exodus as a flight, as soon as they recovered from the panic caused by the death of the first-born, and began to consider the consequences of the permission given to the people to leave his service. This may have occurred as early as the second day after the exodus. In that case, Pharaoh would have had time to collect chariots and horsemen, and overtake the Israelites at Hachiroth, as they could easily perform the same journey in two days, or one day and a half, to which the Israelites had taken more than three. “*He yoked his chariot (had it yoked, cf. 1 Kings vi. 14), and took his people (i.e. his warriors) with him,*” viz. “*six hundred chosen war chariots (ver. 7), and all the chariots of Egypt*” (sc. that he could get together in the time), and “*royal guards upon them all.*” פְּלִשְׁתִּים, τριστατάι, tristatæ qui et terni statores vocantur, nomen est secundi gradus post regiam dignitatem (Jerome on Ezek. xxiii. 23), not charioteers (see my Com. on 1 Kings ix. 22). According to ver. 9, the army raised by Pharaoh consisted of chariot horses (סוּסֵי רֶכֶב), riding horses (פָּרָשִׁים, lit. runners, 1 Kings v. 6), and חֵיל, the men belonging to them. War chariots and cavalry were always the leading force of the Egyptians (cf. Isa. xxxi. 1, xxxvi. 9). Three times (vers. 4, 8, and 17) it is stated that Jehovah hardened Pharaoh’s heart, so that he pursued the Israelites, to show that God had decreed this hardening, to glorify Himself in the judgment and death of the proud king, who would not honour God, the Holy One, in his life. “*And the children of Israel were going out with a high hand:*” ver. 8 is a conditional clause in the sense of, “*although they went out*” (Ewald, § 341). יְדֵי רִמָּה, the high hand, is the high hand of Jehovah with the might which it displayed (Isa. xxvi. 11), not the armed hand of the Israelites. This is the meaning also in Num. xxxiii. 3; it is different in Num. xv. 30. The very fact that Pharaoh did not discern the

lifting up of Jehovah's hand in the exodus of Israel displayed the hardening of his heart. "*Beside Pihachiroth:*" see ver. 2.

Vers. 10-14. When the Israelites saw the advancing army of the Egyptians, they were greatly alarmed; for their situation to human eyes was a very unfortunate one. Shut in on the east by the sea, on the south and west by high mountains, and with the army of the Egyptians behind them, destruction seemed inevitable, since they were neither outwardly armed nor inwardly prepared for a successful battle. Although they cried unto the Lord, they had no confidence in His help, notwithstanding all the previous manifestations of the fidelity of the true God; they therefore gave vent to the despair of their natural heart in complaints against Moses, who had brought them out of the servitude of Egypt to give them up to die in the desert. "*Hast thou, because there were no graves at all* (כִּבְּלִי אֵין), a double negation to give emphasis) *in Egypt, fetched us to die in the desert?*" Their further words in ver. 12 exaggerated the true state of the case from cowardly despair. For it was only when the oppression increased, after Moses' first interview with Pharaoh, that they complained of what Moses had done (chap. v. 21), whereas at first they accepted his proposals most thankfully (chap. iv. 31), and even afterwards implicitly obeyed his directions.—Ver. 13. Moses met their unbelief and fear with the energy of strong faith, and promised them such help from the Lord, that they would never see again the Egyptians, whom they had seen that day. אֲשֶׁר רִאִיתֶם does not mean *ὃν πρόπον ἐώρακατε* (LXX.), *quemadmodum vidistis* (Ros., Kn.); but the sentence is inverted: "The Egyptians, whom ye have seen to-day, ye will never see again."—Ver. 14. "*Jehovah will fight for you* (לְכַם, *dat comm.*), *but you will be silent,*" i.e. keep quiet, and not complain any more (cf. Gen. xxxiv. 5).

Vers. 15-29. The words of Jehovah to Moses, "*What criest thou to Me?*" imply that Moses had appealed to God for help, or laid the complaints of the people before Him, and do not convey any reproof, but merely an admonition to resolute action. The people were to move forward, and Moses was to stretch out his hand with his staff over the sea and divide it, so that the people might go through the midst on dry ground. Vers. 17 and 18 repeat the promise in vers. 3, 4. The command and promise were followed by immediate help (vers. 19-29). Whilst Moses

divided the water with his staff, and thus prepared the way, the angel of God removed from before the Israelites, and placed himself behind them as a defence against the Egyptians, who were following them. "Upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen" (ver. 17), is in apposition to "all his host;" as Pharaoh's army consisted entirely of chariots and horsemen (cf. ver. 18).—Ver. 20. "And it was the cloud and the darkness (sc. to the Egyptians), and lighted up the night (sc. to the Israelites)." *Fuit nubes partim lucida et partim tenebricosa, ex una parte tenebricosa fuit Ægyptiis, ex altera lucida Israelitis* (Jonathan). Although the article is striking in אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה, the difficulty is not to be removed, as Ewald proposes, by substituting אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה, "and as for the cloud, it caused darkness;" for in that case the grammar would require the imperfect with *consec.* This alteration of the text is also rendered suspicious from the fact that both *Onkelos* and the *LXX.* read and render the word as a substantive.—Vers. 21, 22. When Moses stretched out his hand with the staff (ver. 16) over the sea, "Jehovah made the water go (flow away) by a strong east wind the whole night, and made the sea into dry (ground), and the water split itself" (i.e. divided by flowing northward and southward); "and the Israelites went in the midst of the sea (where the water had been driven away by the wind) in the dry, and the water was a wall (i.e. a protection formed by the damming up of the water) on the right and on the left." אֲשֶׁר־הָיָה, the east wind, which may apply either to the south-east or north-east, as the Hebrew has special terms for the four quarters only. Whether the wind blew directly from the east, or somewhat from the south-east or north-east, cannot be determined, as we do not know the exact spot where the passage was made. In any case, the division of the water in both directions could only have been effected by an east wind; and although even now the ebb is strengthened by a north-east wind, as *Tischendorf* says, and the flood is driven so much to the south by a strong north-west wind that the gulf can be ridden through, and even forded on foot, to the north of Suez (v. *Schub.* Reise ii. p. 269), and "as a rule the rise and fall of the water in the Arabian Gulf is nowhere so dependent upon the wind as it is at Suez" (*Wellsted*, Arab. ii. 41, 42), the drying of the sea as here described cannot be accounted for by an ebb strengthened by the east wind, because the water is all driven southwards in the ebb, and not sent in

two opposite directions. Such a division could only be produced by a wind sent by God, and working with omnipotent force, in connection with which the natural phenomenon of the ebb may no doubt have exerted a subordinate influence.¹ The passage was effected in the night, through the whole of which the wind was blowing, and in the morning watch (between three and six o'clock, ver. 24) it was finished.

As to the possibility of a whole nation crossing with their flocks, *Robinson* concludes that this might have been accomplished within the period of an extraordinary ebb, which lasted three, or at the most four hours, and was strengthened by the influence of a miraculous wind. "As the Israelites," he observes, "numbered more than two millions of persons, besides flocks and herds, they would of course be able to pass but slowly. If the part left dry were broad enough to enable them to cross in a body one thousand abreast, which would require a space of more than half a mile in breadth (and is perhaps the largest supposition admissible), still the column would be more than two thousand persons in depth, and in all probability could not have extended less than two miles. It would then have occupied at least an hour in passing over its own length, or in entering the sea; and deducting this from the largest time intervening, before the Egyptians also have entered the sea, there will remain only time enough, under the circumstances, for the body of the Israelites to have passed, at the most, over a space of three or four miles." (*Researches in Palestine*, vol. i. p. 84.)

But as the dividing of the water cannot be accounted for by an extraordinary ebb, even though miraculously strengthened, we have no occasion to limit the time allowed for the crossing to the ordinary period of an ebb. If God sent the wind, which divided the water and laid the bottom dry, as soon as night set in, the crossing might have begun at nine o'clock in the evening, if not before, and lasted till four or five o'clock in the morning

¹ But as the ebb at Suez leaves the shallow parts of the gulf so far dry, when a strong wind is blowing, that it is possible to cross over them, we may understand how the legend could have arisen among the Ichthyophagi of that neighbourhood (*Diod. Sic.* 3, 39) and even the inhabitants of Memphis (*Euseb. præp. ev.* 9, 27), that the Israelites took advantage of a strong ebb, and how modern writers like *Clericus* have tried to show that the passage through the sea may be so accounted for.

(see ver. 27). By this extension of the time we gain enough for the flocks, which *Robinson* has left out of his calculation. The Egyptians naturally followed close upon the Israelites, from whom they were only divided by the pillar of cloud and fire; and when the rear of the Israelites had reached the opposite shore, they were in the midst of the sea. And in the morning watch Jehovah cast a look upon them in the pillar of cloud and fire, and threw their army into confusion (ver. 24). The breadth of the gulf at the point in question cannot be precisely determined. At the narrowest point above Suez, it is only two-thirds of a mile in breadth, or, according to *Niebuhr*, 3450 feet; but it was probably broader formerly, and even now is so farther up, opposite to *Tell Kolzum* (*Rob.* i. pp. 84 and 70). The place where the Israelites crossed must have been broader, otherwise the Egyptian army, with more than six hundred chariots and many horsemen, could not have been in the sea and perished there when the water returned.—“*And Jehovah looked at the army of the Egyptians in (with) the pillar of cloud and fire, and troubled it.*” This look of Jehovah is to be regarded as the appearance of fire suddenly bursting forth from the pillar of cloud that was turned towards the Egyptians, which threw the Egyptian army into alarm and confusion, and not as “a storm with thunder and lightning,” as *Josephus* and even *Rosenmüller* assume, on the ground of Ps. lxxviii. 18, 19, though without noticing the fact that the psalmist has merely given a poetical version of the event, and intends to show “how all the powers of nature entered the service of the majestic revelation of Jehovah, when He judged Egypt and set Israel free” (*Delitzsch*). The fiery look of Jehovah was a much more stupendous phenomenon than a storm; hence its effect was incomparably grander, viz. a state of confusion in which the wheels of the chariots were broken off from the axles, and the Egyptians were therefore impeded in their efforts to escape.—Ver. 25. “*And (Jehovah) made the wheels of his (the Egyptian’s) chariots give way, and made, that he (the Egyptian) drove in difficulty.*” דָּרַג to drive a chariot (2 Sam. vi. 3, cf. 2 Kings ix. 20).—Vers. 26, 27. Then God directed Moses to stretch out his staff again over the sea, and the sea came back with the turning of the morning (when the morning turned, or approached) to its position (פָּרָח *perennitas*, the lasting or permanent position), and the Egyptians were

flying to meet it. "When the east wind which divided the sea ceased to blow, the sea from the north and south began to flow together on the western side;" whereupon, to judge from chap xv. 10, the wind began immediately to blow from the west, and drove the waves in the face of the flying Egyptians. "*And thus Jehovah shook the Egyptians (i.e. plunged them into the greatest confusion) in the midst of the sea,*" so that Pharaoh's chariots and horsemen, to the very last man, were buried in the waves.

Vers. 30, 31. This miraculous deliverance of Israel from the power of Egypt, through the mighty hand of their God, produced so wholesome a fear of the Lord, that they believed in Jehovah, and His servant Moses.—Ver. 31. "The great hand:" *i.e.* the might which Jehovah had displayed upon Egypt. In addition to the glory of God through the judgment upon Pharaoh (vers. 4, 17), the guidance of Israel through the sea was also designed to establish Israel still more firmly in the fear of the Lord and in faith. But faith in the Lord was inseparably connected with faith in Moses as the servant of the Lord. Hence the miracle was wrought through the hand and staff of Moses. But this second design of the miraculous guidance of Israel did not exclude the first, *viz.* glory upon Pharaoh. From this manifestation of Jehovah's omnipotence, the Israelites were to discern not only the merciful Deliverer, but also the holy Judge of the ungodly, that they might grow in the fear of God, as well as in the faith which they had already shown, when, trusting in the omnipotence of Jehovah, they had gone, as though upon dry land (Heb. xi. 29), between the watery walls which might at any moment have overwhelmed them.

MOSES' SONG AT THE RED SEA.—CHAP. XV. 1-21.

In the song of praise which Moses and the children of Israel sang at the Red Sea, in celebration of the wonderful works of Jehovah, the congregation of Israel commemorated the fact of its deliverance and its exaltation into the nation of God. By their glorious deliverance from the slave-house of Egypt, Jehovah had practically exalted the seed of Abraham into His own nation; and in the destruction of Pharaoh and his host, He had glorified Himself as God of the gods and King of the heathen,

whom no power on earth could defy with impunity. As the fact of Israel's deliverance from the power of its oppressors is of everlasting importance to the Church of the Lord in its conflict with the ungodly powers of the world, in which the Lord continually overthrows the enemies of His kingdom, as He overthrew Pharaoh and his horsemen in the depths of the sea : so Moses' song at the Red Sea furnishes the Church of the Lord with the materials for its songs of praise in all the great conflicts which it has to sustain, during its onward course, with the powers of the world. Hence not only does the key-note of this song resound through all Israel's songs, in praise of the glorious works of Jehovah for the good of His people (see especially Isa. xii.), but the song of Moses the servant of God will also be sung, along with the song of the Lamb, by the conquerors who stand upon the " sea of glass," and have gained the victory over the beast and his image (Rev. xv. 3).

The substance of this song, which is entirely devoted to the praise and adoration of Jehovah, is the judgment inflicted upon the heathen power of the world in the fall of Pharaoh, and the salvation which flowed from this judgment to Israel. Although Moses is not expressly mentioned as the author of the song, its authenticity, or Mosaic authorship, is placed beyond all doubt by both the contents and the form. The song is composed of three gradually increasing strophes, each of which commences with the praise of Jehovah, and ends with a description of the overthrow of the Egyptian host (vers. 2-5, 6-10, 11-18). The theme announced in the introduction in ver. 1 is thus treated in three different ways ; and whilst the omnipotence of God, displayed in the destruction of the enemy, is the prominent topic in the first two strophes, the third depicts with prophetic confidence the fruit of this glorious event in the establishment of Israel, as a kingdom of Jehovah, in the promised inheritance. Modern criticism, it is true, has taken offence at this prophetic insight into the future, and rejected the song of Moses, just because the wonders of God are carried forward in vers. 16, 17, beyond the Mosaic times. But it was so natural a thing that, after the miraculous deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt, they should turn their eyes to Canaan, and, looking forward with certainty to the possession of the promised land, should anticipate with believing confidence the foundation of a sanctuary

there, in which their God would dwell with them, that none but those who altogether reject the divine mission of Moses, and set down the mighty works of God in Egypt as myths, could ever deny to Moses this anticipation and prospect. Even *Ewald* admits that this grand song of praise "was probably the immediate effect of first enthusiasm in the Mosaic age," though he also ignores the prophetic character of the song, and denies the reality of any of the supernatural wonders of the Old Testament. There is nothing to prevent our understanding the words, "then sang Moses," as meaning that Moses not only sang this song with the Israelites, but composed it for the congregation to the praise of Jehovah.

Vers. 1b-5. *Introduction and first strophe.*—The introduction, which contains the theme of the song, "Sing will I to the Lord, for highly exalted is He, horse and his rider He hath thrown into the sea," was repeated, when sung, as an anti-strophe by a chorus of women, with Miriam at their head (cf. vers. 20, 21); whether after every verse, or only at the close of the longer strophes, cannot be determined. אָרָץ to arise, to grow up, *trop.* to show oneself exalted; connected with an *inf. abs.* to give still further emphasis. Jehovah had displayed His superiority to all earthly power by casting horses and riders, the proud army of the haughty Pharaoh, into the sea. This had filled His people with rejoicing: (ver. 2), "My strength and song is יְהוָה , He became my salvation; He is my God, whom I extol, my father's God, whom I exalt." עָז strength, might, not praise or glory, even in Ps. viii. 2. זָמַר , an old poetic form for זָמַר , from זָמַר , primarily to hum; thence זָמַר $\psi\alpha\lambda\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$, to play music, or sing with a musical accompaniment. יְהוָה , the concentration of *Jehovah*, the God of salvation ruling the course of history with absolute freedom (cf. vol. i. p. 74), has passed from this song into the Psalms, but is restricted to the higher style of poetry. "For He became salvation to me, granted me deliverance and salvation:" on the use of *vav consec.* in explanatory clauses, see Gen. xxvi. 12. This clause is taken from our song, and introduced in Isa. xii. 2, Ps. cxviii. 14. יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ : this *Jah*, such an one is my God. $\text{אֱהַיְתָה$: *Hiphil* of $\text{נָהַג$, related to נָהַג , *נָהַג*, to be lovely, delightful, *Hiph.* to extol, to praise, $\delta\omicron\zeta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega$, *glorifico* (LXX., *Vulg.*). "The God of my father:" i.e. of Abraham as the ancestor of Israel, or, as in chap. iii. 6, of the three

patriarchs combined. What He promised them (Gen. xv. 14, xlvi. 3, 4) He had now fulfilled.—Ver. 3. “*Jehovah is a man of war:*” one who knows how to make war, and possesses the power to destroy His foes. “*Jehovah is His name:*” *i.e.* He has just proved Himself to be the God who rules with unlimited might. For (ver. 4) “*Pharaoh’s chariots and his might (his military force) He cast into the sea, and the choice (the chosen ones) of his knights (shelishim, see chap. xiv. 7) were drowned in the Red Sea.*”—Ver. 5. “*Floods cover them* (יִכְסִימוּ, defectively written for יִכְסִימוּ = יִכְסִימוּ, and the suffix יָם for יָם, only used here); *they go down into the deep like stone,*” which never appears again.

Vers. 6-10. Jehovah had not only proved Himself to be a true man of war in destroying the Egyptians, but also as the glorious and strong one, who overthrows His enemies at the very moment when they think they are able to destroy His people.—Ver. 6. “*Thy right hand, Jehovah, glorified in power* (gloriously equipped with power: on the Yod in יְמִינֶיךָ, see Gen. xxxi. 39; the form is masc., and יְמִינֶיךָ, which is of common gender, is first of all construed as a masculine, as in Prov. xxvii. 16, and then as a feminine), *Thy right hand dashes in pieces the enemy.*” רָצַץ = רָצַץ: only used here, and in Judg. x. 8. The thought is quite a general one: the right hand of Jehovah smites every foe. This thought is deduced from the proof just seen of the power of God, and is still further expanded in ver 7, “*In the fulness of Thy majesty Thou pullest down Thine opponents.*” הִרַס generally applied to the pulling down of buildings; then used figuratively for the destruction of foes, who seek to destroy the building (the work) of God; in this sense here and Ps. xxviii. 5. קָטְפוּם: those that rise up in hostility against a man (Deut. xxxiii. 11; Ps. xviii. 40, etc.). “*Thou lettest out Thy burning heat, it devours them like stubble.*” הִרְוֶה, the burning breath of the wrath of God, which Jehovah causes to stream out like fire (Ezek. vii. 3), was probably a play upon the fiery look cast upon the Egyptians from the pillar of cloud (cf. Isa. ix. 18, x. 17; and on the last words, Isa. v. 24, Nah. i. 10).—Vers. 8-10. Thus had Jehovah annihilated the Egyptians. “*And by the breath of Thy nostrils* (*i.e.* the strong east wind sent by God, which is described as the blast of the breath of His nostrils; cf. Ps. xviii. 16) *the waters heaped themselves up* (piled

themselves up, so that it was possible to go between them like walls); *the flowing ones stood like a heap*" (גַּב *cumulus*; it occurs in Josh. iii. 13, 16, and Ps. xxxiii. 7, lxxviii. 13, where it is borrowed from this passage. נוֹלֵיִם: the running, flowing ones; a poetic epithet applied to waves, rivers, or brooks, Ps. lxxviii. 16, 44; Isa. xlv. 3). "*The waves congealed in the heart of the sea:*" a poetical description of the piling up of the waves like solid masses.

Ver. 9. "*The enemy said: I pursue, overtake, divide spoil, my soul becomes full of them; I draw my sword, my hand will root them out.*" By these short clauses following one another without any copula, the confidence of the Egyptian as he pursued them breathing vengeance is very strikingly depicted. נַפְשִׁי: the soul as the seat of desire, i.e. of fury, which sought to take vengeance on the enemy, "to cool itself on them." הוֹרִישׁ: to drive from their possession, to exterminate (cf. Num. xiv. 12).—Ver. 10. "*Thou didst blow with Thy breath: the sea covered them, they sank as lead in the mighty waters.*" One breath of God was sufficient to sink the proud foe in the waves of the sea. The waters are called אֲדִירִים, because of the mighty proof of the Creator's glory which is furnished by the waves as they rush majestically along.

Vers. 11-18. *Third strophe.* On the ground of this glorious act of God, the song rises in the third strophe into firm assurance, that in His incomparable exaltation above all gods Jehovah will finish the work of salvation, already begun, fill all the enemies of Israel with terror at the greatness of His arm, bring His people to His holy dwelling-place, and plant them on the mountain of His inheritance. What the Lord had done thus far, the singer regarded as a pledge of the future.—Ver. 11. "*Who is like unto Thee among the gods, O Jehovah* (אֱלֹהִים: not strong ones, but gods, *Elohim*, Ps. lxxxvi. 8, because none of the many so-called gods could perform such deeds), *who is like unto Thee, glorified in holiness?*" God had glorified Himself in holiness through the redemption of His people and the destruction of His foes; so that Asaph could sing, "Thy way, O God, is in holiness" (Ps. lxxvii. 13). קִדְּוָה, holiness, is the sublime and incomparable majesty of God, exalted above all the imperfections and blemishes of the finite creature (*vid.* chap. xix. 6).—"*Fearful for praises, doing wonders.*" The bold ex-

pression **תהלה נורא** conveys more than *summe venerandus, s. colendus laudibus*, and signifies terrible to praise, *terribilis laudibus*. As His rule among men is fearful (Ps. lxi. 5), because He performs fearful miracles, so it is only with fear and trembling that man can sing songs of praise worthy of His wondrous works. *Omnium enim laudantium vires, linguas et mentes superant ideoque magno cum timore et tremore eum laudant omnes angeli et sancti (C. a Lap.). "Thou stretchest out Thy hand, the earth swallows them."* With these words the singer passes in survey all the mighty acts of the Lord, which were wrapt up in this miraculous overthrow of the Egyptians. The words no longer refer to the destruction of Pharaoh and his host. What Egypt had experienced would come upon all the enemies of the Lord and His people. Neither the idea of the earth swallowing them, nor the use of the imperfect, is applicable to the destruction of the Egyptians (see vers. 1, 4, 5, 10, 19, where the perfect is applied to it as already accomplished).—Ver. 13. *"Thou leadest through Thy mercy the people whom Thou redeemest; Thou guidest them through Thy might to Thy holy habitation."* The deliverance from Egypt and guidance through the Red Sea were a pledge to the redeemed people of their entrance into the promised land. The holy habitation of God was Canaan (Ps. lxxviii. 54), which had been consecrated as a sacred abode for Jehovah in the midst of His people by the revelations made to the patriarchs there, and especially by the appearance of God at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 16 sqq., xxxi. 13, xxxv. 7).—Ver. 14. *"People hear, they are afraid; trembling seizes the inhabitants of Philistia."*—Ver. 15. *"Then are the princes (alluphim, see Gen. xxxvi. 15) of Edom confounded; the mighty men of Moab, trembling seizes them; all the inhabitants of Canaan despair."* **אֱלִיִּם**, like **אֱלִיִּם** in 2 Kings xxiv. 15, *scriptio plena* for **אֱלִיִּם**, strong, powerful ones. As soon as these nations should hear of the miraculous guidance of Israel through the Red Sea, and Pharaoh's destruction, they would be thrown into despair from anxiety and alarm, and would not oppose the march of Israel through their land.—Ver. 16. *"Fear and dread fall upon them; for the greatness of Thine arm (the adjective פְּרִיָּה placed as a substantive before the noun) they are dumb (דָּמָה) from (דָּמָה) as stones, till Thy people pass through, Jehovah, till the people which Thou hast purchased pass through."* Israel was still on its march to Canaan, an evident proof that

vers. 13-15 do not describe what was past, but that future events were foreseen in spirit, and are represented by the use of perfects as being quite as certain as if they had already happened. The singer mentions not only Edom and Moab, but Philistia also, and the inhabitants of Canaan, as enemies who are so paralyzed with terror, as to offer no resistance to the passage of Israel through their territory; whereas the history shows that Edom did oppose their passing through its land, and they were obliged to go round in consequence (Num. xx. 18 sqq.; Deut. ii. 3, 8), whilst Moab attempted to destroy them through the power of Balaam's curse (Num. xxii. 2 sqq.); and what the inhabitants of Philistia and Canaan had to fear, was not their passing through, but their conquest of the land.¹ We learn, however, from Josh. ii. 9, 10 and ix. 9, that the report of Israel's miraculous passage through the Red Sea had reached to Canaan, and filled its inhabitants with terror.—Ver. 17. “*Thou wilt bring and plant them in the mountain of Thine inheritance, the place which Thou hast made for Thy dwelling-place, Jehovah, for the sanctuary, Lord, which Thy hands prepared.*” On the *dagesh dirim.* in עִיבֵר, see chap. ii. 3. The futures are not to be taken as expressive of wishes, but as simple predictions, and are not to be twisted into preterites, as they have been by *Knobel*. The “*mountain of Jehovah's inheritance*” was not the hill country of Canaan (Deut. iii. 25), but the mountain which Jehovah had prepared for a sanctuary (Ps. lxxviii. 54), and chosen as a dwelling-place through the sacrifice of Isaac. The planting of Israel upon this mountain does not signify the introduction of the Israelites into the promised land, but the planting of the people of God in the house of the Lord (Ps. xcii. 14), in the future sanctuary, where Jehovah would perfect His fellowship with His people, and where the people would show themselves by their sacrifices to be the “*people of possession,*” and would

¹ The fact that the inhabitants of Philistia and Canaan are described in the same terms as Edom and Moab, is an unquestionable proof that this song was composed at a time when the command to exterminate the Canaanites had not yet been given, and the boundary of the territory to be captured by the Israelites was not yet fixed; in other words, that it was sung by Moses and the Israelites after the passage through the Red Sea. In the words עִיבֵר עַר in ver. 16, there is by no means the allusion to, or play upon, the passage through the Jordan, which *Knobel* introduces.

serve Him for ever as their King. This was the goal, to which the redemption from Egypt pointed, and to which the prophetic foresight of Moses raised both himself and his people in this song, as he beholds in spirit and ardently desires the kingdom of Jehovah in its ultimate completion.¹ The song closes in ver. 18 with an inspiring prospect of the time, when "*Jehovah will be King (of His people) for ever and ever;*" and in ver. 19, it is dovetailed into the historical narrative by the repetition of the fact to which it owed its origin, and by the explanatory "for," which points back to the opening verse.

Vers. 19–21. In the words "*Pharaoh's horse, with his chariots and horsemen,*" Pharaoh, riding upon his horse as the leader of the army, is placed at the head of the enemies destroyed by Jehovah. In ver. 20, *Miriam* is called "*the prophetess,*" not *ob poeticam et musicam facultatem* (Ros.), but because of her prophetic gift, which may serve to explain her subsequent opposition to Moses (Num. xi. 1, 6); and "*the sister of Aaron,*" though she was Moses' sister as well, and had been his deliverer in his infancy, not "because Aaron had his own independent spiritual standing by the side of Moses" (Baumg.), but to point out the position which she was afterwards to occupy in the congregation of Israel, namely, as ranking, not with Moses, but with Aaron, and like him subordinate to Moses, who had been placed at the head of Israel as the mediator of the Old Covenant, and as such was Aaron's god (chap. iv. 16, Kurtz).

¹ Auberlen's remarks in the *Jahrb. f. d. Theol.* iii. p. 793, are quite to the point: "In spirit Moses already saw the people brought to Canaan, which Jehovah had described, in the promise given to the fathers and repeated to him, as His own dwelling-place where He would abide in the midst of His people in holy separation from the nations of the world. When the first stage had been so gloriously finished, he could already see the termination of the journey." . . . "The nation was so entirely devoted to Jehovah, that its own dwelling-place fell into the shade beside that of its God, and assumed the appearance of a sojourning around the sanctuary of Jehovah, for God went up before the people in the pillar of cloud and fire. The fact that a mountain is mentioned in ver. 17 as the dwelling-place of Jehovah is no proof of a *vaticinium post eventum*, but is a true prophecy, having its natural side, however, in the fact that mountains were generally the sites chosen for divine worship and for temples; a fact with which Moses was already acquainted (Gen. xxii. 2; Ex. iii. 1, 12; compare such passages as Num. xxii. 41, xxxiii. 52, Micah iv. 1, 2). In the actual fulfilment it was Mount Zion upon which Jehovah was enthroned as King in the midst of His people.

As prophetess and sister of Aaron she led the chorus of women, who replied to the male chorus with timbrels and dancing, and by taking up the first strophe of the song, and in this way took part in the festival; a custom that was kept up in after times in the celebration of victories (Judg. xi. 34; 1 Sam. xviii. 6, 7, xxi. 12, xxix. 5), possibly in imitation of an Egyptian model (see my *Archäologie*, § 137, note 8).

ISRAEL CONDUCTED FROM THE RED SEA TO THE MOUNTAIN
OF GOD.—CHAP. XV. 22—XVII. 7.

Chap. xv. 22-27. MARCH FROM THE RED SEA TO MARAH AND ELIM.—Being thus delivered from Egypt and led safely through the Red Sea, Israel was led into the desert to the sanctuary of Sinai, to be adopted and consecrated by Jehovah as His possession.—Ver. 22. Leaving the Red Sea, they went into the desert of *Shur*. This name is given to the tract of desert which separates Egypt from Palestine, and also from the more elevated parts of the desert of Arabia, and stretches from the Mediterranean to the head of the Arabian Gulf or Red Sea, and thence along the eastern shore of the sea to the neighbourhood of the Wady Gharandel. In Num. xxxiii. 8 it is called the desert of *Etham*, from the town of *Etham*, which stood upon the border (see chap. xiii. 20). The spot where the Israelites encamped after crossing the sea, and sang praises to the Lord for their gracious deliverance, is supposed to have been the present *Ayun Musa* (the springs of Moses), the only green spot in the northern part of this desolate tract of desert, where water could be obtained. At the present time there are several springs there, which yield a dark, brackish, though drinkable water, and a few stunted palms; and even till a very recent date country houses have been built and gardens laid out there by the richer inhabitants of Suez. From this point the Israelites went three days without finding water, till they came to *Marah*, where there was water, but so bitter that they could not drink it. The first spot on the road from *Ayun Musa* to Sinai where water can be found, is in the well of *Howára*, 33 English miles from the former. It is now a basin of 6 or 8 feet in diameter, with two feet of water in it, but so disagreeably bitter and salt, that the Bedouins consider it the worst water in the whole neighbour-

hood (*Robinson*, i. 96). The distance from Ayun Musa and the quality of the water both favour the identity of *Howâra* and *Marah*. A whole people, travelling with children, cattle, and baggage, could not accomplish the distance in less than three days, and there is no other water on the road from Ayun Musa to Howâra. Hence, from the time of Burckhardt, who was the first to rediscover the well, *Howâra* has been regarded as the *Marah* of the Israelites. In the Wady *Amara*, a barren valley two hours to the north of Howâra, where *Ewald* looked for it, there is no water to be found; and in the Wady *Gharandel*, two hours to the south, to which *Lepsius* assigned it, the quality of the water does not agree with our account.¹ It is true that no trace of the name has been preserved; but it seems to have been given to the place by the Israelites simply on account of the bitterness of the water. This furnished the people with an inducement to murmur against Moses (ver. 24). They had probably taken a supply of water from Ayun Musa for the three days' march into the desert. But this store was now exhausted; and, as *Luther* says, "when the supply fails, our faith is soon gone." Thus even Israel forgot the many proofs of the grace of God, which it had received already.—Ver. 25. When Moses cried to the Lord in consequence, He showed him some wood which, when thrown into the water, took away its bitterness. The Bedouins, who know the neighbourhood, are not acquainted with such a tree, or with any other means of making bitter water sweet; and this power was hardly inherent in the tree itself, though it is ascribed to it in *Ecclus.* xxxviii. 5, but was imparted to it through the word and power of God. We cannot assign any reason for the choice of this particular earthly means, as the Scripture says nothing about any "evident and intentional contrast to the change in the Nile by which the sweet and pleasant water was rendered unfit for use" (*Kurtz*). The word יָדָה "wood" (see only *Num.* xix. 6), alone, without anything in the context to explain it, does not point to a "living tree" in con-

¹ The small quantity of water at *Howâra*, "which is hardly sufficient for a few hundred men, to say nothing of so large an army as the Israelites formed" (*Seetzen*), is no proof that *Howâra* and *Marah* are not identical. For the spring, which is now sanded up, may have flowed more copiously at one time, when it was kept in better order. Its present neglected state is the cause of the scarcity.

trast to the "dead stick." And if any contrast had been intended to be shown between the punishment of the Egyptians and the training of the Israelites, this intention would certainly have been more visibly and surely accomplished by using the staff with which Moses not only brought the plagues upon Egypt, but afterwards brought water out of the rock. If by עץ we understand a tree, with which עץ , however, hardly agrees, it would be much more natural to suppose that there was an allusion to the tree of life, especially if we compare Gen. ii. 9 and iii. 22 with Rev. xxii. 2, "the leaves of the tree of life were for the healing of the nations," though we cannot regard this reference as established. All that is clear and undoubted is, that by employing these means, Jehovah made Himself known to the people of Israel as their Physician, and for this purpose appointed the wood for the healing of the bitter water, which threatened Israel with disease and death (2 Kings iv. 40).

By this event Jehovah accomplished two things: (a) "*there He put (made) for it (the nation) an ordinance and a right,*" and (b) "*there He proved it.*" The ordinance and right which Jehovah made for Israel did not consist in the words of God quoted in ver. 26, for they merely give an explanation of the law and right, but in the divine act itself. The leading of Israel to bitter water, which their nature could not drink, and then the sweetening or curing of this water, were to be a סֵן for Israel, *i.e.*, an institution or law by which God would always guide and govern His people, and a חֶסֶד or right, inasmuch as Israel could always reckon upon the help of God, and deliverance from every trouble. But as Israel had not yet true confidence in the Lord, this was also a trial, serving to manifest its natural heart, and, through the relief of its distress on the part of God, to refine and strengthen its faith. The practical proof which was given of Jehovah's presence was intended to impress this truth upon the Israelites, that Jehovah as their Physician would save them from all the diseases which He had sent upon Egypt, if they would hear His voice, do what was right in His eyes, and keep all His commandments.

Ver. 27. *Elim*, the next place of encampment, has been sought from olden time in the *Wady Gharandel*, about six miles south of *Howára*; inasmuch as this spot, with its plentiful sup-

ply of comparatively good water, and its luxuriance of palms, tamarisks, acacias, and tall grass, which cause it to be selected even now as one of the principal halting-places between Suez and Sinai, quite answers to Elim, with its twelve wells of water and seventy palm-trees (cf. *Rob.* i. pp. 100, 101, 105). It is true the distance from Howâra is short, but the encampments of such a procession as that of the Israelites are always regulated by the supply of water. Both *Baumgarten* and *Kurtz* have found in Elim a place expressly prepared for Israel, from its bearing the stamp of the nation in the number of its wells and palms: a well for every tribe, and the shade of a palm-tree for the tent of each of the elders. But although the number of the wells corresponded to the twelve tribes of Israel, the number of the elders was much larger than that of the palms (chap. xxiv. 9). One fact alone is beyond all doubt, namely, that at Elim, this lovely oasis in the barren desert, Israel was to learn how the Lord could make His people lie down in green pastures, and lead them beside still waters, even in the barren desert of this life (*Ps.* xxiii. 2).

Chap. xvi. QUAILS AND MANNA IN THE DESERT OF SIN.—
Ver. 1. From Elim the congregation of Israel proceeded into the desert of Sin. According to *Num.* xxxiii. 10, they encamped at the Red Sea between Elim and the desert of Sin; but this is passed over here, as nothing of importance happened there. Judging from the nature of the ground, the place of encampment at the Red Sea is to be found at the mouth of the Wady *Taiyibeh*. For the direct road from the W. Gharandel to Sinai, and the only practicable one for caravans, goes over the tableland between this wady and the Wady *Useit* to the upper end of the W. *Taiyibeh*, a beautiful valley, covered with tamarisks and shrubs, where good water may be found by digging, and which winds about between steep rocks, and opens to the sea at *Ras Zelimeh*. To the north of this the hills and rocks come close to the sea, but to the south they recede, and leave a sandy plain with numerous shrubs, which is bounded on the east by wild and rugged rocky formations, and stretches for three miles along the shore, furnishing quite space enough therefore for the Israelitish camp. It is about eight hours' journey from Wady Gharandel, so that by a forced march the Israelites might have

accomplished it in one day. From this point they went "to the desert of *Sin*, which is between *Elim* and *Sinai*." The place of encampment here is doubtful. There are two roads that lead from *W. Taiyibeh* to *Sinai*: the *lower*, which enters the desert plain by the sea at the *Murkha* or *Morcha* well, not far from the mouth of the *Wady eth Thafary*, and from which you can either go as far as *Tûr* by the sea-coast, and then proceed in a north-easterly direction to *Sinai*, or take a more direct road through *Wady Shellâl* and *Badireh* into *Wady Mukatteb* and *Feirân*, and so on to the mountains of *Horeb*; and the *upper road*, first pointed out by *Burckhardt* and *Robinson*, which lies in a S.E. direction from *W. Taiyibeh* through *W. Shubeikeh*, across an elevated plain, then through *Wady Humr* to the broad sandy plain of *el Debbe* or *Debbet en Nasb*, thence through *Wady Nasb* to the plain of *Debbet er Ramleh*, which stretches far away to the east, and so on across the *Wadys Chamile* and *Seich* in almost a straight line to *Horeb*. One of these two roads the Israelites must have taken. The majority of modern writers have decided in favour of the lower road, and place the desert of *Sin* in the broad desert plain, which commences at the foot of the mountain that bounds the *Wady Taiyibeh* towards the south, and stretches along the sea-coast to *Ras Muhammed*, the southernmost point of the peninsula, the southern part of which is now called *el Kâa*. The encampment of the Israelites in the desert of *Sin* is then supposed to have been in the northern part of this desert plain, where the well *Murkha* still furnishes a resting-place plentifully supplied with drinkable water. *Ewald* has thus represented the Israelites as following the desert of *el Kâa* to the neighbourhood of *Tûr*, and then going in a north-easterly direction to *Sinai*. But apart from the fact that the distance is too great for the three places of encampment mentioned in *Num. xxxiii. 12-14*, and a whole nation could not possibly reach *Rephidim* in three stages by this route, it does not tally with the statement in *Num. xxxiii. 12*, that the Israelites left the desert of *Sin* and went to *Dofkah*; so that *Dofkah* and the places that follow were not in the desert of *Sin* at all. For these and other reasons, *De Laborde*, *v. Raumer*, and others suppose the Israelites to have gone from the fountain of *Murkha* to *Sinai* by the road which enters the mountains not far from this fountain through *Wady Shellâl*, and so continues through *Wady Mukatteb* to

Wady Feirân (*Robinson*, i. p. 105). But this view is hardly reconcilable with the encampment of the Israelites "in the desert of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai." For instance, the direct road from W. Gharandel (Elim) to Sinai does not touch the desert plain of *el Kâa* at all, but turns away from it towards the north-east, so that it is difficult to understand how this desert could be said to lie between Elim and Sinai. For this reason, even *Kurtz* does not regard the clause "which is between Elim and Sinai" as pointing out the situation of the desert itself, but (contrary to the natural sense of the words) as a more exact definition of that part or point of the desert of Sin at which the road from Elim to Sinai crosses it. But nothing is gained by this explanation. There is no road from the place of encampment by the Red Sea in the Wady Taiyibeh by which a whole nation could pass along the coast to the upper end of this desert, so as to allow the Israelites to cross the desert on the way from Taiyibeh to the W. Shellâl. As the mountains to the south of the W. Taiyibeh come so close to the sea again, that it is only at low water that a narrow passage is left (*Burckhardt*, p. 985), the Israelites would have been obliged to turn eastwards from the encampment by the Red Sea, to which they had no doubt gone for the sake of the water, and to go all round the mountain to get to the Murkha spring. This spring (according to *Burckhardt*, p. 983, "a small lake in the sandstone rock, close at the foot of the mountain") is "the principal station on this road," next to Ayun Musa and Gharandel; but the water is "of the worst description, partly from the moss, the bog, and the dirt with which the well is filled, but chiefly no doubt from the salt of the soil by which it is surrounded," and men can hardly drink it; whereas in the Wady *Thafary*, a mile (? five English miles) to the north-east of Murkha, there is a spring that "yields the only sweet water between Tor and Suez" (p. 982). Now, even if we were to assume that the Israelites pitched their camp, not by this, the only sweet water in the neighbourhood, but by the bad water of Murkha, the Murkha spring is not situated in the desert of *el Kâa*, but only on the eastern border of it; so that if they proceeded thence into the Wady Shellâl, and so on to the Wady Feirân, they would not have crossed the desert at all. In addition to this, although the lower road through the valley of Mukatteb is described by *Burckhardt* as "much easier and more

frequented," and by *Robinson* as "easier" than the upper road across Nasseb (Nasb), there are two places in which it runs through very narrow defiles, by which a large body of people like the Israelites could not possibly have forced their way through to Sinai. From the Murkha spring, the way into the valley of Mukatteb is through "a wild mountain road," which is shut out from the eyes of the wanderer by precipitous rocks. "We got off our dromedaries," says *Dieterici*, ii. p. 27, "and left them to their own instinct and sure tread to climb the dangerous pass. We looked back once more at the desolate road which we had threaded between the rocks, and saw our dromedaries, the only signs of life, following a serpentine path, and so climbing the pass in this rocky theatre Nakb el Butera." *Strauss* speaks of this road in the following terms: "We went eastwards through a large plain, overgrown with shrubs of all kinds, and reached a narrow pass, only broad enough for one camel to go through, so that our caravan emerged in a very pictorial serpentine fashion. The wild rocks frowned terribly on every side." Moreover, it is only through a "terribly wild pass" that you can descend from the valley Mukatteb into the glorious valley of Feiran (*Strauss*, p. 128).¹

For these reasons we must adopt *Knobel's* conclusions, and seek the desert of Sin in the upper road which leads from

¹ This pass is also mentioned by *Graul* (*Reise* ii. p. 226) as "a wild romantic mountain pass," and he writes respecting it, "For five minutes the road down was so narrow and steep, that the camels stept in fear, and we ourselves preferred to follow on foot. If the Israelites came up here on their way from the sea at Ras Zelime, the immense procession must certainly have taken a long time to get through the narrow gateway." To this we may add, that if Moses had led the people to Sinai through one of these narrow passes, they could not possibly have reached Sinai in a month from the desert of Sin, to say nothing of eight days, which was all that was left for them, if, as is generally supposed, and as *Kurtz* maintains, their stay at the place of encampment in the desert of Sin, where they arrived on the 15th day of the second month (xvi. 1), lasted full seven days, and their arrival at Sinai took place on the first day of the third month. For if a pass is so narrow that only one camel can pass, not more than three men could walk abreast. Now if the people of Israel, consisting of two millions of men, had gone through such a pass, it would have taken at least twenty days for them all to pass through, as an army of 100,000 men, arranged three abreast, would reach 27 English miles; so that, supposing the pass to be not more than five minutes walk long, 100,000 Israelites would hardly go through in a day, to say nothing at all about their flocks and herds.

Gharandel to Sinai, viz. in the broad sandy table-land *el Debbe* or *Debbet er Ramle*, which stretches from the Tih mountains over almost the whole of the peninsula from N.W. to S.E. (*vid. Robinson*, i. 112), and in its south-eastern part touches the northern walls of the Horeb or Sinai range, which helps to explain the connection between the names *Sin* and *Sinai*, though the meaning "thorn-covered" is not established, but is merely founded upon the idea that סִן has the same meaning as סִיָּה. This desert table-land, which is essentially distinguished from the limestone formations of the Tih mountains, and the granite mass of Horeb, by its soil of sand and sandstone, stretches as far as *Jebel Humr* to the north-west, and the *Wady Khamile* and *Barak* to the south-west (*vid. Robinson*, i. p. 101, 102). Now, if this sandy table-land is to be regarded as the desert of *Sin*, we must look for the place of Israel's encampment somewhere in this desert, most probably in the north-western portion, in a straight line between *Elim* (Gharandel) and *Sinai*, possibly in *Wady Nasb*, where there is a well surrounded by palm-trees about six miles to the north-west of *Sarbut el Khadim*, with a plentiful supply of excellent water, which *Robinson* says was better than he had found anywhere since leaving the Nile (i. 110). The distance from *W. Taiyibeh* to this spot is not greater than that from *Gharandel* to *Taiyibeh*, and might therefore be accomplished in a hard day's march.

Vers. 2–12. Here, in this arid sandy waste, the whole congregation murmured against *Moses* and *Aaron* on account of the want of food. What they brought with them from *Egypt* had been consumed in the 30 days that had elapsed since they came out (ver. 1). In their vexation the people expressed the wish that they had died in *Egypt* by the flesh-pot, in the midst of plenty, "by the hand of *Jehovah*," i.e. by the last plague which *Jehovah* sent upon *Egypt*, rather than here in the desert of slow starvation. The form יִיָּי is a *Hiphil* according to the consonants, and should be pointed יִיָּי, from יִיָּי for יִיָּי (see *Ges.* § 72, *Ann.* 9, and *Ewald*, § 114c.). As the want really existed, *Jehovah* promised them help (ver. 4). He would rain bread from heaven, which the *Israelites* should gather every day for their daily need, to try the people, whether they would walk in His law or not. In what the trial was to consist, is briefly

indicated in ver. 5: "*And it will come to pass on the sixth day (of the week), that they will prepare what they have brought, and it will be double what they gather daily.*" The meaning is, that what they gathered and brought into their tents on the sixth day of the week, and made ready for eating, would be twice as much as what they gathered on every other day; not that Jehovah would miraculously double what was brought home on the sixth day, as *Knobel* interprets the words in order to make out a discrepancy between ver. 5 and ver. 22. *הֵכִיז*, *to prepare*, is to be understood as applying partly to the measuring of what had been gathered (ver. 18), and partly to the pounding and grinding of the grains of manna into meal (Num. xi. 8). In what respect this was a test for the people, is pointed out in vers. 16 sqq. Here, in vers. 4 and 5, the promise of God is only briefly noticed, and its leading points referred to; it is described in detail afterwards, in the communications which Moses and Aaron make to the people. In vers. 6, 7, they first tell the people, "*At even, then shall ye know that Jehovah hath brought you out of Egypt; and in the morning, then shall ye see the glory of the Lord.*" Bearing in mind the parallelism of the clauses, we obtain this meaning, that in the evening and in the morning the Israelites would perceive the glory of the Lord, who had brought them out of Egypt. "Seeing" is synonymous with "knowing." Seeing the glory of Jehovah did not consist in the sight of the glory of the Lord which appeared in the cloud, as mentioned in ver. 10, but in their perception or experience of that glory in the miraculous gift of flesh and bread (ver. 8, cf. Num. xiv. 22). "*By His hearing*" (*שָׁמַע*), i.e. because He has heard, "*your murmuring against Jehovah*" ("against Him" in ver. 8, as in Gen. xix. 24); *for what are we, that ye murmur against us?*" The murmuring of the people against Moses and Aaron as their leaders really affected Jehovah as the actual guide, and not Moses and Aaron, who had only executed His will. Jehovah would therefore manifest His glory to the people, to prove to them that He had heard their murmuring. The announcement of this manifestation of God is more fully explained to the people by Moses in ver. 8, and the explanation is linked on to the leading clause in ver. 7 by the words, "*when He giveth,*" etc. Ye shall see the glory of Jehovah, when Jehovah shall give you, etc.—Vers. 9, 10. But before Jehovah

manifested Himself to the people in His glory, by relieving their distress, He gave them to behold His glory in the cloud, and by speaking out of the cloud, confirmed both the reproaches and promises of His servants. In the murmuring of the people, their unbelief in the actual presence of God had been clearly manifested. "It was a deep unbelief," says *Luther*, "that they had thus fallen back, letting go the word and promise of God, and forgetting His former miracles and aid." Even the pillar of cloud, this constant sign of the gracious guidance of God, had lost its meaning in the eyes of the people; so that it was needful to inspire the murmuring multitude with a salutary fear of the majesty of Jehovah, not only that their rebellion against the God who had watched them with a father's care might be brought to mind, but also that the fact might be deeply impressed upon their hearts, that the food about to be sent was a gift of His grace. "Coming near before Jehovah" (ver. 9), was coming out of the tents to the place where the cloud was standing. On thus coming out, "they turned towards the desert" (ver. 10), *i.e.* their faces were directed towards the desert of Sin; "and, behold, the glory of Jehovah appeared in the cloud," *i.e.* in a flash of light bursting forth from the cloud, and revealing the majesty of God. This extraordinary sign of the glory of God appeared in the desert, partly to show the estrangement of the murmuring nation from its God, but still more to show to the people, that God could glorify Himself by bestowing gifts upon His people even in the barren wilderness. For Jehovah spoke to Moses out of this sign, and confirmed to the people what Moses had promised them (vers. 11, 12).

Vers. 13-15. The same evening (according to ver. 12, "between the two evenings," *vid.* chap. xii. 6) quails came up and covered the camp. קָנָי : to advance, applied to great armies. קָנָיִם , with the article indicating the generic word, and used in a collective sense, are quails, ὀρνυγομήτρα (LXX.); *i.e.* the quail-king, according to *Hesychius ὀρνυξ ὑπερμεγέθης*, and *Phot. ὀρνυξ μέγας*, hence a large species of quails, ὀρνυγες (*Josephus*), *coturnices* (*Vulg.*). Some suppose it to be the *Katà* of the Arabs, a kind of partridge which is found in great abundance in Arabia, Palestine, and Syria. These fly in such dense masses that the Arab boys often kill two or three at a time, by merely striking

at them with a stick as they fly (*Burckhardt*, *Syr.* p. 681). But in spring the quails also come northwards in immense masses from the interior of Africa, and return in autumn, when they sometimes arrive so exhausted, that they can be caught with the hand (cf. *Diod. Sic.* i. 60; *v. Schubert*, *Reise* ii. p. 361). Such a flight of quails was now brought by God, who caused them to fall in the camp of the Israelites, so that it was completely covered by them. Then in the morning there came an "effusion of dew round about the camp; and when the effusion of dew ascended (i.e. when the mist that produced the dew had cleared away), behold there (it lay) upon the surface of the desert, fine, congealed, fine as the hoar-frost upon the ground." The meaning of the *ἀπ. λεγ.* *ספספס* is uncertain. The meaning, scaled off, scaly, *decorticated*, which is founded upon the Chaldee rendering *חֲסִיִּים*, is neither suitable to the word nor to the thing. The rendering *volutatum, rotundum*, is better; and better still perhaps that of *Meier*, "run together, curdled." When the Israelites noticed this, which they had never seen before, they said to one another, *מָה הֵנּוּ*, *τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο* (LXX.), "what is this?" for they knew not what it was. *מָן* for *מָן* belongs to the popular phraseology, and has been retained in the Chaldee and Ethiopic, so that it is undoubtedly to be regarded as early Semitic. From the question, *man hu*, the divine bread received the name of *man* (ver. 31), or *manna*. *Kimchi*, however, explains it as meaning *donum et portio*. *Luther* follows him, and says, "*Mann* in Hebrew means ready money, a present or a gift;" whilst *Gesenius* and others trace the word to *מָנָה*, to divide, to apportion, and render *מָה הֵנּוּ מָן* "what is apportioned, a gift or present." But the Arabic word to which appeal is made, is not early Arabic; and this explanation does not suit the connection. How could the people say "it is apportioned," when they did not know what it was, and Moses had to tell them, it is the bread which Jehovah has given you for food? If they had seen at once that it was food sent them by God, there would have been no necessity for Moses to tell them so.

Vers. 16-21. After explaining the object of the manna, Moses made known to them at once the directions of God about gathering it. *In the first place*, every one was to gather according to the necessities of his family, a bowl a head, which held, according to ver. 36, the tenth part of an ephah. Accordingly

they gathered, "he that made much, and he that made little," i.e. he that gathered much, and he that gathered little, and measured it with the omer; and he who gathered much had no surplus, and he who gathered little had no lack: "every one according to the measure of his eating had they gathered." These words are generally understood by the Rabbins as meaning, that whether they had gathered much or little, when they measured it in their tents, they had collected just as many omers as they needed for the number in their families, and therefore that no one had either superfluity or deficiency. Calvin, on the other hand, and other Christian commentators, suppose the meaning to be, that all that was gathered was placed in a heap, and then measured out in the quantity that each required. In the former case, the miraculous superintendence of God was manifested in this, that no one was able to gather either more or less than what he needed for the number in his family; in the second case, in the fact that the entire quantity gathered, amounted exactly to what the whole nation required. In both cases, the superintending care of God would be equally wonderful, but the words of the text decidedly favour the old Jewish view.—Vers. 19 sqq. In the second place, Moses commanded them, that no one was to leave any of what had been gathered till the next morning. Some of them disobeyed, but what was left went into worms (יָרַם תּוֹלְעִים literally rose into worms) and stank. Israel was to take no care for the morrow (Matt. vi. 34), but to enjoy the daily bread received from God in obedience to the giver. The gathering was to take place in the morning (ver. 21); for when the sun shone brightly, it melted away.

Vers. 22–31. Moreover, God bestowed His gift in such a manner, that the Sabbath was sanctified by it, and the way was thereby opened for its sanctification by the law. On the sixth day of the week the quantity yielded was twice as much, viz. two omers for one (one person). When the princes of the congregation informed Moses of this, he said to them, "Let tomorrow be rest (שַׁבָּתוֹ), a holy Sabbath to the Lord." They were to bake and boil as much as was needed for the day, and keep what was over for the morrow, for on the Sabbath they would find none in the field. They did this, and what was kept for the Sabbath neither stank nor bred worms. It is perfectly clear from this event, that the Israelites were not acquainted with any

sabbatical observance at that time, but that, whilst the way was practically opened, it was through the decalogue that it was raised into a legal institution (see chap. xx. 8 sqq.). מִשְׁבֹּתוֹ is an abstract noun denoting "rest," and שֹׁבֵת a concrete, literally the observer, from which it came to be used as a technical term for the seventh day of the week, which was to be observed as a day of rest to the Lord.—Vers. 27 sqq. On the seventh day some of the people went out to gather manna, notwithstanding Moses' command, but they found nothing. Whereupon God reprov'd their resistance to His commands, and ordered them to remain quietly at home on the seventh day. Through the commandments which the Israelites were to keep in relation to the manna, this gift assumed the character of a temptation, or test of their obedience and faith (cf. ver. 4).—Ver. 31. The manna was "like coriander-seed, white; and the taste of it like cake with honey." מַן: Chald. מִן; LXX. κόριον; Vulg. coriandrum; according to Dioscorid. 3, 64, it was called γολδ by the Carthaginians. מַן is rendered ἔγκρις by the LXX.; according to *Athenæus* and the Greek Scholiasts, a sweet kind of confectionary made with oil. In Num. xi. 7, 8, the manna is said to have had the appearance of *bdellium*, a fragrant and transparent resin, resembling wax (Gen. ii. 12). It was ground in handmills or pounded in mortars, and either boiled in pots or baked on the ashes, and tasted like מִן הַשֶּׁן, "dainty of oil," i.e. sweet cakes boiled with oil.

This "bread of heaven" (Ps. lxxviii. 24, cv. 40) Jehovah gave to His people for the first time at a season of the year and also in a place in which natural manna is still found. It is ordinarily met with in the peninsula of Sinai in the months of June and July, and sometimes even in May. It is most abundant in the neighbourhood of Sinai, in Wady Feirân and es Sheikh, also in Wady Gharandel and Taiyibeh, and some of the valleys to the south-east of Sinai (*Ritter*, 14, p. 676; *Seetzen's Reise* iii. pp. 76, 129). In warm nights it exudes from the branches of the tarfah-tree, a kind of tamarisk, and falls down in the form of small globules upon the withered leaves and branches that lie under the trees; it is then gathered before sunrise, but melts in the heat of the sun. In very rainy seasons it continues in great abundance for six weeks long; but in many seasons it entirely fails. It has the appearance of gum, and has a sweet,

honey-like taste ; and when taken in large quantities, it is said to act as a mild aperient (*Burckhardt*, Syr. p. 954 ; *Wellsted in Ritter*, p. 674). There are striking points of resemblance, therefore, between the manna of the Bible and the tamarisk manna. Not only was the locality in which the Israelites first received the manna the same as that in which it is obtained now ; but the time was also the same, inasmuch as the 15th day of the second month (ver. 1) falls in the middle of our May, if not somewhat later. The resemblance in colour, form, and appearance is also unmistakeable ; for, though the tamarisk manna is described as a dirty yellow, it is also said to be white when it falls upon stones. Moreover, it falls upon the earth in grains, is gathered in the morning, melts in the heat of the sun, and has the flavour of honey. But if these points of agreement suggest a connection between the natural manna and that of the Scriptures, the differences, which are universally admitted, point with no less distinctness to the miraculous character of the bread of heaven. This is seen at once in the fact that the Israelites received the manna for 40 years, in all parts of the desert, at every season of the year, and in sufficient quantity to satisfy the wants of so numerous a people. According to ver. 35, they ate manna "until they came to a land inhabited, unto the borders of the land of Canaan ;" and according to Josh. v. 11, 12, the manna ceased, when they kept the Passover after crossing the Jordan, and ate of the produce of the land of Canaan on the day after the Passover. Neither of these statements is to be so strained as to be made to signify that the Israelites ate no other bread than manna for the whole 40 years, even after crossing the Jordan : they merely affirm that the Israelites received no more manna after they had once entered the inhabited land of Canaan ; that the period of manna or desert food entirely ceased, and that of bread baked from corn, or the ordinary food of the inhabited country, commenced when they kept the Passover in the steppes of Jericho, and ate unleavened bread and parched cakes of the produce of the land as soon as the new harvest had been consecrated by the presentation of the sheaf of first-fruits to God.

But even in the desert the Israelites had other provisions at command. In the first place, they had brought large flocks and herds with them out of Egypt (chap. xii. 38, xvii. 3) ; and these

they continued in possession of, not only at Sinai (chap. xxxiv. 3), but also on the border of Edom and the country to the east of the Jordan (Num. xx. 19, xxxii. 1). Now, if the maintenance of these flocks necessitated, on the one hand, their seeking for grassy spots in the desert; on the other hand, the possession of cattle secured them by no means an insignificant supply of milk and flesh for food, and also of wool, hair, and skins for clothing. Moreover, there were different tribes in the desert at that very time, such as the Ishmaelites and Amalekites, who obtained a living for themselves from the very same sources which must necessarily have been within reach of the Israelites. Even now there are spots in the desert of Arabia where the Bedouins sow and reap; and no doubt there was formerly a much larger number of such spots than there are now, since the charcoal trade carried on by the Arabs has interfered with the growth of trees, and considerably diminished both the fertility of the valleys and the number and extent of the green oases (cf. *Rüppell, Nubien*, pp. 190, 201, 256). For the Israelites were not always wandering about; but after the sentence was pronounced, that they were to remain for 40 years in the desert, they may have remained not only for months, but in some cases even for years, in certain places of encampment, where, if the soil allowed, they could sow, plant, and reap. There were many of their wants, too, that they could supply by means of purchases made either from the trading caravans that travelled through the desert, or from tribes that were settled there; and we find in one place an allusion made to their buying food and water from the Edomites (Deut. ii. 6, 7). It is also very obvious from Lev. viii. 2, xxvi. 31, 32, ix. 4, x. 12, xxiv. 5 sqq., and Num. vii. 13 sqq., that they were provided with wheaten meal during their stay at Sinai.¹ But notwithstanding all these resources, the desert was "great and terrible" (Deut. i. 19, viii. 15); so that, even though it is no doubt the fact that the want of food is very trifling in that region (cf. *Burckhardt, Syria*, p. 901), there must often have been districts to traverse, and seasons to endure, in which the natural resources were either insufficient for so numerous a people, or failed altogether. It was necessary, therefore, that God should

¹ Vide *Hengstenberg's Geschichte Bileam's*, p. 284 sqq. For the English translation, see "Hengstenberg on the Genuineness of Daniel, etc.," p. 566. Clark. 1847.

interpose miraculously, and give His people bread and water and flesh by supernatural means. So that it still remains true, that God fed Israel with manna for 40 years, until their entrance into an inhabited country rendered it possible to dispense with these miraculous supplies. We must by no means suppose that the supply of manna was restricted to the neighbourhood of Sinai; for it is expressly mentioned after the Israelites had left Sinai (Num. xi. 7 sqq.), and even when they had gone round the land of Edom (Num. xxi. 5). But whether it continued outside the true desert,—whether, that is to say, the Israelites were still fed with manna after they had reached the inhabited country, viz. in Gilead and Bashan, the Amoritish kingdoms of Sihon and Og, which extended to Edrei in the neighbourhood of Damascus, and where there was no lack of fields, and vineyards, and wells of water (Num. xxi. 22), that came into the possession of the Israelites on their conquest of the land,—or during their encampment in the fields of Moab opposite to Jericho, where they were invited by the Moabites and Edomites to join in their sacrificial meals (Num. xxv. 2), and where they took possession, after the defeat of the Midianites, of their cattle and all that they had, including 675,000 sheep and 72,000 beeves (Num. xxxi. 31 sqq.),—cannot be decided in the negative, as *Hengstenberg* supposes; still less can it be answered with confidence in the affirmative, as it has been by *C. v. Raumer* and *Kurtz*. For if, as even *Kurtz* admits, the manna was intended either to supply the want of bread altogether, or where there was bread to be obtained, though not in sufficient quantities, to make up the deficiency, it might be supposed that no such deficiency would occur in these inhabited and fertile districts, where, according to Josh. i. 11, there were sufficient supplies, at hand to furnish ample provision for the passage across the Jordan. It is possible too, that as there were more trees in the desert at that time than there are now, and, in fact, more vegetation generally, there may have been supplies of natural manna in different localities, in which it is not met with at present, and that this manna harvest, instead of yielding only 5 or 7 cwt., as is the case now, produced considerably more.¹ Nevertheless, the quantity which

¹ The natural manna was not exclusively confined to the tamarisk, which seems to be the only tree in the peninsula of Sinai that yields it now; but, according to both ancient and modern testimony, it has been found in Persia,

the Israelites gathered every day,—viz. an omer a head, or at least 2 lbs.,—still remains a divine miracle; though this statement in vers. 16 sqq. is not to be understood as affirming, that for 40 years they collected that quantity every day, but only, that whenever and wherever other supplies failed, that quantity could be and was collected day by day.

Moreover, the divine manna differed both in origin and composition from the natural produce of the tamarisk. Though the tamarisk manna resembles the former in appearance, colour, and taste, yet according to the chemical analysis to which it has been submitted by *Mitscherlich*, it contains no farina, but simply saccharine matter, so that the grains have only the consistency of wax; whereas those of the manna supplied to the Israelites were so hard that they could be ground in mills and pounded in mortars, and contained so much meal that it was made into cakes and baked, when it tasted like honey-cake, or sweet confectionary prepared with oil, and formed a good substitute for ordinary bread. There is no less difference in the origin of the two. The manna of the Israelites fell upon the camp with the morning dew (vers. 13, 14; Num. xi. 9), therefore evidently out of the air, so that Jehovah might be said to have rained it from heaven (ver. 4); whereas the tamarisk manna drops upon the ground from the fine thin twigs of this shrub, and, in *Ehrenberg's* opinion, in consequence of the puncture of a small, yellow insect, called *coccus maniparus*. But it may possibly be produced apart from this insect, as *Lepsius* and *Tischendorf* found branches with a considerable quantity of manna upon them, and saw it drop from trees in thick adhesive lumps, without being able to discover any *coccus* near (see *Ritter*, 14, pp. 675-6). Now, even though the manna of the Bible may be connected with the produce of the tamarisk, the supply was not so inseparably connected with these shrubs, as that it could only fall to the earth with the dew, as it was exuded from their branches. After all, therefore, we can neither deny that there was some connection between the two, nor explain the gift of the heavenly manna, as arising from an unrestricted multiplication and increase of this gift of nature. We rather regard the bread of heaven as the production and gift of the grace of God, which fills all Chorasán, and other parts of Asia, dropping from other trees. Cf. *Rosenmüller ubi supra*, and *Ritter*, 14, pp. 686 sqq.

nature with its powers and productions, and so applies them to its purposes of salvation, as to create out of that which is natural something altogether new, which surpasses the ordinary productions of nature, both in quality and quantity, as far as the kingdom of nature is surpassed by the kingdom of grace and glory.

Vers. 32–36. As a constant memorial of this bread of God for succeeding generations, Jehovah commanded Moses to keep a bowl full (מלא העפר, the filling of a bowl) of the manna. Accordingly Aaron placed a jar of manna (as it is stated in vers. 34, 35, by way of anticipation, for the purpose of summing up everything of importance relating to the manna) “before Jehovah,” or speaking still more exactly, “before the testimony,” *i.e.* the tables of the law (see chap. xxv. 16), or according to Jewish tradition, in the ark of the covenant (Heb. ix. 4). צנצנת, from צן to guard round, to preserve, signifies a jar or bottle, not a basket. According to the Jerusalem Targum, it was an earthenware jar; in the LXX. it is called *στάμνος χρυσοῦς*, a golden jar, but there is nothing of this kind in the original text.—Ver. 36. In conclusion, the quantity of the manna collected for the daily supply of each individual, which was preserved in the sanctuary, is given according to the ordinary measurement, *viz.* the ephah. The common opinion, that עמר was the name for a measure of capacity, which was evidently shared by the Seventy, who have rendered the word *γομόρ*, has no foundation so far as the Scriptures are concerned. Not only is it a fact, that the word *omer* is never used as a measure except in this chapter, but the tenth of an ephah is constantly indicated, even in the Pentateuch, by “the tenth part of an ephah” (Lev. v. 11, vi. 13; Num. v. 15, xxviii. 5), or “a tenth deal” (Ex. xxix. 40; Lev. xiv. 10, etc.; in all 30 times). The *omer* was a small vessel, cup, or bowl, which formed part of the furniture of every house, and being always of the same size, could be used as a measure in case of need.¹ The ephah is given by *Bertheau* as consisting of 1985·77 Parisian cubic inches, and

¹ *Omer proprie nomen poculi fuit, quale secum gestare solent Orientales, per deserta iter facientes, ad hauriendam si quam rivus vel fons offerret aquam. . . . Hoc in poculo, alia vasa non habentes, et mannam collegerunt Israelitæ (Michaelis, Supplem. ad Lex. hebr., p. 1929). Cf. Hengstenberg, Dissertations on the Pentateuch, vol. ii. p. 172.*

holding 739,800 Parisian grains of water; *Thenius*, however, gives only 1014·39 Parisian, or 1124·67 Rhenish inches. (See my *Archäologie*, ii. 141-2.)

Chap. xvii. 1-7. WANT OF WATER AT REPHIDIM.—Ver. 1. On leaving the desert of Sin, the Israelites came לְמַסְעֵיהֶם, “according to their journeys,” i.e. in several marches performed with encampings and departures, to *Rephidim*, at Horeb, where they found no water. According to Num. xxxiii. 12-14, they encamped twice between the desert of Sin and Rephidim, viz. at *Dofkah* and *Alush*. The situation of *Rephidim* may be determined with tolerable certainty, partly from ver. 6 as compared with chap. xviii. 5, which shows that it is to be sought for at Horeb, and partly from the fact, that the Israelites reached the desert of Sinai, after leaving Rephidim, in a single day’s march (chap. xix. 2). As the only way from *Debbet er Ramleh* to Horeb or Sinai, through which a whole nation could pass, lies through the large valley of *es-Sheikh*, Rephidim must be sought for at the point where this valley opens into the broad plain of *er Rahah*; and not in the defile with Moses’ seat (*Mokad Seidna Musa*) in it, which is a day’s journey from the foot of Sinai, or five hours from the point at which the Sheikh valley opens into the plain of *er Rahah*, or the plain of *Sæueir* or *Suweiri*,¹ because this plain is so far from Sinai, that the Israelites could not possibly have travelled thence to the desert of Sinai in a single day; nor yet at the fountain of *Abu Suweirah*, which is three hours to the north of Sinai (*Strauss*, p. 131), for the Sheikh valley, which is only a quarter of a mile broad at this spot, and enclosed on both sides by tall cliffs (*Robinson*, i. 215), would not afford the requisite space for a whole nation; and the well found here, which though small is never dry (*Robinson*, i. 216), neither tallies with the want of water at Rephidim, nor stands “upon the rock at (in) Horeb,” so that it could be taken to be the spring opened by Moses. The distance from *Wady Nasb* (in the desert of Sin) to the point at which the upper Sinai road reaches the *Wady es Sheikh* is about 15 hours (*Robinson*, vol. iii. app.), and the distance thence to the plain of

¹ *Burckhardt*, p. 799; *v. Raumer*, *Zug der Israeliten*, p. 29; *Robinson’s Palestine*, pp. 178, 179; *De Laborde*, comment., p. 78; *Tischendorf*, *Reise* i. p. 244.

er Rahah through the Sheikh valley, which runs in a large semicircle to Horeb, 10 hours more (*Burckhardt*, pp. 797 sqq.), whereas the straight road across el Oerf, Wady Solaf, and Nukb Hawy to the convent of Sinai is only seven hours and a half (*Robinson*, vol. iii. appendix). The whole distance from Wady Nasb to the opening of the Sheikh valley into the plain of *er Rahah*, viz. 25 hours in all, the Israelites might have accomplished in three days, answering to the three stations, Dofkah, Alush, and Rephidim. A trace of Dofkah seems to have been retained in *el Tabbacha*, which *Seetzen* found in the narrow rocky valley of Wady *Gné*, i.e. *Kineh*, after his visit to Wady Mukatteb, on proceeding an hour and a half farther in a north-westerly (?) direction, and where he saw some Egyptian antiquities. *Knobel* supposes the station *Alush* to have been in the Wady *Oesch* or *Osh* (*Robinson*, i. 125; *Burckhardt*, p. 792), where sweet water may be met with at a little distance off. But apart from the improbability of *Alush* being identical with *Osh*, even if *al* were the Arabic article, the distance is against it, as it is at least twelve camel-hours from Horeb through the Sheikh valley. *Alush* is rather to be sought for at the entrance to the Sheikh valley; for in no other case could the Israelites have reached Rephidim in one day.

Vers. 2-7. As there was no water to drink in Rephidim, the people murmured against Moses, for having brought them out of Egypt to perish with thirst in the wilderness. This murmuring Moses called "tempting God," i.e. unbelieving doubt in the gracious presence of the Lord to help them (ver. 7). In this the people manifested not only their ingratitude to Jehovah, who had hitherto interposed so gloriously and miraculously in every time of distress or need, but their distrust in the guidance of Jehovah and the divine mission of Moses, and such impatience of unbelief as threatened to break out into open rebellion against Moses. "Yet a little," he said to God (i.e. a very little more), "and they stone me;" and the divine long-suffering and grace interposed in this case also, and provided for the want without punishing their murmuring. Moses was to pass on before the people, and, taking some of the elders with him, and his staff with which he smote the Nile, to go to the rock at Horeb, and smite upon the rock with the staff, at the place where God should stand before him, and water would come out

of the rock. The elders were to be eye-witnesses of the miracle, that they might bear their testimony to it before the unbelieving people, "*ne dicere possint, jam ab antiquis temporibus fontes ibi fuisse*" (*Rashi*). Jehovah's standing before Moses upon the rock, signified the gracious assistance of God. עָמַד לְפָנָי frequently denotes the attitude of a servant when standing before his master, to receive and execute his commands. Thus Jehovah condescended to come to the help of Moses, and assist His people with His almighty power. His gracious presence caused water to flow out of the hard dry rock, though not till Moses struck it with his staff, that the people might acknowledge him afresh as the possessor of supernatural and miraculous powers. The precise spot at which the water was smitten out of the rock cannot be determined; for there is no reason whatever for fixing upon the summit of the present Horeb, *Ras el Sufsafeh*, from which you can take in the whole of the plain of er Rahah (*Robinson*, i. p. 154).—Ver. 7. From this behaviour of the unbelieving nation the place received the names *Massah* and *Meribah*, "temptation and murmuring," that this sin of the people might never be forgotten (cf. Deut. vi. 16; Ps. lxxviii. 20, xcvi. 8, cv. 41).

CONFLICT WITH AMALEK.—CHAP. XVII. 8-16.

Vers. 8-13. The want of water had only just been provided for, when Israel had to engage in a conflict with the Amalekites, who had fallen upon their rear and smitten it (Deut. xxv. 18). The expansion of this tribe, that was descended from a grandson of Esau (see Gen. xxxvi. 12), into so great a power even in the Mosaic times, is perfectly conceivable, if we imagine the process to have been analogous to that which we have already described in the case of the leading branches of the Edomites, who had grown into a powerful nation through the subjugation and incorporation of the earlier population of Mount Seir. The Amalekites had no doubt come to the neighbourhood of Sinai for the same reason for which, even in the present day, the Bedouin Arabs leave the lower districts at the beginning of summer, and congregate in the mountain regions of the Arabian peninsula, viz. because the grass is dried up in the former, whereas in the

latter the pasturage remains green much longer, on account of the climate being comparatively cooler (*Burckhardt*, Syr. p. 789). There they fell upon the Israelites, probably in the Sheikh valley, where the rear had remained behind the main body, not merely for the purpose of plundering or of disputing the possession of this district and its pasture ground with the Israelites, but to assail Israel as the nation of God, and if possible to destroy it. The divine command to exterminate Amalek (ver. 14) points to this; and still more the description given of the Amalekites in Balaam's utterances, as רֵאשִׁית נִימִים, "the beginning," i.e. the first and foremost of the heathen nations (Num. xxiv. 20). In Amalek the heathen world commenced that conflict with the people of God, which, while it aims at their destruction, can only be terminated by the complete annihilation of the ungodly powers of the world. Earlier theologians pointed out quite correctly the deepest ground for the hostility of the Amalekites, when they traced the *causa belli* to this fact, "*quod timebat Amalec, qui erat de semine Esau, jam implendam benedictionem, quam Jacob obtinuit et præripuit ipsi Esau, præsertim cum in magna potentia venirent Israelitæ, ut promissam occuparent terram*" *Münster, C. a Lapide*, etc.). This peculiar significance in the conflict is apparent, not only from the divine command to exterminate the Amalekites, and to carry on the war of Jehovah with Amalek from generation to generation (vers. 14 and 16), but also from the manner in which Moses led the Israelites to battle and to victory. Whereas he had performed all the miracles in Egypt and on the journey by stretching out his staff, on this occasion he directed his servant Joshua to choose men for the war, and to fight the battle with the sword. He himself went with Aaron and Hur to the summit of a hill to hold up the staff of God in his hands, that he might procure success to the warriors through the spiritual weapons of prayer.

The proper name of *Joshua*, who appears here for the first time in the service of Moses, was Hosea (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ); he was a prince of the tribe of Ephraim (Num. xiii. 8, 16; Deut. xxxii. 44). The name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, "Jehovah is help" (or, God-help), he probably received at the time when he entered Moses' service, either before or after the battle with the Amalekites (see Num. xiii. 16, and *Hengstenberg*, *Dissertations*, vol. ii.). *Hur*, who also held a prominent position in the nation, according to chap. xxiv. 14, in

connection with Aaron, was the son of Caleb, the son of Hezron, the grandson of Judah (1 Chron. ii. 18-20), and the grandfather of Bezaleel, the architect of the tabernacle (chap. xxxi. 2, xxxv. 30, xxxviii. 22, cf. 1 Chron. ii. 19, 20). According to Jewish tradition, he was the husband of Miriam.—The battle was fought on the day after the first attack (ver. 9). The hill (הַר הַצִּבְיָה, not Mount Horeb), upon the summit of which Moses took up his position during the battle, along with Aaron and Hur, cannot be fixed upon with exact precision, but it was probably situated in the table-land of *Fureia*, to the north of er Rahah and the Sheikh valley, which is a fertile piece of pasture ground (*Burckhardt*, p. 801; *Robinson*, i. pp. 139, 215), or else in the plateau which runs to the north-east of the Horeb mountains and to the east of the Sheikh valley, with the two peaks Umlanz and Um Alawy; supposing, that is, that the Amalekites attacked the Israelites from Wady Muklifeh or es Suweiriyeh. Moses went to the top of the hill that he might see the battle from thence. He took Aaron and Hur with him, not as adjutants to convey his orders to Joshua and the army engaged, but to support him in his own part in connection with the conflict. This was to hold up his hand with the staff of God in it. To understand the meaning of this sign, it must be borne in mind that, although ver. 11 merely speaks of the raising and dropping of the hand (in the singular), yet, according to ver. 12, both hands were supported by Aaron and Hur, who stood one on either side, so that Moses did not hold up his hands alternately, but grasped the staff with both his hands, and held it up with the two. The lifting up of the hands has been regarded almost with unvarying unanimity by Targumists, Rabbins, Fathers, Reformers, and nearly all the more modern commentators, as the sign or attitude of prayer. *Kurtz*, on the contrary, maintains, in direct opposition to the custom observed throughout the whole of the Old Testament by all pious and earnest worshippers, of lifting up their hands to God in heaven, that this view attributes an importance to the outward form of prayer which has no analogy even in the Old Testament; he therefore agrees with *Lake-macher*, in *Rosenmüller's Scholien*, in regarding the attitude of Moses with his hand lifted up as "the attitude of a commander superintending and directing the battle," and the elevation of the hand as only the means adopted for raising the staff, which was

elevated in the sight of the warriors of Israel as the banner of victory. But this meaning cannot be established from vers. 15 and 16. For the altar with the name "*Jehovah my banner,*" and the watchword "*the hand on the banner of Jehovah, war of the Lord against Amalek,*" can neither be proved to be connected with the staff which Moses held in his hand, nor be adduced as a proof that Moses held the staff in front of the Israelites as the banner of victory. The lifting up of the staff of God was, no doubt, a banner to the Israelites of victory over their foes, but not in this sense, that Moses directed the battle as commander-in-chief, for he had transferred the command to Joshua; nor yet in this sense, that he imparted divine powers to the warriors by means of the staff, and so secured the victory. To effect this, he would not have lifted it up, but have stretched it out, either over the combatants, or at all events towards them, as in the case of all the other miracles that were performed with the staff. The lifting up of the staff secured to the warriors the strength needed to obtain the victory, from the fact that by means of the staff Moses brought down this strength from above, *i.e.* from the Almighty God in heaven; not indeed by a merely spiritless and unthinking elevation of the staff, but by the power of his prayer, which was embodied in the lifting up of his hands with the staff, and was so far strengthened thereby, that God had chosen and already employed this staff as the medium of the saving manifestation of His almighty power. There is no other way in which we can explain the effect produced upon the battle by the raising and dropping (יָרָד) of the staff in his hands. As long as Moses held up the staff, he drew down from God victorious powers for the Israelites by means of his prayer; but when he let it fall through the exhaustion of the strength of his hands, he ceased to draw down the power of God, and Amalek gained the upper hand. The staff, therefore, as it was stretched out on high, was not a sign to the Israelites that were fighting, for it is by no means certain that they could see it in the heat of the battle; but it was a sign to Jehovah, carrying up, as it were, to God the wishes and prayers of Moses, and bringing down from God victorious powers for Israel. If the intention had been to hold it up before the Israelites as a banner of victory, Moses would not have withdrawn to a hill apart from the field of battle, but would either have carried it himself in front of the army, or

have given it to Joshua as commander, to be borne by him in front of the combatants, or else have entrusted it to Aaron, who had performed the miracles in Egypt, that he might carry it at their head. The pure reason why Moses did not do this, but withdrew from the field of battle to lift up the staff of God upon the summit of a hill, and to secure the victory by so doing, is to be found in the important character of the battle itself. As the heathen world was now commencing its conflict with the people of God in the persons of the Amalekites, and the prototype of the heathen world, with its hostility to God, was opposing the nation of the Lord, that had been redeemed from the bondage of Egypt and was on its way to Canaan, to contest its entrance into the promised inheritance; so the battle which Israel fought with this foe possessed a typical significance in relation to all the future history of Israel. It could not conquer by the sword alone, but could only gain the victory by the power of God, coming down from on high, and obtained through prayer and those means of grace with which it had been entrusted. The means now possessed by Moses were the staff, which was, as it were, a channel through which the powers of omnipotence were conducted to him. In most cases he used it under the direction of God; but God had not promised him miraculous help for the conflict with the Amalekites, and for this reason he lifted up his hands with the staff in prayer to God, that he might thereby secure the assistance of Jehovah for His struggling people. At length he became exhausted, and with the falling of his hands and the staff he held, the flow of divine power ceased, so that it was necessary to support his arms, that they might be kept firmly directed upwards (נִצָּנְתָּ, *lit.* firmness) until the enemy was entirely subdued. And from this Israel was to learn the lesson, that in all its conflicts with the ungodly powers of the world, strength for victory could only be procured through the incessant lifting up of its hands in prayer. “*And Joshua discomfited Amalek and his people (the Amalekites and their people) with the edge of the sword*” (*i.e.* without quarter. See Gen. xxxiv. 26).

Vers. 14-16. As this battle and victory were of such significance, Moses was to write it for a memorial בְּסֵפֶר, in “*the book*” appointed for a record of the wonderful works of God, and “*to put it into the ears of Joshua,*” *i.e.* to make known to him, and

impress upon him, that Jehovah would utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; not "in order that he might carry out this decree of God on the conquest of Canaan," as *Knobel* supposes, but to strengthen his confidence in the help of the Lord against all the enemies of Israel. In Deut. xxv. 19 the Israelites are commanded to exterminate Amalek, when God should have given them rest in the land of Canaan from all their enemies round about.—Vers. 15, 16. To praise God for His help, Moses built an altar, which he called "*Jehovah my banner*," and said, when he did so, "*The hand on the throne (or banner) of Jah! War to the Lord from generation to generation!*" There is nothing said about sacrifices being offered upon this altar. It has been conjectured, therefore, that as a place of worship and thank-offering, the altar with its expressive name was merely to serve as a memorial to posterity of the gracious help of the Lord, and that the words which were spoken by Moses were to serve as a watchword for Israel, keeping this act of God in lively remembrance among the people in all succeeding generations. יָ (ver. 16) merely introduces the words as in Gen. iv. 23, etc. The expression יָ עַל־בַּיִת is obscure, chiefly on account of the ἀπ. λεγ. בַּיִת. In the ancient versions (with the exception of the Septuagint, in which יָ בַּיִת is treated as one word, and rendered κρυφαία) בַּיִת is taken to be equivalent to בַּיִת (1 Kings x. 19; Job xxvi. 9) for בַּיִת, and the clause is rendered "the hand upon the throne of the Lord." But whilst some understand the laying of the hand (*sc.* of God) upon the throne to be expressive of the attitude of swearing, others regard the hand as symbolical of power. There are others again, like *Clericus*, who suppose the hand to denote the hand laid by the Amalekites upon the throne of the Lord, *i.e.* on Israel. But if בַּיִת signifies throne or *adytum arcanum*, the words can hardly be understood in any other sense than "the hand lifted up to the throne of Jehovah in heaven, war to the Lord," etc.; and thus understood, they can only contain an admonition to Israel to follow the example of Moses, and wage war against Amalek with the hands lifted up to the throne of Jehovah. Modern expositors, however, for the most part regard בַּיִת as a corruption of בַּיִת, "the hand on the banner of the Lord." But even admitting this, though many objections may be offered to its correctness, we must not understand by "the banner of Jehovah"

the staff of Moses, but only the altar with the name Jehovah-nissi, as the symbol or memorial of the victorious help afforded by God in the battle with the Amalekites.

JETHRO THE MIDIANITE IN THE CAMP OF ISRAEL.—

CHAP. XVIII.

Vers. 1-12. The Amalekites had met Israel with hostility, as the prototype of the heathen who would strive against the people and kingdom of God. But Jethro, the Midianitish priest, appeared immediately after in the camp of Israel, not only as Moses' father-in-law, to bring back his wife and children, but also with a joyful acknowledgment of all that Jehovah had done to the Israelites in delivering them from Egypt, to offer burnt-offerings to the God of Israel, and to celebrate a sacrificial meal with Moses, Aaron, and all the elders of Israel; so that in the person of Jethro the first-fruits of the heathen, who would hereafter seek the living God, entered into religious fellowship with the people of God. As both the Amalekites and Midianites were descended from Abraham, and stood in blood-relationship to Israel, the different attitudes which they assumed towards the Israelites foreshadowed and typified the twofold attitude which the heathen world would assume towards the kingdom of God. (On *Jethro*, see chap. ii. 18; on Moses' wife and sons, see chap. ii. 21, 22; and on the expression in ver. 2, "*after he had sent her back*," chap. iv. 26.)—Jethro came to Moses "*into the wilderness, where he encamped at the mount of God*." The mount of God is Horeb (chap. iii. 1); and the place of encampment is Rephidim, at Horeb, *i.e.* at the spot where the Sheikh valley opens into the plain of er Rahah (chap. xvii. 1). This part is designated as a wilderness; and according to *Robinson* (1, pp. 130, 131) the district round this valley and plain is "naked desert," and "wild and desolate." The occasion for Jethro the priest to bring back to his son-in-law his wife and children was furnished by the intelligence which had reached him, that Jehovah had brought Israel out of Egypt (ver. 1), and, as we may obviously supply, had led them to Horeb. When Moses sent his wife and sons back to Jethro, he probably stipulated that they were to return to him on the arrival of the Israelites at Horeb. For when God first called Moses at Horeb, He foretold to him that

Israel would be brought to this mountain on its deliverance from Egypt (chap. iii. 12).¹

Vers. 6-12. When Jethro announced his arrival to Moses ("he said," *sc.* through a messenger), he received his father-in-law with the honour due to his rank ; and when he had conducted him to his tent, he related to him all the leading events connected with the departure from Egypt, and all the troubles they had met with on the way, and how Jehovah had delivered them out of them all. Jethro rejoiced at this, and broke out in praise to Jehovah, declaring that Jehovah was greater than all gods, *i.e.* that He had shown Himself to be exalted above all gods, for God is great in the eyes of men only when He makes known His greatness through the display of His omnipotence. He then gave a practical expression to his praise by a burnt-offering and slain-offering, which he presented to God. The second ׀ in

¹ Kurtz (Hist. of O. C. iii. 46, 53) supposes that it was chiefly the report of the glorious result of the battle with Amalek which led Jethro to resolve to bring Moses' family back to him. There is no statement, however, to this effect in the biblical text, but rather the opposite, namely, that what Jethro had heard of all that God had done to Moses and Israel consisted of the fact that Jehovah had brought Israel out of Egypt. Again, there are not sufficient grounds for placing the arrival of Jethro at the camp of Israel, in the desert of Sinai and after the giving of the law, as *Ranke* has done. For the fact that the mount of God is mentioned as the place of encampment at the time, is an argument in favour of Rephidim, rather than against it, as we have already shown. And we can see no force in the assertion that the circumstances, in which we find the people, point rather to the longer stay at Sinai, than to the passing halt at Rephidim. For how do we know that the stay at Rephidim was such a passing one, that it would not afford time enough for Jethro's visit? It is true that, according to the ordinary assumption, only half a month intervened between the arrival of the Israelites in the desert of Sin and their arrival in the desert of Sinai; but within this space of time everything might have taken place that is said to have occurred on the march from the former to the latter place of encampment. It is not stated in the biblical text that seven days were absorbed in the desert of Sin alone, but only that the Israelites spent a Sabbath there, and had received manna a few days before, so that three or four days (say from Thursday to Saturday inclusive) would amply suffice for all that took place. If the Israelites, therefore, encamped there in the evening of the 15th, they might have moved farther on the morning of the 19th or 20th, and after a two days' journey by Dofkah and Alush have reached Rephidim on the 21st or 22d. They could then have fought the battle with the Amalekites the following day, so that Jethro might have come to the camp on the 24th or 25th, and held the sacrificial meal with the Israelites the next day. In that case there

ver. 11 is only an emphatic repetition of the first, and *בִּדְבַר אֱשֶׁר* is not dependent upon *וַיַּעַבְדוּ*, but upon *גָּדוֹל*, or upon *הַגָּדוֹל* understood, which is to be supplied in thought after the second *כִּי*: “*That He has proved Himself great by the affair in which they (the Egyptians) dealt proudly against them (the Israelites).*” Compare Neh. ix. 10, from which it is evident, that to refer these words to the destruction of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea as a punishment for their attempt to destroy the Israelites in the water (chap. i. 22) is too contracted an interpretation; and that they rather relate to all the measures adopted by the Egyptians for the oppression and detention of the Israelites, and signify that Jehovah had shown Himself great above all gods by all the plagues inflicted upon Egypt down to the destruction of Pharaoh and his army in the Red Sea.—Ver. 12. The sacrifices, which Jethro offered to God, were applied to a sacrificial meal, in which Moses joined, as well as Aaron and all the elders.

would still be four or five days left for him to see Moses sitting in judgment a whole day long (ver. 13), and for the introduction of the judicial arrangements proposed by Jethro;—amply sufficient time, inasmuch as one whole day would suffice for the sight of the judicial sitting, which is said to have taken place the day after the sacrificial meal (ver. 13). And the election of judges on the part of the people, for which Moses gave directions in accordance with Jethro's advice, might easily have been carried out in two days. For, on the one hand, it is most probable that after Jethro had watched this severe and exhausting occupation of Moses for a whole day, he spoke to Moses on the subject the very same evening, and laid his plan before him; and on the other hand, the execution of this plan did not require a very long time, as the people were not scattered over a whole country, but were collected together in one camp. Moreover, Moses carried on all his negotiations with the people through the elders as their representatives; and the judges were not elected in modern fashion by universal suffrage, but were nominated by the people, *i.e.* by the natural representatives of the nation, from the body of elders, according to their tribes, and then appointed by Moses himself.—Again, it is by no means certain that Israel arrived at the desert of Sinai on the *first* day of the third month, and that only half a month (15 or 16 days) elapsed between their arrival in the desert of Sin and their encamping at Sinai (cf. chap. xix. 1). And lastly, though Kurtz still affirms that Jethro lived on the other side of the Elanitic Gulf, and did not set out till he heard of the defeat of the Amalekites, in which case a whole month might easily intervene between the victory of Israel and the arrival of Jethro, the two premises upon which this conclusion is based, are assumptions without foundation, as we have already shown at chap. iii. 1 in relation to the former, and have just shown in relation to the latter.

Eating bread before God signified the holding of a sacrificial meal, which was eating before God, because it was celebrated in a holy place of sacrifice, where God was supposed to be present.

Vers. 13–24. The next day Jethro saw how Moses was occupied from morning till evening in judging the people, who brought all their disputes to him, that he might settle them according to the statutes of God. *עָמַד עָלָיו*: as in Gen. xviii. 8. The people came to Moses “to seek or inquire of God” (ver. 15), *i.e.* to ask for a decision from God: in most cases, this means to inquire through an oracle; here it signifies to desire a divine decision as to questions in dispute. By judging or deciding the cases brought before him, Moses made known to the people the ordinances and laws of God. For every decision was based upon some law, which, like all true justice here on earth, emanated first of all from God. This is the meaning of ver. 16, and not, as *Knobel* supposes, that Moses made use of the questions in dispute, at the time they were decided, as good opportunities for giving laws to the people. Jethro condemned this plan (vers. 18 sqq.) as exhausting, wearing out (*נִבַּל lit.* to fade away, Ps. xxxvii. 2), both for Moses and the people: for the latter, inasmuch as they not only got wearied out through long waiting, but, judging from ver. 23, very often began to take the law into their own hands on account of the delay in the judicial decision, and so undermined the well-being of the community at large; and for Moses, inasmuch as the work was necessarily too great for him, and he could not continue for any length of time to sustain such a burden alone (ver. 18). The obsolete form of the *inf. const.* *עָשָׂהוּ* for *עָשָׂתוּ* is only used here, but is not without analogies in the Pentateuch. Jethro advised him (vers. 19 sqq.) to appoint judges from the people for all the smaller matters in dispute, so that in future only the more difficult cases, which really needed a superior or divine decision, would be brought to him that he might lay them before God. “*I will give thee counsel, and God be with thee (i.e. help thee to carry out this advice): Be thou to the people מִלֵּךְ הָאֱלֹהִים, towards God,*” *i.e.* lay their affairs before God, take the place of God in matters of judgment, or, as *Luther* expresses it, “take charge of the people before God.” To this end, in the *first* place, he was to instruct the people in the commandments of God, and their own walk and conduct (*הִלְכוּ* with a double accusative, to enlighten,

instruct; **יָרָךְ** the walk, the whole behaviour; **מַעֲשָׂה** particular actions); *secondly*, he was to select able men (**אֲנָשֵׁי חַיִל** men of moral strength, 1 Kings i. 52) as judges, men who were God-fearing, sincere, and unselfish (gain-hating), and appoint them to administer justice to the people, by deciding the simpler matters themselves, and only referring the more difficult questions to him, and so to lighten his own duties by sharing the burden with these judges. **הִקַּל מֵעָלֶיךָ** (ver. 22) "*make light of* (that which lies) *upon thee.*" If he would do this, and God would command him, he would be able to stand, and the people would come to their place, *i.e.* to Canaan, in good condition (**בְּשָׁלוֹם**). The *apodosis* cannot begin with **וְיָצִיחַ**, "then God will *establish* thee," for **וְיָצִיחַ** never has this meaning; but the idea is this, "if God should preside over the execution of the plan proposed."—Ver. 24. Moses followed this sage advice, and, as he himself explains in Deut. i. 12-18, directed the people to nominate wise, intelligent, and well-known men from the heads of the tribes, whom he appointed as judges, instructing them to administer justice with impartiality and without respect of persons.

Vers. 25-27. The judges chosen were arranged as chiefs (**שָׂרִים**) over thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, after the analogy of the military organization of the people on their march (Num. xxxi. 14), in such a manner, however, that this arrangement was linked on to the natural division of the people into tribes, families, etc. (see my *Archäologie*, § 140). For it is evident that the decimal division was not made in an arbitrary manner according to the number of heads, from the fact that, on the one hand, the judges were chosen from the heads of the tribes and according to their tribes (Deut. i. 13); and on the other hand, the larger divisions of the tribes, *viz.* the families (*mishpachoth*), were also called thousands (Num. i. 16, x. 4; Josh. xxii. 14, etc.), just because the number of their heads of families would generally average about a thousand; so that in all probability the hundreds, fifties, and tens denote smaller divisions of the nation, in which there were about this number of fathers. Thus in Arabic, for example, "*the ten*" is a term used to signify a family (cf. *Hengstenberg*, Dissertations v. ii. 343, and my *Arch.* § 149). The difference between the harder or greater matters and the smaller matters consisted in this: questions which there was no definite law to

decide were great or hard; whereas, on the other hand, those which could easily be decided from existing laws or general principles of equity were simple or small. (*Vide Joh. Selden de Synedriis* i. c. 16, in my *Arch.* § 149, Not. 3, where the different views are discussed respecting the relative positions and competency of the various judges, about which there is no precise information given in the law.) So far as the total number of judges is concerned, all that can be affirmed with certainty is, that the estimated number of 600 judges over thousands, 6000 over hundreds, 12,000 over fifties, and 60,000 over tens, in all 78,600 judges, which is given by *Grotius* and in the Talmud, and according to which there must have been a judge for every seven adults, is altogether erroneous (cf. *J. Selden l.c.* pp. 339 seq.). For if the thousands answered to the families (*mishpachoth*), there cannot have been a thousand males in every one; and in the same way the hundreds, etc., are not to be understood as consisting of precisely that number of persons, but as larger or smaller family groups, the numerical strength of which we do not know. And even if we did know it, or were able to estimate it, this would furnish no criterion by which to calculate the number of the judges, for the text does not affirm that every one of these larger or smaller family groups had a judge of its own; in fact, the contrary may rather be inferred, from the fact that, according to Deut. i. 15, the judges were chosen out of the heads of the tribes, so that the number of judges must have been smaller than that of the heads, and can hardly therefore have amounted to many hundreds, to say nothing of many thousands.

ARRIVAL AT SINAI, AND PREPARATION FOR THE
COVENANT.—CHAP. XIX.

Vers. 1, 2. In the third month after their departure from Egypt, the Israelites arrived at Sinai, proceeding from Rephidim into the desert of Sinai, and encamping there before the mountain. On what day of the month, the received text does not state. The striking expression בַּיּוֹם הַזֶּה ("the same day"), without any previous notice of the day, cannot signify the first day of the month; nor can הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁלִישִׁי signify the third new moon in the year, and be understood as referring to the first day of the third

month. For although, according to the etymology of *שִׁח* (from *שִׁח* to be new), it might denote the new moon, yet in chronological data it is never used in this sense; but the day of the month is invariably appended after the month itself has been given (e.g. *אֶחָד לַחֹדֶשׁ* chap. xl. 2, 17; Gen. viii. 5, 13; Num. i. 1, xxix. 1, xxxiii. 38, etc.). Moreover, in the Pentateuch the word *שִׁח* never signifies new moon; but the new moons are called *אֲשֵׁי חֹדֶשׁ* (Num. x. 10, xxviii. 11, cf. *Hengstenberg*, Dissertations, vol. ii. 297). And even in such passages as 1 Sam. xx. 5, xviii. 24, 2 Kings iv. 23, Amos viii. 5, Isa. i. 13, etc., where *שִׁח* is mentioned as a feast along with the Sabbaths and other feasts, the meaning new moon appears neither demonstrable nor necessary, as *שִׁח* in this case denotes the feast of the month, the celebration of the beginning of the month. If, therefore, the text is genuine, and the date of the month has not dropt out (and the agreement of the ancient versions with the Masoretic text favours this conclusion), there is no other course open, than to understand *י*, as in Gen. ii. 4 and Num. iii. 1, and probably also in the unusual expression *יִום הַחֹדֶשׁ*, Ex. xl. 2, in the general sense of time; so that here, and also in Num. ix. 1, xx. 1, the month only is given, and not the day of the month, and it is altogether uncertain whether the arrival in the desert of Sinai took place on one of the first, one of the middle, or one of the last days of the month. The Jewish tradition, which assigns the giving of the law to the fiftieth day after the Passover, is of far too recent a date to pass for historical (see my *Archæologie*, § 83, 6).

The *desert of Sinai* is not the plain of er Rahah to the north of Horeb, but the desert in front (*בְּנֵי*) of the mountain, upon the summit of which Jehovah came down, whilst Moses ascended it to receive the law (ver. 20 and xxxiv. 2). This mountain is constantly called Sinai so long as Israel stayed there (vers. 18, 20, 23, xxiv. 16, xxxiv. 2, 4, 29, 32; Lev. vii. 38, xxv. 1, xxvi. 46, xxvii. 34; Num. iii. 1; see also Num. xxviii. 6 and Deut. xxxiii. 2); and the place of their encampment by the mountain is also called the "*desert of Sinai*," never the desert of Horeb (Lev. vii. 38; Num. i. 1, 19, iii. 14, ix. 1, x. 12, xxvi. 64, xxxiii. 15). But in Ex. xxxiii. 6 this spot is designated as "Mount Horeb," and in Deuteronomy, as a rule, it is spoken of briefly as "Horeb" (Deut. i. 2, 6, 19, iv. 10, 15, v. 2, ix. 8,

xviii. 16, xxviii. 69). And whilst the general identity of Sinai and Horeb may be inferred from this; the fact, that wherever the intention of the writer is to give a precise and geographical description of the place where the law was given, the name Sinai is employed, leads to the conclusion that the term Horeb was more general and comprehensive than that of Sinai; in other words, that Horeb was the range of which Sinai was one particular mountain, which only came prominently out to view when Israel had arrived at the mount of legislation. This distinction between the two names, which *Hengstenberg* was the first to point out and establish (in his *Dissertations*, vol. ii. p. 325), is now generally admitted; so that the only room that is left for any difference of opinion is with reference to the extent of the Horeb range. There is no ground for supposing that the name *Horeb* includes the whole of the mountains in the Arabian peninsula. Sufficient justice is done to all the statements in the Bible, if we restrict this name to the southern and highest range of the central mountains,—to the exclusion, therefore, of the *Serbal* group.¹ This southern range, which Arabian geographers and the Bedouins call *Jebel Tur* or *Jebel Tur Sina*, consists of three summits: (1) a central one, called by the Arabs *Jebel Musa* (Moses' Mountain), and by Christians either *Horeb* or else *Horeb-Sinai*, in which case the northern and lower peak, or *Ras es Sufsafeh*, is called Horeb, and the southern and loftier one Sinai; (2) a western one, called *Jebel Humr*, with *Mount Catherine* on the south, the loftiest point in the whole range; and (3) an eastern one, called *Jebel el Deir* (Convent Mountain) or *Episteme* (*vide Ritter*, 14, pp. 527 sqq.).—Near this range there are two plains, which furnish space enough for a large encampment. One of these is the plain of *er Rahah*, on the north and north-west of Horeb-Sinai, with a level space of an English square mile, which is considerably enlarged by the Sheikh valley that opens into it from the east. At its southern extremity Horeb, with its granite rocks, runs almost precipitously to the height of 1200 or 1500 feet; and towards the west it is also shut in as with a wall by the equally precipitous spurs of

¹ The hypothesis advocated by *Lepsius*, that Sinai or Horeb is to be sought for in *Serbal*, has very properly met with no favour. For the objections to this, see *Ritter*, *Erdkunde* 14, pp. 738 sqq.; and *Kurtz*, *History of O. C.*, vol. iii. p. 94 sqq.

Jebel Humr. The other plain, which is called *Sebayeh*, lies to the south-east of Sinai, or Jebel Musa in the more restricted sense; it is from 1400 to 1800 feet broad, 12,000 feet long, and is shut in towards the south and east by mountains, which rise very gently, and do not reach any considerable height. There are three wadys leading to this plain from er Rahah and the Sheikh valley. The most westerly of these, which separates Horeb-Sinai from Jebel Humr with Mount Catherine on the south, is called *el Leja*, and is a narrow defile full of great blocks of stone, and shut in towards the south like a *cul de sac* by Mount Catherine. The central one, which separates Horeb from Jebel Deir, is Wady *Shoeib* (Jethro valley), with the convent of Sinai in it, which is also called the Convent Valley in consequence. This is less confined, and not so much strewn with stones; towards the south it is not quite shut in, and yet not quite open, but bounded by a steep pass and a grassy mountain-saddle, viz. the easily accessible *Jebel Sebayeh*. The third and most easterly is the Wady *es Sebayeh*, which is from 400 to 600 feet broad, and leads from the Sheikh valley, in a southern and south-westerly direction, to the plain of the same name, which stretches like an amphitheatre to the southern slope of Sinai, or Jebel Musa, in the more restricted sense. When seen from this plain, "Jebel Musa has the appearance of a lofty and splendid mountain cone, towering far above the lower gravelly hills by which it is surrounded" (*Ritter*, pp. 540, 541).

Since *Robinson*, who was the first to describe the plain of *er Rahah*, and its fitness for the encampment of Israel, visited Sinai, this plain has generally been regarded as the site where Israel encamped in the "desert of Sinai." *Robinson* supposed that he had discovered the Sinai of the Bible in the northern peak of Mount Horeb, viz. *Ras es Sufsafeh*. But *Ritter*, *Kurtz*, and others have followed *Laborde* and *F. A. Strauss*, who were the first to point out the suitability of the plain of *Sebayeh* to receive a great number of people, in fixing upon *Jebel Musa* in the stricter sense, the southern peak of the central group, which tradition had already indicated as the scene of the giving of the law, as the true Mount Sinai, where Moses received the laws from God, and the plain of *Sebayeh* as the spot to which Moses led the people (*i. e.* the men) on the third day, out of the camp of God and through the *Sebayeh* valley (ver. 16). For this

plain is far better adapted to be the scene of such a display of the nation, than the plain of er Rahah : first, because the hills in the background slope gradually upwards in the form of an amphitheatre, and could therefore hold a larger number of people ;¹ whereas the mountains which surround the plain of er Rahah are so steep and rugged, that they could not be made use of in arranging the people ;—and secondly, because the gradual sloping of the plain upwards, both on the east and south, would enable even the furthest rows to see Mount Sinai in all its majestic grandeur ; whereas the plain of er Rahah slopes downwards towards the north, so that persons standing in the background would be completely prevented by those in front from seeing Ras es Sufsafeh.—If, however, the plain of *es Sebayeh* so entirely answers to all the topographical data of the Bible, that we must undoubtedly regard it as the spot where the people of God were led up to the foot of the mountain, we cannot possibly fix upon the plain of er Rahah as the place of encampment in the desert of Sinai. The very expression “desert of Sinai,” which is applied to the place of encampment, is hardly reconcilable with this opinion. For example, if the Sinai of the Old Testament is identical with the present Jebel Musa, and the whole group of mountains bore the name of Horeb, the plain of er Rahah could not with propriety be called the desert of Sinai, for Sinai cannot even be seen from it, but is completely hidden by the Ras es Sufsafeh of Horeb. Moreover, the road from the plain of er Rahah into the plain of es Sebayeh through the Sebayeh valley is so long and so narrow, that the people of Israel, who numbered more than 600,000 men, could not possibly have been conducted from the camp in er Rahah into the Sebayeh plain, and so up to Mount Sinai, and then, after being placed in order there, and listening to the promulgation of the law, have returned to the camp again, all in a single day. The Sebayeh valley, or the road from the Sheikh valley to the commencement of the plain of Sebayeh, is, it is true, only an

¹ “Sinai falls towards the south for about 2000 feet into low granite hills, and then into a large plain, which is about 1600 feet broad and nearly five miles long, and rises like an amphitheatre opposite to the mountain both on the south and east. It is a plain that seems made to accommodate a large number gathered round the foot of the mountain ” (*Strauss*, p. 135).

hour long. But we have to add to this the distance from the point at which the Sebayeh valley opens into the Sheikh valley to the western end of the plain of er Rahah, viz. two hours' journey, and the length of the plain of Sebayeh itself, which is more than five miles long; so that the Israelites, at least those who were encamped in the western part of the plain of er Rahah, would have to travel four or five hours before they could be posted at the foot of Sinai.¹ *Tischendorf* calls this a narrow, bad road, which the Israelites were obliged to pass through to Sinai, when they came out of the Sheikh valley. At any rate, this is true of the southern end of the valley of Sebayeh, from the point at which it enters the plain of Sebayeh, where we can hardly picture it to ourselves as broad enough for two hundred men to walk abreast in an orderly procession through the valley;² consequently, 600,000 men would have required two hours' time simply to pass through the narrow southern end of the valley of Sebayeh. Now, it is clear enough from the narrative itself that Moses did not take merely the elders, as the representatives of the nation, from the camp to the mountain to meet with God (ver. 17), but took the whole nation, that is to say, all the adult males of 20 years old and upwards; and this is especially evident from the command so emphatically and repeatedly given, that no one was to break through the hedge placed

¹ Some Englishmen who accompanied *F. A. Strauss* "had taken three-quarters of an hour for a fast walk from the Sebayeh plain to Wady es Sheikh;" so that it is not too much to reckon an hour for ordinary walking. *Döbel* took quite six hours to go round Horeb-Sinai, which is only a little larger than Jebel Deir; so that at least three hours must be reckoned as necessary to accomplish the walk from the eastern end of the plain of er Rahah through the Wady Sebayeh to the foot of Sinai. And *Robinson* took fifty minutes to go with camels from the commencement of the Sheikh valley, at the end of the Convent Valley, to the point at which it is joined by the valley of Sebayeh (Palestine i. p. 215).

² We are still in want of exact information from travellers as to the breadth of the southern end of the valley of Sebayeh. *Ritter* merely states, on the ground of MS. notes in *Strauss'* diary, that "at first it is somewhat contracted on account of projections in the heights by which it is bounded towards the south, but it still remains more than 500 feet broad." And "when it turns towards the north-west, the wady is considerably widened; so that at the narrowest points it is more than 600 feet broad. And very frequently, at the different curves in the valley, large basins are formed, which would hold a considerable number of people."

round the mountain. It may also be inferred from the design of the revelation itself, which was intended to make the deepest impression upon the whole nation of that majesty of Jehovah and the holiness of His law.

Under these circumstances, if the people had been encamped in the plain of er Rahah and the Sheikh valley, they could not have been conducted to the foot of Sinai and stationed in the plain of Sebayeh in the course of six hours, and then, after hearing the revelation of the law, have returned to their tents on the same day; even assuming, as *Kurtz* does (iii. p. 117), that "the people were overpowered by the majesty of the promulgation of the law, and fled away in panic;" for flight through so narrow a valley would have caused inevitable confusion, and therefore would have prevented rather than facilitated rapidity of movement. There is not a word, however, in the original text about a panic, or about the people flying (see chap. xx. 18): it is merely stated, that as soon as the people witnessed the alarming phenomena connected with the descent of God upon the mountain, they trembled in the camp (chap. xix. 16), and that when they were conducted to the foot of the mountain, and "saw the thunderings, and the lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking," and heard the solemn promulgation of the decalogue, they trembled (וַיִּרְאוּ, chap. xx. 18), and said to Moses, through their elders and the heads of tribes, that they did not wish God to speak directly to them any more, but wished Moses to speak to God and listen to His words; whereupon, after God had expressed His approval of these words of the people, Moses directed the people to return to their tents (chap. xx. 18 sqq.; Deut. v. 23-30). If, again, we take into consideration, that after Moses had stationed the people at the foot of the mountain, he went up to God to the summit of Sinai, and came down again at the command of God to repeat the charge to the people, not to break through the hedge round the mountain (vers. 20-25), and it was not till after this, that God proclaimed the decalogue, and that this going up and down must also have taken up time, it cannot have been for so very short a time that the people continued standing round the bottom of the mountain. But if all these difficulties be regarded as trivial, and we include the evening and part of the night in order to afford time for the people to return to their tents; not only is there nothing

in the biblical text to require the hypothesis which assigns the encampment to the plain of er Rahah, and the posting of the people at Sinai to the plain of Sebayeh, but there are various allusions which seem rather to show that such a hypothesis is inadmissible. It is very obvious from chap. xxiv. 17, that the glory of the Lord upon the top of the mountain could be seen from the camp; and from chap. xxxiv. 1-3, that the camp, with both the people and their cattle in it, was so immediately in the neighbourhood of Sinai, that the people could easily have ascended the mountain, and the cattle could have grazed upon it. Now this does not apply in the least to the plain of er Rahah, from which not even the top of Jebel Musa can be seen, and where the cattle could not possibly have grazed upon it, but only to the plain of Sebayeh; and therefore proves that the camp in "the desert of Sinai" is not to be sought for in the plain of er Rahah, but in the plain of Sebayeh, which reaches to the foot of Sinai. If it should be objected, on the other hand, that there is not room in this plain for the camp of the whole nation, this objection is quite as applicable to the plain of er Rahah, which is not large enough in itself to take in the entire camp, without including a large portion of the Sheikh valley; and it loses all its force from the fact, that the mountains by which the plain of Sebayeh is bounded, both on the south and east, rise so gently and gradually, that they could be made use of for the camp, and on these sides therefore the space is altogether unlimited, and would allow of the widest dispersion of the people and their flocks.

Vers. 3-6. Moses had known from the time of his call that Israel would serve God on this mountain (iii. 12); and as soon as the people were encamped opposite to it, he went up to God, *i.e.* up the mountain, to the top of which the cloud had probably withdrawn. There God gave him the necessary instructions for preparing for the covenant: first of all assuring him, that He had brought the Israelites to Himself to make them His own nation, and that He would speak to them from the mountain (vers. 4-9); and then ordering him to sanctify the people for this revelation of the Lord (vers. 10-15). The promise precedes the demand; for the grace of God always anticipates the wants of man, and does not demand before it has given. Jehovah spoke to Moses "from Mount Horeb." Moses had probably ascended one of

the lower heights, whilst Jehovah is to be regarded as on the summit of the mountain. The words of God (vers. 4 sqq.) refer first of all to what He had done for the Egyptians, and how He had borne the Israelites on eagles' wings; manifesting in this way not only the separation between Israel and the Egyptians, but the adoption of Israel as the nation of His especial grace and favour. The "eagles' wings" are figurative, and denote the strong and loving care of God. The eagle watches over its young in the most careful manner, flying under them when it leads them from the nest, lest they should fall upon the rocks, and be injured or destroyed (cf. Deut. xxxii. 11, and for proofs from profane literature, *Bochart*, Hieroz. ii. pp. 762, 765 sqq.). "And brought you unto Myself:" i.e. not "led you to the dwelling-place of God on Sinai," as *Knobel* supposes; but took you into My protection and My especial care.—Ver. 5. This manifestation of the love of God to Israel formed only the prelude, however, to that gracious union which Jehovah was now about to establish between the Israelites and Himself. If they would hear His voice, and keep the covenant which was about to be established with them, they should be a costly possession to Him out of all nations (cf. Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 18). הַקִּיְנוֹת does not signify property in general, but valuable property, that which is laid by, or put aside (לְקַיֵּן), hence a treasure of silver and gold (1 Chron. xxix. 3; Eccl. ii. 8). In the *Sept.* the expression is rendered *λαὸς περιούσιος*, which the Scholiast in *Octat.* interprets *ἐξάιρετος*, and in Mal. iii. 17 *εἰς περιποίησιν*: hence the two phrases in the New Testament, *λαὸς περιούσιος* in Tit. ii. 14, and *λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν* in 1 Pet. ii. 9. Jehovah had chosen Israel as His costly possession out of all the nations of the earth, because the whole earth was His possession, and all nations belonged to Him as Creator and Preserver. The reason thus assigned for the selection of Israel precludes at the very outset the exclusiveness which would regard Jehovah as merely a national Deity. The idea of the *segullah* is explained in ver. 6: "Ye shall be unto Me a kingdom of priests." מַמְלָכָה signifies both *kingship*, as the embodiment of royal supremacy, exaltation, and dignity, and the *kingdom*, or the union of both king and subjects, i.e. the land and nation together with its king. In the passage before us, the word has been understood by most of the early commentators, both Jewish and Christian,

and also in the ancient versions,¹ in the first or active sense, so that the expression contains the idea, "Ye shall be all priests and kings" (*Luther*); *præditos fore tam sacerdotali quam regio honore* (*Calvin*); *quod reges et sacerdotes sunt in republica, id vos eritis mihi* (*Drusus*). This explanation is required by both the passage itself and the context. For apart from the fact that kingship is the primary and most general meaning of the word מַמְלָכָה (cf. מַמְלָכָה דָּוִד, the kingship, or government of David), the other (passive) meaning would not be at all suitable here; for a kingdom of priests could never denote the fellowship existing in a kingdom between the king and the priests, but only a kingdom or commonwealth consisting of priests, i.e. a kingdom the members and citizens of which were priests, and as priests constituted the מַמְלָכָה, in other words, were possessed of royal dignity and power; for מַמְלָכָה, βασιλεία, always includes the idea of מְלִיכָה or ruling (βασιλεύειν). The LXX. have quite hit the meaning in their rendering: βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα. Israel was to be a regal body of priests to Jehovah, and not merely a nation of priests governed by Jehovah. The idea of the theocracy, or government of God, as founded by the establishment of the Sinaitic covenant institution in Israel, is not at all involved in the term "kingdom of priests." The theocracy established by the conclusion of the covenant (chap. xxiv.) was only the means adopted by Jehovah for making His chosen people a royal body of priests; and the maintenance of this covenant was the indispensable subjective condition, upon which their attainment of this divinely appointed destiny and glory depended. This promise of Jehovah expressed the design of the call of Israel, to which it was to be fully conducted by the covenant institution of the theocracy, if it maintained the covenant with Jehovah. The object of Israel's kingship and priesthood was to be found in the nations of the earth, out of which Jehovah had chosen Israel as a costly possession. This great and glorious promise, the fulfilment of which could not be attained till the completion

¹ LXX.: βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα, a royal priesthood, i.e. a priestly nation of royal power and glory. מַלְכֵי כֹהֲנֵי: Kings-priests (*Onkelos*).—*"Eritis coram me reges coronati (מְלִיכֵי בְּלִיָּא) vincti coronis) et sacerdotes ministrantes"* (*Jonathan*).—*"Eritis meo nomini reges et sacerdotes"* (*Jer. Targ.*).

of the kingdom of God, when the Israel of God, the Church of the Lord, which Jesus Christ, the first-begotten from the dead, and prince (*ἄρχων*, ruler) of the kings of the earth, has made a "kingdom," "priests unto God and His Father" (Rev. i. 6 and v. 10, where the reading should be *βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς*), is exalted to glory with Christ as the first-born among many brethren, and sits upon His throne and reigns, has not been introduced abruptly here. On the contrary, the way was already prepared by the promises made to the patriarchs, of the blessing which Abraham would become to all the nations of the earth, and of the kings who were to spring from him and come out of the loins of Israel (Gen. xii. 3, xvii. 6, xxxv. 11), and still more distinctly by Jacob's prophecy of the sceptre of Judah, to whom, through *Shiloh*, the willing submission of the nations should be made (Gen. xlix. 10). But these promises and prophecies are outshone by the clearness, with which kingship and priesthood over and for the nations are foretold of Israel here. This kingship, however, is not merely of a spiritual kind, consisting, as *Luther* supposes, in the fact, that believers "are lords over death, the devil, hell, and all evil," but culminates in the universal sway foretold by Balaam in Num. xxiv. 8 and 17 sqq., by Moses in his last words (Deut. xxxiii. 29), and still more distinctly in Dan. vii. 27, to the people of the saints of the Most High, as the ultimate end of their calling from God. The spiritual attitude of Israel towards the nations was the result of its priestly character. As the priest is a mediator between God and man, so Israel was called to be the vehicle of the knowledge and salvation of God to the nations of the earth. By this it unquestionably acquired an intellectual and spiritual character; but this includes, rather than excludes, the government of the world. For spiritual and intellectual supremacy and rule must eventually ensure the government of the world, as certainly as spirit is the power that overcomes the world. And if the priesthood of Israel was the power which laid the foundation for its kingship,—in other words, if Israel obtained the מַמְלָכָה or government over the nations solely as a priestly nation,—the Apostle Peter, when taking up this promise (I. ii. 9), might without hesitation follow the Septuagint rendering (*βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα*), and substitute in the place of the "priestly kingdom," a "royal priesthood;" for there is no essential dif-

ference between the two, the kingship being founded upon the priesthood, and the priesthood completed by the kingship.

As a kingdom of priests, it was also necessary that Israel should be a "holy nation." *Gens sancta hic dicitur non respectu pietatis vel sanctimonie, sed quam Deus singulari privilegio ab aliis separavit. Verum ab hac sanctificatione pendet altera, nempe ut sanctitatem colant, qui Dei gratia eximii sunt, atque ita vicissim Deum sanctificent (Calvin).* This explanation is in general a correct one; for these words indicate the dignity to which Israel was to be elevated by Jehovah, the Holy One, through its separation from the nations of the earth. But it cannot be shown that קָרָאָה ever means "separated." Whether we suppose it to be related to קָרָאָה, and קָרָאָה the newly shining moonlight, or compare it with the Sanskrit *dhûsch*, to be splendid, or beautiful, in either case the primary meaning of the word is, "to be splendid, pure, untarnished." *Diestel* has correctly observed, that the holiness of God and Israel is most closely connected with the covenant relationship; but he is wrong in the conclusion which he draws from this, namely, that "holy" was originally only a "relative term," and that a thing was holy "so far as it was the property of God." For the whole earth is Jehovah's property (ver. 5), but it is not holy on that account. Jehovah is not holy only "so far as within the covenant He is both possession and possessor, absolute life and the source of life, and above all, both the chief good and the chief model for His people" (*Diestel*), or "as the truly separate One, enclosed within Himself, who is self-existent, in contrast with the world to which He does not belong" (*Hofmann*); but holiness pertains to God alone, and to those who participate in the divine holiness,—not, however, to God as the Creator and Preserver of the world, but to God as the Redeemer of man. Light is the earthly reflection of His holy nature: the Holy One of Israel is the light of Israel (Isa. x. 17, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 16). The light, with its purity and splendour, is the most suitable earthly element to represent the brilliant and spotless purity of the Holy One, in whom there is no interchange of light and darkness (Jas. i. 17). God is called the Holy One, because He is altogether pure, the clear and spotless light; so that in the idea of the holiness of God there are embodied the absolute moral purity and perfection of the divine nature, and His unclouded glory. Holiness and glory

are inseparable attributes in God ; but in His relation to the world they are so far distinguished, that the whole earth is full of His glory, whilst it is to and in Israel that His holiness is displayed (Isa. vi. 3) ; in other words, the glory of God is manifested in the creation and preservation of the world, and His holy name in the election and guidance of Israel (compare Ps. civ. with Ps. ciii.). God has displayed the glory of His name in the creation of the heavens and the earth (Ps. viii.) ; but His way in Israel (Ps. lxxvii. 14), *i.e.* the work of God in His kingdom of grace, is holy ; so that it might be said, that the glory of God which streams forth in the material creation is manifested as holiness in His saving work for a sinful world, to rescue it from the *φθόρα* of sin and death and restore it to the glory of eternal life, and that it was manifested here in the fact, that by the counsels of His own spontaneous love (Deut. iv. 37) He chose Israel as His possession, to make of it a holy nation, if it hearkened to His voice and kept His covenant. It was not made this, however, by being separated from the other nations, for that was merely the means of attaining the divine end, but by the fact, that God placed the chosen people in the relation of covenant fellowship with Himself, founded His kingdom in Israel, established in the covenant relationship an institution of salvation, which furnished the covenant people with the means of obtaining the expiation of their sins, and securing righteousness before God and holiness of life with God, in order that by the discipline of His holy commandments, under the guidance of His holy arm, He might train and guide them to the holiness and glory of the divine life. But as sin opposes holiness, and the sinner resists sanctification, the work of the holiness of God reveals itself in His kingdom of grace, not only positively in the sanctification of those who suffer themselves to be sanctified and raised to newness of life, but negatively also, in the destruction of all those who obstinately refuse the guidance of His grace ; so that the glory of the thrice Holy One (Isa. vi. 3) will be fully manifested both in the glorification of His chosen people and the deliverance of the whole creation from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God (Rom. viii. 21), and also in the destruction of hardened sinners, the annihilation of everything that is ungodly in this world, the final overthrow of Satan and his kingdom, and the

founding of the new heaven and new earth. Hence not only is every person, whom God receives into the sphere of His sin-destroying grace, קֹדֶשׁ, or holy; but everything which is applied to the realization of the divine work of salvation, or consecrated by God to this object. The opposite of קֹדֶשׁ, holy, is חֵל, *kowós*, *profanus* (from חָלַל to be loose, *lit.* the unbound), not devoted to holy purposes and uses (cf. Lev. x. 10); and this term was applied, not only to what was sinful and unclean (טָמֵא), but to everything earthly in its natural condition, because the whole earth, with all that is upon it, has been involved in the consequences of sin.

Vers. 7-15. When Moses communicated to the people through their elders this incomparable promise of the Lord, they promised unanimously (יְהִי) to do all that Jehovah said; and when Moses reported to the Lord what the people had answered, He said to Moses, “*I will come to thee in the darkness of the cloud, that the people may listen to My speaking to thee (שָׁמַעַתְּ) as in Gen. xxvii. 5, etc., and also believe thee for ever.*” As God knew the weakness of the sinful nation, and could not, as the Holy One, come into direct intercourse with it on account of its unholiness, but was about to conclude the covenant with it through the mediation of Moses, it was necessary, in order to accomplish the design of God, that the chosen mediator should receive special credentials; and these were to consist in the fact that Jehovah spoke to Moses in the sight and hearing of the people, that is to say, that He solemnly proclaimed the fundamental law of the covenant in the presence of the whole nation (chap. xix. 16-xx. 18), and showed by this fact that Moses was the recipient and mediator of the revelation of God, in order that the people might believe him “*for ever*,” as the law was to possess everlasting validity (Matt. v. 18).—Vers. 10-16. God then commanded Moses to prepare the people for His appearing or speaking to them: (1) by their sanctification, through the washing of the body and clothes (see Gen. xxxv. 2), and abstinence from conjugal intercourse (ver. 15) on account of the defilement connected therewith (Lev. xv. 18); and (2) by setting bounds round the people, that they might not ascend or touch the mountain. The hedging or bounding (הִגְבִּיל) of the people is spoken of in ver. 23 as setting bounds about the mountain, and consisted therefore in the erection of a barrier round the

mountain, which was to prevent the people from ascending or touching it. Any one who touched it (קצהו, "its end," i.e. the outermost or lowest part of the mountain) was to be put to death, whether man or beast. "No hand shall touch him" (the individual who passed the barrier and touched the mountain), i.e. no one was to follow him within the appointed boundaries, but he was to be killed from a distance either by stones or darts. (יירה for ירה, see Gesenius, § 69.) Not till "the drawing out of the trumpet blast," or, as Luther renders it, "only when it sounded long," could they ascend the mountain (ver. 13). הִיבֵל, from יבל to stream violently with noise, is synonymous with קָחַ הַיֵּבֶל (Josh. vi. 5), and was really the same thing as the שׁוֹפָר, i.e. a long wind instrument shaped like a horn. קָחַ הַיֵּבֶל is to draw the horn, i.e. to blow the horn with tones long drawn out. This was done either to give a signal to summon the people to war (Judg. iii. 27, vi. 34), or to call them to battle (Judg. vii. 18; Job xxxix. 24, 25, etc.), or for other public proclamations. No one (this is the idea) was to ascend the mountain on pain of death, or even to touch its outermost edge; but when the horn was blown with a long blast, and the signal to approach was given thereby, then they might ascend it (see ver. 21),—of course not 600,000 men, which would have been physically impossible, but the people in the persons of their representatives the elders. עָלוּ בְהָרַיִן signifies to go up the mountain in ver. 13 as well as in ver. 12, and not merely to come to the foot of the mountain (see Deut. v. 5).

Vers. 16-25. After these preparations, on the morning of the third day (from the issuing of this divine command), Jehovah came down upon the top of Mount Sinai (ver. 20), manifesting His glory in fire as the mighty, jealous God, in the midst of thunders (קָלוֹת) and lightnings, so that the mountain burned with fire (Deut. iv. 11, v. 20), and the smoke of the burning mountain ascended as the smoke (עָשָׁן for עֲשָׁן), and the whole mountain trembled (ver. 18), at the same time veiling in a thick cloud the fire of His wrath and jealousy, by which the unholy are consumed. Thunder and lightning bursting forth from the thick cloud, and fire with smoke, were the elementary substrata, which rendered the glory of the divine nature visible to men, though in such a way that the eye of mortals beheld no form of the spiritual and invisible Deity. These natural phenomena were accom-

panied by a loud trumpet blast, which "blew long and waxed louder and louder" (vers. 16 and 19; see Gen. viii. 3), and was, as it were, the herald's call, announcing to the people the appearance of the Lord, and summoning them to assemble before Him and listen to His words, as they sounded forth from the fire and cloudy darkness. The blast (שֹׁפָר) of the *shophar* (ver. 19), *i.e.* the *σάλπιγγξ Θεοῦ*, the trump of God, such a trumpet as is used in the service of God (in heaven, 1 Thess. iv. 16; see *Winer's Grammar*), is not "the voice of Jehovah," but a sound resembling a trumpet blast. Whether this sound was produced by natural means, or, as some of the earlier commentators supposed, by angels, of whom myriads surrounded Jehovah when He came down upon Sinai (Deut. xxxiii. 2), it is impossible to decide. At this alarming phenomenon, "all the people that was in the camp trembled" (ver. 16). For according to chap. xx. 20 (17), it was intended to inspire them with a salutary fear of the majesty of God. Then Moses conducted the people (*i.e.* the men) out of the camp of God, and stationed them at the foot of the mountain outside the barrier (ver. 17); and "*Moses spake*" (ver. 19), *i.e.* asked the Lord for His commands, "*and God answered loud*" (בְּקוֹל), and told him to come up to the top of the mountain. He then commanded him to go down again, and impress upon the people that no one was to break through to Jehovah to see, *i.e.* to break down the barriers that were erected around the mountain as the sacred place of God, and attempt to penetrate into the presence of Jehovah. Even the priests, who were allowed to approach God by virtue of their office, were to sanctify themselves, that Jehovah might not break forth upon them (פָּרֹץ), *i.e.* dash them to pieces. (On the form הַעֲרִיחָהּ for הַעֲרִיחָהּ, see *Ewald*, § 199 a). The *priests* were neither "the sons of Aaron," *i.e.* Levitical priests, nor the first-born or *principes populi*, but "those who had hitherto discharged the duties of the priestly office according to natural right and custom" (*Baumgarten*). Even these priests were too unholy to be able to come into the presence of the holy God. This repeated enforcement of the command not to touch the mountain, and the special extension of it even to the priests, were intended to awaken in the people a consciousness of their own unholiness quite as much as of the unapproachable holiness of Jehovah. But this separation from God, which arose from the unholiness of the nation, did not ex-

tend to Moses and Aaron, who were to act as mediators, and were permitted to ascend the mountain. Moreover, the prospect of ascending the holy mountain "at the drawing of the blast" was still before the people (ver. 13). And the strict prohibition against breaking through the barrier, to come of their own accord into the presence of Jehovah, is by no means at variance with this. When God gave the sign to ascend the mountain, the people might and were to draw near to Him. This sign, viz. the long-drawn trumpet blast, was not to be given in any case till after the promulgation of the ten words of the fundamental law. But it was not given even after this promulgation; not, however, because "the development was altogether an abnormal one, and not in accordance with the divine appointment in ver. 13, inasmuch as at the thunder, the lightning, and the sound of the trumpet, with which the giving of the law was concluded, they lost all courage, and instead of waiting for the promised signal, were overcome with fear, and ran from the spot," for there is not a word in the text about running away; but because the people were so terrified by the alarming phenomena which accompanied the coming down of Jehovah upon the mountain, that they gave up the right of speaking with God, and from a fear of death entreated Moses to undertake the intercourse with God on their behalf (chap. xx. 18-21). Moreover, we cannot speak of an "abnormal development" of the drama, for the simple reason, that God not only foresaw the course and issue of the affair, but at the very outset only promised that He would come to Moses in a thick cloud (ver. 9), and merely announced and carried out His own descent upon Mount Sinai before the eyes of the people in the terrible glory of His sacred majesty (ver. 11), for the purpose of proving the people, that His fear might be before their eyes (chap. xx. 20; cf. Deut. v. 28, 29). Consequently, apart from the physical impossibility of 600,000 ascending the mountain, it never was intended that all the people should do so.¹ What God really intended, came to pass.

¹ The idea of the people fleeing and running away must have been got by Kurtz from either *Luther's* or *De Wette's* translation. They have both of them rendered 'וַיִּנָּעוּ וַיֵּלְכוּ', "they fled and went far off," instead of "they trembled and stood far off." And not only the supposed flight, but his idea that "thunder, lightning, and the trumpet blast (which were silent in any case during the utterance of the ten commandments), concluded the pro-

After the people had been received into fellowship with Jehovah through the atoning blood of the sacrifice, they were permitted to ascend the mountain in the persons of their representatives, and there to see God (chap. xxiv. 9-11).

THE TEN WORDS OF JEHOVAH.—CHAP. XX. 1-21.

Ver. 1. The promulgation of the ten words of God, containing the fundamental law of the covenant, took place before Moses ascended the mountain again with Aaron (chap. xix. 24). "*All these words*" are the words of God contained in vers. 2-17, which are repeated again in Deut. v. 6-18, with slight variations that do not materially affect the sense,¹ and are called the "words

mulgation of the law, as they had already introduced it according to chap. xix. 16," also rests upon a misunderstanding of the text of the Bible. There is not a syllable in chap. xx. 18 about the thunder, lightning, and trumpet blast bursting forth afresh after the proclamation of the ten commandments. There is simply an account of the impression, which the alarming phenomena, mentioned in chap. xix. 16-19 as attending the descent of Jehovah upon the mountain (ver. 20), and preceding His speaking to Moses and the people, made upon the people, who had been brought out of the camp to meet with God.

¹ The discrepancies in the two texts are the following:—In Deut. v. 8 the cop. ם ("or," Eng. Ver.), which stands before כָּל תְּמוּנָה (any likeness), is omitted, to give greater clearness to the meaning; and on the other hand it is added before עַל שְׁלֵשִׁים in ver. 9 for rhetorical reasons. In the fourth commandment (ver. 12) שְׁמוֹר is chosen instead of זָכוֹר in Ex. ver. 8, and זָכוֹר is reserved for the hortatory clause appended in ver. 15: "and remember that thou wast a servant," etc.; and with this is connected the still further fact, that instead of the fourth commandment being enforced on the ground of the creation of the world in six days and the resting of God on the seventh day, their deliverance from Egypt is adduced as the subjective reason for their observance of the command. In ver. 14, too, the clause "nor thy cattle" (Ex. ver. 10) is amplified rhetorically, and particularized in the words "thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle." So again, in ver. 16, the promise appended to the fifth commandment, "that thy days may be long in the land," etc., is amplified by the interpolation of the clause "and that it may go well with thee," and strengthened by the words "as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee." In ver. 17, instead of עַד שְׁקָר (Ex. ver. 16), the more comprehensive expression עַד שְׁוֹאָה is chosen. Again, in the tenth commandment (ver. 18), the "neighbour's wife" is placed first, and then, after the "house," the field is added before the "man-servant and maid-servant," whereas in Exodus the "neighbour's house" is

of the covenant, the ten words," in chap. xxxiv. 28, and Deut. iv. 13, x. 4. God spake these words directly to the people, and not "through the medium of His finite spirits," as *v. Hofmann*, *Kurtz*, and others suppose. There is not a word in the Old Testament about any such mediation. Not only was it *Elohim*, according to the chapter before us, who spake these words to the people, and called Himself Jehovah, who had brought Israel out of Egypt (ver. 2), but according to Deut. v. 4, Jehovah spake these words to Israel "face to face, in the mount, out of the midst of the fire." Hence, according to *Buxtorf* (*Dissert. de Decalogo in genere*, 1642), the Jewish commentators almost unanimously affirm that God Himself spake the words of the decalogue, and that words were formed in the air by the power of God, and not by the intervention and ministry of angels.¹ And even from the New Testament this cannot be proved to be a doctrine of the Scriptures. For when Stephen says to the Jews, in Acts vii. 53, "Ye have received the law" εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων (Eng. Ver. "by the disposition of angels"), and Paul speaks of the law in Gal. iii. 19 as διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ("ordained by angels"), these expressions leave it quite uncertain in what the διατάσσειν of the angels consisted, or what part they took in connection

mentioned first, and then the "wife" along with the "man-servant and maid-servant;" and instead of the repetition of תְּחִמָּךְ, the synonym תְּחִמָּה is employed. Lastly, in Deuteronomy all the commandments from לא תרצוח onwards are connected together by the repetition of the cop. ו before every one, whereas in Exodus it is not introduced at all.—Now if, after what has been said, the rhetorical and hortatory intention is patent in all the variations of the text of Deuteronomy, even down to the transposition of wife and house in the last commandment, this transposition must also be attributed to the freedom with which the decalogue was reproduced, and the text of Exodus be accepted as the original, which is not to be altered in the interests of any arbitrary exposition of the commandments.

¹ This also applies to the Targums. *Onkelos* and *Jonathan* have "בְּלִילֵי" in ver. 1, and the Jerusalem Targum "בְּלִילֵי מִיִּמְרָא דֵי". But in the popular Jewish Midrash, the statement in Deut. xxxiii. 2 (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 17), that Jehovah came down upon Sinai "out of myriads of His holiness," i.e. attended by myriads of holy angels, seems to have given rise to the notion that God spake through angels. Thus *Josephus* represents King Herod as saying to the people, "For ourselves, we have learned from God the most excellent of our doctrines, and the most holy part of our law *through angels*" (Ant. 15, 5, 3, Whiston's translation).

with the giving of the law.¹ So again, in Heb. ii. 2, where the law, "the word spoken by angels" (*δι' ἀγγέλων*), is placed in contrast with the "salvation which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord" (*διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου*), the antithesis is of so indefinite a nature that it is impossible to draw the conclusion with any certainty, that the writer of this epistle supposed the speaking of God at the promulgation of the decalogue to have been effected through the medium of a number of finite spirits, especially when we consider that in the Epistle to the Hebrews speaking is the term applied to the divine revelation generally (see chap. i. 1). As his object was not to describe with precision the manner in which God spake to the Israelites from Sinai, but only to show the superiority of the Gospel, as the revelation of salvation, to the revelation of the law; he was at liberty to select the indefinite expression *δι' ἀγγέλων*, and leave it to the readers of his epistle to interpret it more fully for themselves from the Old Testament. According to the Old Testament, however, the law was given through the medium of angels, only so far as God appeared to Moses, as He had done to the patriarchs, in the form of the "Angel of the Lord," and Jehovah came down upon Sinai, according to Deut. xxxiii. 2, surrounded by myriads of holy angels as His escort.² The notion that God

¹ That Stephen cannot have meant to say that God spoke through a number of finite angels, is evident from the fact, that in ver. 38 he had spoken just before of *the* Angel (in the singular) who spoke to Moses upon Mount Sinai, and had described him in vers. 35 and 30 as the Angel who appeared to Moses in the bush, *i.e.* as no other than the Angel of Jehovah who was identical with Jehovah. "The Angel of the Lord occupies the same place in ver. 38 as Jehovah in Ex. xix. The angels in ver. 53 and Gal. iii. 19 are taken from Deut. xxxiii. And there the angels do not come in the place of the Lord, but the Lord comes attended by them" (*Hengstenberg*).

² *Lud. de Dieu*, in his commentary on Acts vii. 53, after citing the parallel passages Gal. iii. 19 and Heb. ii. 2, correctly observes, that "horum diotorum hæc videtur esse ratio et veritas. S. Stephanus supra v. 39 dixit, Angelum locutum esse cum Mose in monte Sina, eundem nempe qui in rubo ipsa apparuerat, ver. 35 qui quamvis in se Deus hic tamen κατ' οἰκονομίαν tanquam Angelus Dei cæterorumque angelorum præfectus consideratus e medio angelorum, qui eum undique stipabant, legem in monte Mosi dedit. . . . Atque inde colligi potest causa, cur apostolus Heb. ii. 2, 3, Legi Evangelium tantopere anteferat. Etsi enim utriusque auctor et promulgator fuerit idem Dei filius, quia tamen legem tulit in forma angeli e senatu angelico et velatus gloria angelorum, tandem vero caro factus et in

spake through the medium of "His finite spirits" can only be sustained in one of two ways: either by reducing the angels to personifications of natural phenomena, such as thunder, lightning, and the sound of a trumpet, a process against which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews enters his protest in chap. xii. 19, where he expressly distinguishes the "voice of words" from these phenomena of nature; or else by affirming, with *v. Hofmann*, that God, the supernatural, cannot be conceived of without a plurality of spirits collected under Him, or apart from His active operation in the world of bodies, in distinction from which these spirits are comprehended with Him and under Him, so that even the ordinary and regular phenomena of nature would have to be regarded as the workings of angels; in which case the existence of angels as created spirits would be called in question, and they would be reduced to mere personifications of divine powers.

The words of the covenant, or ten words, were written by God upon two tables of stone (chap. xxxi. 18), and are called the law and the commandment (הַתּוֹרָה וְהַמִּצְוֹת) in chap. xxiv. 12, as being the kernel and essence of the law. But the Bible contains neither distinct statements, nor definite hints, with reference to the numbering and division of the commandments upon the two tables,—a clear proof that these points do not possess the importance which has frequently been attributed to them. Two different views have arisen in the course of time. Some divide the ten commandments into two pentads, one upon each table. Upon the first they place the commandments concerning (1) other gods, (2) images, (3) the name of God, (4) the Sabbath, and (5) parents; on the second, those concerning (1) murder, (2) adultery, (3) stealing, (4) false witness, and (5) coveting. Others, again, reckon only three to the first table, and seven to the second. In the first they include the commandments respecting (1) other gods, (2) the name of God, (3) the Sabbath, or those which concern the duties towards God; and in the second, those respecting (1) parents, (2) murder, (3) adultery, (4) stealing, (5) false witness, (6) coveting a neighbour's house, (7) coveting a neighbour's wife, servants, cattle, and other *poscæ* manifestatus, gloriam præ se ferens non angelorum sed unigeniti filii Dei, evangelium ipsemet, humana voce, habitans inter homines prædicavit, merito lex angelorum sermo, evangelium autem solius filii Dei dicitur."

sessions, or those which concern the duties towards one's neighbour. The *first* view, with the division into two fives, we find in *Josephus* (Ant. iii. 5, 5) and *Philo* (*quis rer. divin. hæc.* § 35, *de Decal.* § 12, etc.); it is unanimously supported by the fathers of the first four centuries,¹ and has been retained to the present day by the Eastern and Reformed Churches. The later Jews agree so far with this view, that they only adopt *one* commandment against coveting; but they differ from it in combining the commandment against images with that against false gods, and taking the introductory words "I am the Lord thy God" to be the first commandment. This mode of numbering, of which we find the first traces in *Julian Apostata* (in *Cyrylli Alex. c. Julian l. V. init.*), and in an allusion made by *Jerome* (on Hos. x. 10), is at any rate of more recent origin, and probably arose simply from opposition to the Christians. It still prevails, however, among the modern Jews.²

The *second* view was brought forward by *Augustine*, and no one is known to have supported it previous to him. In his *Quæst.* 71 on Ex., when treating of the question how the commandments are to be divided ("*utrum* quatuor sint usque ad præceptum de Sabbatho, quæ ad ipsum Deum pertinent, sex autem reliqua, quorum primum: Honora patrem et matrem, quæ ad hominem pertinent: an potius illa tria sint et ipsa septem"), he explains the two different views, and adds, "Mihi tamen videntur congruentius accipi illa tria et ista septem, quoniam Trinitatem videntur illa, quæ ad Deum pertinent, insinuare diligentius intuentibus." He then proceeds still further to show that the commandment against images is only a fuller explanation of that against other gods, but that the commandment not to covet is divided into two commandments by the repetition of the words, "*Thou shalt not covet,*" although "*concupiscentia*

¹ They either speak of two tables with five commandments upon each (*Iren. adv. hæc.* ii. 42), or mention only one commandment against coveting (*Constit. apost.* i. 1, vii. 3; *Theoph. ad Autol.* ii. 50; *Tertull. adv. Marc.* ii. 17; *Ephr. Syr. ad Ex.* 20; *Epiph. hæc.* ii. 2, etc.), or else they expressly distinguish the commandment against images from that against other gods (*Origen*, homil. 8 in Ex.; *Hieron. ad Ephes.* vi. 2; *Greg. Naz. carm.* i. 1; *Sulpicius Sev. hist. sacr.* i. 17, etc.).

² It is adopted by *Gemar. Macc.* f. 24 a; *Targ. Jon.* on Ex. and Deut.; *Mechilta* on Ex. xx. 16; *Pesikta* on Deut. v. 6; and the rabbinical commentators of the middle ages.

uxoris alienæ et concupiscentia domus alienæ tantum in peccando differant." In this division *Augustine* generally reckons the commandment against coveting the neighbour's wife as the *ninth*, according to the text of Deuteronomy; although in several instances he places it after the coveting of the house, according to the text of *Exodus*. Through the great respect that was felt for *Augustine*, this division became the usual one in the Western Church; and it was adopted even by *Luther* and the Lutheran Church, with this difference, however, that both the Catholic and Lutheran Churches regard the commandment not to covet a neighbour's house as the *ninth*, whilst only a few here and there give the preference, as *Augustine* does, to the order adopted in Deuteronomy.

Now if we inquire, which of these divisions of the ten commandments is the correct one, there is nothing to warrant either the assumption of the Talmud and the Rabbins, that the words, "I am Jehovah thy God," etc., form the first commandment, or the preference given by *Augustine* to the text of Deuteronomy. The words, "I am the Lord," etc., contain no independent member of the decalogue, but are merely the preface to the commandments which follow. "Hic sermo nondum sermo mandati est, sed quis sit, qui mandat, ostendit" (*Origen, homil. 8 in Ex.*). But, as we have already shown, the text of Deuteronomy, in all its deviations from the text of *Exodus*, can lay no claim to originality. As to the other two views which have obtained a footing in the Church, the historical credentials of priority and majority are not sufficient of themselves to settle the question in favour of the first, which is generally called the Philonian view, from its earliest supporter. It must be decided from the text of the Bible alone. Now in both substance and form this speaks against the Augustinian, Catholic, and Lutheran view, and in favour of the Philonian, or Oriental and Reformed. In *substance*; for whereas no essential difference can be pointed out in the two clauses which prohibit coveting, so that even *Luther* has made but one commandment of them in his smaller catechism, there was a very essential difference between the commandment against other gods and that against making an image of God, so far as the Israelites were concerned, as we may see not only from the account of the golden calf at Sinai, but also from the image worship of Gideon (*Judg. viii. 27*), Micah

(Judg. xvii.), and Jeroboam (1 Kings xii. 28 sqq.). In *form*; for the last five commandments differ from the first five, not only in the fact that no reasons are assigned for the former, whereas all the latter are enforced by reasons, in which the expression "Jehovah thy God" occurs every time; but still more in the fact, that in the text of Deuteronomy all the commandments after "Thou shalt do no murder" are connected together by the copula ו, which is repeated before every sentence, and from which we may see that Moses connected the commandments which treat of duties to one's neighbour more closely together, and by thus linking them together showed that they formed the second half of the decalogue.

The weight of this testimony is not counterbalanced by the division into *parashoth* and the double accentuation of the Masoretic text, viz. by accents both above and below, even if we assume that this was intended in any way to indicate a logical division of the commandments. In the Hebrew MSS. and editions of the Bible, the decalogue is divided into ten *parashoth*, with spaces between them marked either by ׀ (*Setuma*) or ׃ (*Phetucha*); and whilst the commandments against other gods and images, together with the threat and promise appended to them (vers. 3-6), form one *parashah*, the commandment against coveting (ver. 14) is divided by a *setuma* into two. But according to *Kennicott* (ad Ex. xx. 17, Deut. v. 18, and *diss. gener.* p. 59) this *setuma* was wanting in 234 of the 694 MSS. consulted by him, and in many exact editions of the Bible as well; so that the testimony is not unanimous here. It is no argument against this division into *parashoth*, that it does not agree either with the Philonian or the rabbinical division of the ten commandments, or with the Masoretic arrangement of the verses and the lower accents which correspond to this. For there can be no doubt that it is older than the Masoretic treatment of the text, though it is by no means original on that account. Even when the Targum on the Song of Sol. (v. 13) says that the tables of stone were written in ten שִׁטִּים or שִׁטִּים, i.e. rows or strophes, like the rows of a garden full of sweet odours, this Targum is much too recent to furnish any valid testimony to the original writing and plan of the decalogue. And the upper accentuation of the decalogue, which corresponds to the division into *parashoth*, has just as little claim to be received as a testi-

mony in favour of "a division of the verses which was once evidently regarded as very significant" (*Ewald*); on the contrary, it was evidently added to the lower accentuation simply in order that the decalogue might be read in the synagogues on particular days after the *parashoth*.¹ Hence the double accentuation was only so far of importance, as showing that the Masorites regarded the *parashoth* as sufficiently important, to be retained for reading in the synagogue by a system of accentuation which corresponded to them. But if this division into *parashoth* had been regarded by the Jews from time immemorial as original, or Mosaic, in its origin; it would be impossible to understand either the rise of other divisions of the decalogue, or the difference between this division and the Masoretic accentuation and arrangement of the verses. From all this so much at any rate is clear, that from a very early period there was a disposition to unite together the two commandments against other gods and images; but assuredly on no other ground than because of the threat and promise with which they are followed, and which must refer, as was correctly assumed, to both commandments. But if these two commandments were classified as one, there was no other way of bringing out the number ten, than to divide the commandment against coveting into two. But as the transposition of the wife and the house in the two texts could not well be reconciled with this, the *setuma* which separated them in ver 14 did not meet with universal reception.

Lastly, on the division of the ten covenant words upon the two tables of stone, the text of the Bible contains no other information, than that "the tables were written on both their sides" (chap. xxxii. 15), from which we may infer with tolerable certainty, what would otherwise have the greatest probability as being the most natural supposition, viz. that the entire contents of the "ten words" were engraved upon the tables, and not merely the

¹ See *Geiger* (wissensch. Ztschr. iii. 1, 151). According to the testimony of a Rabbin who had embraced Christianity, the decalogue was read in one way, when it occurred as a Sabbath *parashah*, either in the middle of January or at the beginning of July, and in another way at the feast of Pentecost, as the feast of the giving of the law; the lower accentuation being followed in the former case, and the upper in the latter. We may compare with this the account given in *En Israel*, fol. 103, col. 3, that one form of accentuation was intended for ordinary or private reading, the other for public reading in the synagogue.

ten commandments in the stricter sense, without the accompanying reasons.¹ But if neither the numbering of the ten commandments nor their arrangement on the two tables was indicated in the law as drawn up for the guidance of the people of Israel, so that it was possible for even the Israelites to come to different conclusions on the subject; the Christian Church has all the more a perfect right to handle these matters with Christian liberty and prudence for the instruction of congregations in the law, from the fact that it is no longer bound to the ten commandments, as a part of the law of Moses, which has been abolished for them through the fulfilment of Christ, but has to receive them for the regulation of its own doctrine and life, simply as being the unchangeable norm of the holy will of God which was fulfilled through Christ. 8

Ver. 2. The TEN WORDS commenced with a declaration of Jehovah concerning Himself, which served as a practical basis for the obligation on the part of the people to keep the commandments: "*I am Jehovah thy God, who brought thee,*" etc. By bringing them out of Egypt, the house of bondage, Jehovah had proved to the Israelites that He was their God. This glorious act, to which Israel owed its existence as an independent nation, was peculiarly fitted, as a distinct and practical manifestation of unmerited divine love, to kindle in the hearts of the people the warmest love in return, and to incite them to keep the commandments. These words are not to be regarded, as

¹ If the whole of the contents stood upon the table, the ten words cannot have been arranged either according to Philo's two pentads, or according to Augustine's division into three and seven; for in either case there would have been far more words upon the first table than upon the second, and, according to Augustine's arrangement, there would have been 131 upon one table, and only 41 upon the other. We obtain a much more suitable result, if the words of vers. 2-7, *i.e.* the first three commandments according to Philo's reckoning, were engraved upon the one table, and the other seven from the Sabbath commandment onwards upon the other; for in that case there would be 96 words upon the first table and 76 upon the second. If the reasons for the commandments were not written along with them upon the tables, the commandments respecting the name and nature of God, and the keeping of the Sabbath, together with the preamble, which could not possibly be left out, would amount to 73 words in all, the commandment to honour one's parents would contain 5 words, and the rest of the commandments 26.

Knobel supposes, as either a confession, or the foundation of the whole of the theocratical law, just as *Saleucus*, *Plato*, and other lawgivers placed a belief in the existence of the gods at the head of their laws. They were rather the preamble, as *Calvin* says, by which God prepared the minds of the people for obeying them, and in this sense they were frequently repeated to give emphasis to other laws, sometimes in full, as in chap. xxix. 46, Lev. xix. 36, xxiii. 43, xxv. 38, 55, xxvi. 13, etc., sometimes in the abridged form, "I am Jehovah your God," as in Lev. xi. 44, xviii. 2, 4, 30, xix. 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, xx. 7, etc., for which the simple expression, "I am Jehovah," is now and then substituted, as in Lev. xix. 12, 14, 16, 18, etc.

Ver. 3. The FIRST WORD.—"Let there not be to thee (thou shalt have no) other gods $\text{לֹא יִהְיֶה} \text{לְךָ}$," *lit.* beyond Me (לְךָ as in Gen. xlviii. 22; Ps. xvi. 2), or in addition to Me (לְךָ as in Gen. xxxi. 50; Deut. xix. 9), equivalent to πλὴν ἐμοῦ (LXX.), "by the side of Me" (*Luther*). "Before Me," *coram me* (*Vulg.*, etc.), is incorrect; also against Me, in opposition to Me. (On לְךָ see chap. xxxiii. 14). The singular יְהוָה does not require that we should regard *Elohim* as an abstract noun in the sense of Deity; and the plural אֱלֹהִים would not suit this rendering (see Gen. i. 14). The sentence is quite a general one, and not only prohibits polytheism and idolatry, the worship of idols in thought, word, and deed (cf. Deut. viii. 11, 17, 19), but also commands the fear, love, and worship of God the Lord (cf. Deut. vi. 5, 13, 17, x. 12, 20). Nearly all the commandments are couched in the negative form of prohibition, because they presuppose the existence of sin and evil desires in the human heart.

Vers. 4–6. The SECOND WORD.—To the prohibition of idolatrous worship there is linked on, as a second word, the prohibition of the worship of images. "After declaring in the first commandment who was the true God, He commanded that He alone should be worshipped; and now He defines what is His lawful worship" (*Calvin*). "Thou shalt not make to thyself a likeness and any form of that which is in heaven above," etc. $\text{לֹא תַּעֲשֶׂה} \text{לְךָ}$ is construed with a double accusative, so that the literal rendering would be "make, as a likeness and any form, that which is in heaven," etc. לְעֵצִים , from לַעֲשׂוֹת to carve wood or

stone, is a figure made of wood or stone, and is used in Judg. xvii. 3 sqq. for a figure representing Jehovah, and in other places for figures of heathen deities—of Asherah, for example, in 2 Kings xxi. 7. תְּמוּנָה does not signify an image made by man, but a form which is seen by him (Num. xii. 8; Deut. iv. 12, 15 sqq.; Job iv. 16; Ps. xvii. 15). In Deut. v. 8 (cf. iv. 16) we find פֶּסֶל כְּלֵי־תְמוּנָה “likeness of any form:” so that in this passage also וְכֵל־תְּמוּנָה is to be taken as in apposition to פֶּסֶל, and the וַ as *vav explic.*: “and indeed any form,” viz. of Jehovah, not of heathen gods. That the words should be so understood, is demanded by Deut. iv. 15 sqq., where Moses lays stress upon the command, not to make to themselves an image (פֶּסֶל) in the form of any sculpture (פְּסֻלָּה), and gives this as the reason: “For ye saw no form in the day when Jehovah spake to you at Horeb.” This authoritative exposition of the divine prohibition on the part of Moses himself proves undeniably, that פֶּסֶל and תְּמוּנָה are to be understood as referring to symbolical representations of Jehovah. And the words which follow also receive their authoritative exposition from Deut. iv. 17 and 18. By “*that which is in heaven*” we are to understand the birds, not the angels, or at the most, according to Deut. iv. 19, the stars as well; by “*that which is in earth*,” the cattle, reptiles, and the larger or smaller animals; and by “*that which is in the water*,” fishes and water animals. “*Under the earth*” is appended to the “*water*,” to express in a pictorial manner the idea of its being lower than the solid ground (cf. Deut. iv. 18). It is not only evident from the context that the allusion is not to the making of images generally, but to the construction of figures of God as objects of religious reverence or worship, but this is expressly stated in ver. 5; so that even Calvin observes, that “there is no necessity to refute what some have foolishly imagined, that sculpture and painting of every kind are condemned here.” With the same aptness he has just before observed, that “although Moses only speaks of idols, there is no doubt that by implication he condemns all the forms of false worship, which men have invented for themselves.”—Ver. 5. “*Thou shalt not pray to them and serve them.*” (On the form תַּעֲבֹדֶם with the *o*-sound under the guttural, see Ewald, § 251d.). הִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה signifies bending before God in prayer, and invoking His name; עָבַד, worship by means of sacrifice and religious ceremonies. The suffixes לָהֶם and לָם (to them, and

them) refer to the things in heaven, etc., which are made into *pesel*, symbols of Jehovah, as being the principal object of the previous clause, and not to *בַּסֵּל וְכָל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ*, although *עֲבַד בַּסֵּל* is applied in Ps. xcvi. 7 and 2 Kings xvii. 41 to a rude idolatrous worship, which identifies the image as the symbol of deity with the deity itself. Still less do they refer to *אֱלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים* in ver. 3.

The threat and promise, which follow in vers. 5*b* and 6, relate to the first two commandments, and not to the second alone; because both of them, although forbidding two forms of idolatry, viz. idolatry and ikonolatry, are combined in a higher unity, by the fact, that whenever Jehovah, the God who cannot be copied because He reveals His spiritual nature in no visible form, is worshipped under some visible image, the glory of the invisible God is changed, or Jehovah changed into a different God from what He really is. Through either form of idolatry, therefore, Israel would break its covenant with Jehovah. For this reason God enforces the two commandments with the solemn declaration: "I, Jehovah thy God, am *אֵל קַנָּז* a jealous God;" i.e. not only *ζηλωτής*, a zealous avenger of sinners, but *ζηλωτοῦς*, a jealous God, who will not transfer to another the honour that is due to Himself (Isa. xlii. 8, xlvi. 11), nor tolerate the worship of any other god (chap. xxxiv. 14), but who directs the warmth of His anger against those who hate Him (Deut. vi. 15), with the same energy with which the warmth of His love (Song of Sol. viii. 6) embraces those who love Him, except that love in the form of grace reaches much further than wrath. The sin of the fathers He visits (punishes) on the children to the third and fourth generation. *שְׁלִישִׁים* third (*sc.* children) are not grandchildren, but great-grandchildren, and *רְבָעִים* the fourth generation. On the other hand He shows mercy to the thousandths, i.e. to the thousandth generation (cf. Deut. vii. 9, where *לְאַלְפֵי דוֹר* stands for *לְאַלְפִים*). The cardinal number is used here for the ordinal, for which there was no special form in the case of *אַלְפֵי*. The words *לְשִׁנְאֵי* and *לְאַהֲבָי*, in which the punishment and grace are traced to their ultimate foundation, are of great importance to a correct understanding of this utterance of God. The *לְ* before *שִׁנְאֵי* does not take up the genitive with *עַל* again, as *Knobel* supposes, for no such use of *לְ* can be established from Gen. vii. 11, xvi. 3, xiv. 18, xli. 12, or in fact in any way whatever. In this instance *לְ* signifies "at" or "in relation to;"

and לִשְׁנַיִם, from its very position, cannot refer to the fathers alone, but to the fathers and children to the third and fourth generation. If it referred to the fathers alone, it would necessarily stand after אָבֹת. לִשְׁנַיִם וְנֹתָם is to be taken in the same way. God punishes the sin of the fathers in the children to the third and fourth generation in relation to those who hate Him, and shows mercy to the thousandth generation in relation to those who love Him. The human race is a living organism, in which not only sin and wickedness are transmitted, but evil as the curse of the sin and the punishment of the wickedness. As children receive their nature from their parents, or those who beget them, so they have also to bear and atone for their fathers' guilt. This truth forced itself upon the minds even of thoughtful heathen from their own varied experience (cf. *Aeschyl. Sept. 744*; *Eurip.* according to *Plutarch de sera num. vind. 12, 21*; *Cicero de nat. deorum 3, 38*; and *Baumgarten-Crusius, bibl. Theol. p. 208*). Yet there is no fate in the divine government of the world, no irresistible necessity in the continuous results of good and evil; but there reigns in the world a righteous and gracious God, who not only restrains the course of His penal judgments, as soon as the sinner is brought to reflection by the punishment and hearkens to the voice of God, but who also forgives the sin and iniquity of those who love Him, keeping mercy to the thousandth generation (chap. xxxiv. 7). The words neither affirm that sinning fathers remain unpunished, nor that the sins of fathers are punished in the children and grandchildren without any fault of their own: they simply say nothing about whether and how the fathers themselves are punished; and, in order to show the dreadful severity of the penal righteousness of God, give prominence to the fact, that punishment is not omitted,—that even when, in the long-suffering of God, it is deferred, it is not therefore neglected, but that the children have to bear the sins of their fathers, whenever, for example (as naturally follows from the connection of children with their fathers, and, as *Onkelos* has added in his paraphrase of the words), “the children fill up the sins of their fathers,” so that the descendants suffer punishment for both their own and their forefathers' misdeeds (*Lev. xxvi. 39*; *Isa. lxi. 7*; *Amos vii. 17*; *Jer. xvi. 11 sqq.*; *Dan. ix. 16*). But when, on the other hand, the hating ceases, when the children forsake their fathers' evil ways, the warmth of the divine wrath is turned

into the warmth of love, and God becomes *עֲשֵׂה חֶסֶד* ("showing mercy") to them; and this mercy endures not only to the third and fourth generation, but to the thousandth generation, though only in relation to those who love God, and manifest this love by keeping His commandments. "If God continues for a long time His visitation of sin, He continues to all eternity His manifestation of mercy, and we cannot have a better proof of this than in the history of Israel itself" (*Schultz*).¹

Ver. 7. The THIRD WORD, "*Thou shalt not take the name of Jehovah thy God in vain,*" is closely connected with the former two. Although there is no God beside Jehovah, the absolute One, and His divine essence cannot be seen or conceived of under any form, He had made known the glory of His nature in His name (chap. iii. 14 sqq., vi. 2), and this was not to be abused by His people. *לִשְׂוֹא שְׁמִי* does not mean to utter the name (*לִשְׂוֹא* never has this meaning), but in all the passages in which it has been so rendered it retains its proper meaning, "to take up, lift up, raise;" e.g. to take up or raise (begin) a proverb (Num. xxiii. 7; Job xxvii. 1), to lift up a song (Ps. lxxxi. 3), or a prayer (Isa. xxxvii. 4). And it is evident from the parallel in Ps. xxiv. 4, "to lift up his soul to vanity," that it does not mean "to utter" here. *לִשְׂוֹא* does not signify a lie (*לִשְׁקֹר*), but according to its etymon *לִשְׂוֹא*, to be waste, it denotes that which is waste and in disorder, hence that which is empty, vain, and nugatory, for which there is no occasion. This word prohibits all employment of the name of God for vain and unworthy objects, and includes not only false swearing, which is condemned in Lev. xix. 12 as a profanation of the name of Jehovah, but trivial swearing in the ordinary intercourse of life, and every use of the name of God in the service of untruth and lying, for imprecation, witchcraft, or conjuring; whereas the true employment of the name of God is confined to "invocation, prayer, praise, and thanksgiving," which proceeds from a pure, believing heart. The natural heart is very liable to transgress this command, and therefore it is solemnly enforced by the threat, "for Jehovah will not hold him guiltless" (leave him unpunished), etc.

¹ On the visitation of the sins of the fathers upon the children, see also *Hengstenberg*, *Dissertations*, vol. ii. p. 446 sqq.

Vers. 8-11. The FOURTH WORD, "*Remember the Sabbath-day, to keep it holy,*" presupposes an acquaintance with the Sabbath, as the expression "remember" is sufficient to show, but not that the Sabbath had been *kept* before this. From the history of the creation that had been handed down, Israel must have known, that after God had created the world in six days He rested the seventh day, and by His resting sanctified the day (Gen. ii. 3). But hitherto there had been no commandment given to man to sanctify the day. This was given for the first time to Israel at Sinai, after preparation had been made for it by the fact that the manna did not fall on the seventh day of the week (chap. xvi. 22). Here therefore the mode of sanctifying it was established for the first time. The seventh day was to be שַׁבָּת (a festival-keeper, see chap. xvi. 23), *i.e.* a day of rest belonging to the Lord, and to be consecrated to Him by the fact that no work was performed upon it. The command not to do any (בִּלְ) work applied to both man and beast without exception. Those who were to rest are divided into two classes by the omission of the cop. ׀ before עֲבֹדָה (ver. 10): *viz.* *first*, free Israelites ("thou") and their children ("thy son and thy daughter"); and *secondly*, their slaves (*man-servant* and *maid-servant*), and cattle (beasts of draught and burden), and their strangers, *i.e.* foreign labourers who had settled among the Israelites. "*Within thy gates*" is equivalent to in the cities, towns, and villages of thy land, not in thy houses (cf. Deut. v. 14, xiv. 21, etc.). שַׁעַר (a gate) is only applied to the entrances to towns, or large enclosed courts and palaces, never to the entrances into ordinary houses, huts, and tents. מְלָאכָה *work* (cf. Gen. ii. 2), as distinguished from עֲבֹדָה *labour*, is not so much a term denoting a lighter kind of labour, as a general and comprehensive term applied to the performance of any task, whether easy or severe. עֲבֹדָה is the execution of a definite task, whether in field labour (Ps. cĳ. 23) and mechanical employment (chap. xxxix. 32) on the one hand, or priestly service and the duties connected with worship on the other (chap. xii. 25, 26; Num. iv. 47). On the Sabbath (and also on the day of atonement, Lev. xxiii. 28, 31) every occupation was to rest; on the other feast-days only laborious occupations (מְלָאכָה עֲבֹדָה, Lev. xxiii. 7 sq.), *i.e.* such occupations as came under the denomination of labour, business, or industrial employment. Consequently, not only were ploughing

and reaping (xxxiv. 21), pressing wine and carrying goods (Neh. xiii. 15), bearing burdens (Jer. xvii. 21), carrying on trade (Amos viii. 5), and holding markets (Neh. xiii. 15 sqq.) prohibited, but collecting manna (xvi. 26 sqq.), gathering wood (Num. xv. 32 sqq.), and kindling fire for the purpose of boiling or baking (chap. xxxv. 3). The intention of this resting from every occupation on the Sabbath is evident from the foundation upon which the commandment is based in ver. 11, viz. that at the creation of the heaven and the earth Jehovah rested on the seventh day, and therefore blessed the Sabbath-day and hallowed it. This does not imply, however, that "Israel was to follow the Lord by keeping the Sabbath, and, in imitation of His example, to be active where the Lord was active, and rest where the Lord rested; to copy the Lord in accordance with the lofty aim of man, who was created in His likeness, and make the pulsation of the divine life in a certain sense his own" (Schultz). For although a parallel is drawn, between the creation of the world by God in six days and His resting upon the seventh day on the one hand, and the labour of man for six days and his resting upon the seventh on the other; the reason for the keeping of the Sabbath is not to be found in this parallel, but in the fact that God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it, because He rested upon it. The significance of the Sabbath, therefore, is to be found in God's blessing and sanctifying the seventh day of the week at the creation, *i.e.* in the fact, that after the work of creation was finished on the seventh day, God blessed and hallowed the created world, filling it with the powers of peace and good belonging to His own blessed rest, and raising it to a participation in the pure light of His holy nature (see Gen. ii. 3). For this reason His people Israel were to keep the Sabbath now, not for the purpose of imitating what God had done, and enjoying the blessing of God by thus following God Himself, but that on this day they also might rest from their work; and that all the more, because their work was no longer the work appointed to man at the first, when he was created in the likeness of God, work which did not interrupt his blessedness in God (Gen. ii. 15), but that hard labour in the sweat of his brow to which he had been condemned in consequence of the fall. In order therefore that His people might rest from toil so oppressive to both body and soul, and be refreshed, God prescribed the

keeping of the Sabbath, that they might thus possess a day for the repose and elevation of their spirits, and a foretaste of the blessedness into which the people of God are at last to enter, the blessedness of the eternal *κατάπαυσις ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ* (Heb. iv. 10), the *ἀνάπαυσις ἐκ τῶν κόπων* (Rev. xiv. 13. See my Archæologie, § 77).

But instead of this objective ground for the sabbatical festival, which furnished the true idea of the Sabbath, when Moses recapitulated the decalogue, he adduced only the subjective aspect of rest or refreshing (Deut. v. 14, 15), reminding the people, just as in Ex. xxiii. 12, of their bondage in Egypt and their deliverance from it by the strong arm of Jehovah, and then adding, "therefore (that thou mightest remember this deliverance from bondage) Jehovah commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day." This is not at variance with the reason given in the present verse, but simply gives prominence to a subjective aspect, which was peculiarly adapted to warm the hearts of the people towards the observance of the Sabbath, and to render the Sabbath rest dear to the people, since it served to keep the Israelites constantly in mind of the rest which Jehovah had procured for them from the slave labour of Egypt. For resting from every work is the basis of the observance of the Sabbath; but this observance is an institution peculiar to the Old Testament, and not to be met with in any other nation, though there are many among whom the division of weeks occurs. The observance of the Sabbath, by being adopted into the decalogue, was made the foundation of all the festal times and observances of the Israelites, as they all culminated in the Sabbath rest. At the same time, as an *ἐντολή τοῦ νόμου*, an ingredient in the Sinaitic law, it belonged to the "shadow of (good) things to come" (Col. ii. 17, cf. Heb. x. 1), which was to be done away when the "body" in Christ had come. Christ is Lord of the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 8), and after the completion of His work, He also rested on the Sabbath. But He rose again on the Sunday; and through His resurrection, which is the pledge to the world of the fruit of His redeeming work, He has made this day the *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα* (Lord's day) for His Church, to be observed by it till the Captain of its salvation shall return, and having finished the judgment upon all His foes to the very last shall lead it to the rest of that

eternal Sabbath, which God prepared for the whole creation through His own resting after the completion of the heaven and the earth.

Ver. 12. The FIFTH WORD, "*Honour thy father and thy mother,*" does not refer to fellow-men, but to "those who are the representatives (*vicarii*) of God. Therefore, as God is to be served with honour and fear, His representatives are to be so too" (*Luther decem. præc.*). This is placed beyond all doubt by Lev. xix. 3, where reverence towards parents is placed on an equality with the observance of the Sabbath, and *פִּיָּרָא* (*fear*) is substituted for *כְּבֹד* (*honour*). It also follows from *כְּבֹד*, which, as *Calvin* correctly observes, nihil aliud est quam Deo et hominibus, qui dignitate pollent, justum honorem deferre. Fellow-men or neighbours (*לְרֵעֵךְ*) are to be loved (Lev. xix. 18): parents, on the other hand, are to be honoured and feared; reverence is to be shown to them with heart, mouth, and hand—in thought, word, and deed. But by father and mother we are not to understand merely the authors and preservers of our bodily life, but also the founders, protectors, and promoters of our spiritual life, such as prophets and teachers, to whom sometimes the name of father is given (2 Kings ii. 12, xiii. 14), whilst at other times paternity is ascribed to them by their scholars being called sons and daughters (Ps. xxxiv. 12, xlv. 11; Prov. i. 8, 10, 15, etc.); also the guardians of our bodily and spiritual life, the powers ordained of God, to whom the names of father and mother (Gen. xlv. 8; Judg. v. 7) may justly be applied, since all government has grown out of the relation of father and child, and draws its moral weight and stability, upon which the prosperity and well-being of a nation depends, from the reverence of children towards their parents.¹ And the promise, "*that thy days may be long* (thou mayest live long) *in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee,*" also points to this. There is a double promise here. So long as the nation rejoiced in the possession of obedient children, it was assured of a long life or existence in the land of Canaan; but there is also included the promise

¹ "In this demand for reverence to parents, the fifth commandment lays the foundation for the sanctification of the whole social life, inasmuch as it thereby teaches us to acknowledge a divine authority in the same" (*Oehler, Dekalog*, p. 322).

of a long life, *i.e.* a great age, to individuals (cf. Deut. vi. 2, xxii. 7), just as we find in 1 Kings iii. 14 a good old age referred to as a special blessing from God. In Deut. v. 16, the promise of long life is followed by the words, "and that it may be well with thee," which do not alter the sense, but merely explain it more fully.

As the majesty of God was thus to be honoured and feared in parents, so the image of God was to be kept sacred in all men. This thought forms the transition to the rest of the commandments.

Vers. 13-17. The OTHER FIVE WORDS or commandments, which determine the duties to one's neighbour, are summed up in Lev. xix. 18 in the one word, "Love thy neighbour as thyself." The order in which they follow one another is the following: they first of all secure life, marriage, and property against active invasion or attack, and then, proceeding from deed to word and thought, they forbid false witness and coveting.¹ If, therefore, the first three commandments in this table refer primarily to deeds; the subsequent advance to the prohibition of desire is a proof that the deed is not to be separated from the disposition, and that "the fulfilment of the law is only complete when the heart itself is sanctified" (*Oehler*). Accordingly, in the command, "Thou shalt not *kill*," not only is the accomplished fact of murder condemned, whether it proceed from open violence or stratagem (chap. xxi. 12, 14, 18), but every act that endangers human life, whether it arise from carelessness (Deut. xxii. 8) or wantonness (Lev. xix. 14), or from hatred, anger, and revenge (Lev. xix. 17, 18). Life is placed at the head of these commandments, not as being the highest earthly possession, but because it is the basis of human existence, and in the life the personality is attacked, and in that the image of God (Gen. ix. 6). The omission of the object still remains to be

¹ *Luther* has pointed out this *mirum et aptum ordinem*, and expounds it thus: "Incipit prohibitio a majori usque ad minimum, nam maximum damnum est occisio hominis, deinde proximum violatio conjugis, tertium ablatio facultatis. Quod qui in iis nocere non possunt, saltem lingua nocent, ideo quartum est læsio famæ. Quodsi in iis non prævalent omnibus, saltem corde lædunt proximum, cupiendo quæ ejus sunt, in quo et invidia proprie consistit."

noticed, as showing that the prohibition includes not only the killing of a fellow-man, but the destruction of one's own life, or suicide.—The two following commandments are couched in equally general terms. *Adultery*, אִנּוּי, which is used in Lev. xx. 10 of both man and woman, signifies (as distinguished from זִנּוּי to commit fornication) the sexual intercourse of a husband with the wife of another, or of a wife with the husband of another. This prohibition is not only directed against any assault upon the husband's dearest possession, for the tenth commandment guards against that, but upholds the sacredness of marriage as the divine appointment for the propagation and multiplication of the human race; and although addressed primarily to the man, like all the commandments that were given to the whole nation, applies quite as much to the woman as to the man, just as we find in Lev. xx. 10 that adultery was to be punished with death in the case of both the man *and* the woman.—Property was to be equally inviolable. The command, "Thou shalt not steal," prohibited not only the secret or open removal of another person's property, but injury done to it, or fraudulent retention of it, through carelessness or indifference (chap. xxi. 33, xxii. 13, xxiii. 4, 5; Deut. xxii. 1–4).—But lest these commandments should be understood as relating merely to the outward act as such, as they were by the Pharisees, in opposition to whom Christ set forth their true fulfilment (Matt. v. 21 sqq.), God added the further prohibition, "*Thou shalt not answer as a false witness against thy neighbour,*" i.e. give false testimony against him. אָנַף with אָ: to answer or give evidence against a person (Gen. xxx. 33). אָ is not evidence, but a witness. Instead of אָנַף אָ, a witness of a lie, who consciously gives utterance to falsehood, we find אָנַף אָ in Deuteronomy, one who says what is vain, worthless, unfounded (אָנַף אָ, chap. xxiii. 1; on אָנַף see ver. 7). From this it is evident, that not only is lying prohibited, but false and unfounded evidence in general; and not only evidence before a judge, but false evidence of every kind, by which (according to the context) the life, married relation, or property of a neighbour might be endangered (cf. chap. xxiii. 1; Num. xxxv. 30; Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15, xxii. 13 sqq.).—The last or tenth commandment is directed against desiring (coveting), as the root from which every sin against a neighbour springs, whether it be in word or deed. The אָבִיר, ἐπιθυμῶν

(LXX.), coveting, proceeds from the heart (Prov. vi. 25), and brings forth sin, which "is finished" in the act (Jas. i. 14, 15). The repetition of the words, "Thou shalt not covet," does not prove that there are two different commandments, any more than the substitution of **הִתְאַוָּה** in Deut. v. 18 for the second **הִתְאַוָּר** and **הִתְאַוָּה** are synonyms,—the only difference between them being, that "the former denotes the desire as founded upon the perception of beauty, and therefore excited from without; the latter, desire originating at the very outset in the person himself, and arising from his own want or inclination" (*Schultz*). The repetition merely serves to strengthen and give the greater emphasis to that which constitutes the very kernel of the command, and is just as much in harmony with the simple and appropriate language of the law, as the employment of a synonym in the place of the repetition of the same word is with the rhetorical character of Deuteronomy. Moreover, the objects of desire do not point to two different commandments. This is evident at once from the transposition of the house and wife in Deuteronomy. **בַּיִת** (the house) is not merely the dwelling, but the entire household (as in Gen. xv. 2, Job viii. 15), either including the wife, or exclusive of her. In the text before us she is included; in Deuteronomy she is not, but is placed first as the crown of the man, and a possession more costly than pearls (Prov. xii. 4, xxxi. 10). In this case, the idea of the "house" is restricted to the other property belonging to the domestic economy, which is classified in Deuteronomy as fields, servants, cattle, and whatever else a man may have; whereas in Exodus the "house" is divided into wife, servants, cattle, and the rest of the possessions.

Vers. 18-21 (cf. Deut. v. 19-33). The terrible phenomena, amidst which the Lord displayed His majesty, made the intended impression upon the people who were stationed by the mountain below, so that they desired that God would not speak to them any more, and entreated Moses through their elders to act as mediator between them, promising at the same time that they would hear him (cf. chap. xix. 9, 16-19). **רָאִים**, perceiving: **רָאָה** to see being frequently used for perceiving, as being the principle sense by which most of the impressions of the outer world are received (*e.g.* Gen. xlii. 1; Isa. xlv. 16; Jer. xxxiii. 24). **לַפִּידִם**, fire-torches, are the vivid flashes of lightning (chap.

xix. 16). “*They trembled and stood afar off:*” not daring to come nearer to the mountain, or to ascend it. “*And they said,*” viz. the heads of the tribes and elders: cf. Deut. v. 20, where the words of the people are more fully given. “*Lest we die:*” cf. Deut. v. 21–23. Though they had discovered that God speaks with man, and yet man lives; they felt so much that they were ^{בשר} *flesh*, i.e. powerless, frail, and alienated by sin from the holy God, that they were afraid lest they should be consumed by this great fire, if they listened any longer to the voice of God.—Ver. 20. To direct the sinner’s holy awe in the presence of the holy God, which was expressed in these words of the people, into the proper course of healthy and enduring penitence, Moses first of all took away the false fear of death by the encouraging answer, “Fear not,” and then immediately added, “for God is come to prove you.” ^{נִסֶּה} referred to the testing of the state of the heart in relation to God, as it is explained in the exegetical clause which follows: “*that His fear may be before your faces, that ye sin not.*” By this terrible display of His glory, God desired to inspire them with the true fear of Himself, that they might not sin through distrust, disobedience, or resistance to His guidance and commands.—Ver. 21. “*So the people stood afar off*” (as in ver 18), not “went far away,” although, according to Deut. v. 30, Moses was directed by God to tell the people to return to their tents. This is passed over here, and it is merely observed, for the purpose of closing the first act in the giving the law, and preparing the way for the second, that the people remained afar off, whereas Moses (and Aaron, cf. xix. 24) drew near to the darkness where God was, to receive the further commands of the Lord.

THE LEADING FEATURES IN THE COVENANT CONSTITUTION.—

CHAP. XX. 22–XXIV. 2.

These refer, *first* of all, to the general form of divine worship in Israel (xx. 22–26); *secondly*, to the rights of the Israelites, (a) in a civil or social point of view, i.e. so far as their relation to one another was concerned (xxi. 1–xxiii. 13), and (b) in their religious and theocratical relation to Jehovah (chap. xxiii. 14–19); and *thirdly*, to the attitude which Jehovah would maintain towards Israel (chap. xxiii. 20–33).

Chap. xx. 22-26. THE GENERAL FORM OF DIVINE WORSHIP IN ISRAEL.—As Jehovah had spoken to the Israelites from heaven, they were not to make gods of earthly materials, such as silver and gold, by the side of Him, but simply to construct an altar of earth or unhewn stones without steps, for the offering up of His sacrifices at the place where He would reveal Himself. “From heaven” Jehovah came down upon Sinai enveloped in the darkness of a cloud; and thereby He made known to the people that His nature was heavenly, and could not be imitated in any earthly material. “Ye shall not make with Me,” place by the side of, or on a par with Me, “gods of silver and gold,”—that is to say, idols primarily intended to represent the nature of God, and therefore meant as symbols of Jehovah, but which became false gods from the very fact that they were intended as representations of the purely spiritual God.—Ver. 24. For the worship of Jehovah, the God of heaven, Israel needed only an altar, on which to cause its sacrifices to ascend to God. The altar, as an elevation built up of earth or rough stones, was a symbol of the elevation of man to God, who is enthroned on high in the heaven; and because man was to raise himself to God in his sacrifices, Israel also was to make an altar, though only of earth, or if of stones, not of hewn stones. “For if thou swingest thy tool (רִתֵּן, *lit.* sharpness, then any edge tool) over it (over the stone), thou defilest it” (ver. 25). “Of earth:” *i.e.* not “of comparatively simple materials, such as befitted a representation of the creature” (*Schultz on Deut. xii.*); for the altar was not to represent the creature, but to be the place to which God came to receive man into His fellowship there. For this reason the altar was to be made of the same material, which formed the earthly soil for the kingdom of God, either of earth or else of stones, just as they existed in their natural state; not, however, “because unpolished stones, which retain their true and native condition, appear to be endowed with a certain native purity, and therefore to be most in harmony with the sanctity of an altar” (*Spencer de legg. Hebr. rit. lib. ii. c. 6*), for the “native purity” of the earth does not agree with Gen. iii. 17; but because the altar was to set forth the nature of the simple earthly soil, unaltered by the hand of man. The earth, which has been involved in the curse of sin, is to be renewed and glorified into the kingdom of God, not by sinful men, but by the gracious hand

of God alone. Moreover, Israel was not to erect the altar for its sacrifices in any place that it might choose, but only in every place in which Jehovah should bring His name to remembrance. *הִזְכִּיר שְׁמִי וְנִ* does not mean "to make the name of the Lord remembered," *i.e.* to cause men to remember it; but to establish a memorial of His name, *i.e.* to make a glorious revelation of His divine nature, and thereby to consecrate the place into a holy soil (cf. iii. 5), upon which Jehovah would come to Israel and bless it. Lastly, the command not to go up to the altar by steps (ver. 26) is followed by the words, "that thy nakedness be not discovered thereon." It was in the feeling of shame that the consciousness of sin first manifested itself, and it was in the shame that the sin was chiefly apparent (Gen. iii. 7); hence the nakedness was a disclosure of sin, through which the altar of God would be desecrated, and for this reason it was forbidden to ascend to the altar by steps. These directions with reference to the altar to be built do not refer merely to the altar, which was built for the conclusion of the covenant, nor are they at variance with the later instructions respecting the one altar at the tabernacle, upon which all the sacrifices were to be presented (Lev. xvii. 8, 9; Deut. xii. 5 sqq.), nor are they merely "provisional;" but they lay the foundation for the future laws with reference to the places of worship, though without restricting them to one particular locality on the one hand, or allowing an unlimited number of altars on the other. Hence "several places and altars are referred to here, because, whilst the people were wandering in the desert, there could be no fixed place for the tabernacle" (*Riehm*). But the erection of the altar is unquestionably limited to every place which Jehovah appointed for the purpose by a revelation. We are not to understand the words, however, as referring merely to those places in which the tabernacle and its altar were erected, and to the site of the future temple (Sinai, Shiloh, and Jerusalem), but to all those places also where altars were built and sacrifices offered on extraordinary occasions, on account of God,—appearing there such, for example, as Ebal (Josh. viii. 30 compared with Deut. xxvii. 5), the rock in Ophrah (Judg. vi. 25, 26), and many other places besides.

Chap. xxi. 1–xxiii. 13. FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE

ISRAELITES IN THEIR CIVIL OR SOCIAL RELATIONS.—Chap. xxi. 1-11. The *mishpatim* (ver. 1) are not the “laws, which were to be in force and serve as rules of action,” as *Knobel* affirms, but the *rights*, by which the national life was formed into a civil commonwealth and the political order secured. These rights had reference first of all to the relation in which the individuals stood one towards another. The *personal rights* of dependants are placed at the head (vers. 2-11); and first those of *slaves* (vers. 2-6), which are still more minutely explained in Deut. xv. 12-18, where the observance of them is urged upon the hearts of the people on subjective grounds.—Ver. 2. The Hebrew servant was to obtain his freedom without paying compensation, after six years of service. According to Deut. xv. 12, this rule applied to the Hebrew maid-servant as well. The predicate עֲבָדִי limits the rule to Israelitish servants, in distinction from slaves of foreign extraction, to whom this law did not apply (cf. Deut. xv. 12, “thy brother”).¹ An Israelite might buy his own countryman, either when he was sold by a court of justice on account of theft (chap. xxii. 1), or when he was poor and sold himself (Lev. xxv. 39). The emancipation in the seventh year of service was intimately connected with the sabbatical year, though we are not to understand it as taking place in that particular year. “He shall go out free, *sc.* from his master’s house, *i.e.* be set at liberty. חָפְזִים: without compensation. In Deuteronomy the master is also commanded not to let him go out empty, but to load him (הֶעֱנִיק) to put upon his neck) from his flock, his threshing-floor, and his wine-press (*i.e.* with corn and wine); that is to say, to give him as much as he could carry away with him. The motive for this command is drawn from their recollection of their own deliverance by Jehovah from the bondage of Egypt. And in ver. 18 an additional reason is supplied, to incline the heart of the master to this emancipation, viz. that “he has served thee for six years the double of a labourer’s wages,”—that is to say, “he has served and worked so much, that it would have cost twice as much, if it had been necessary to hire a labourer in his place” (*Schultz*),—and “Jehovah thy God hath blessed thee in all that thou doest,”

¹ *Saalschütz* is quite wrong in his supposition, that עֲבָדִי relates not to Israelites, but to relations of the Israelites who had come over to them from their original native land. (See my *Archäologie*, § 112, Note 2.)

sc. through his service.—Vers. 3, 4. There were three different circumstances possible, under which emancipation might take place. The servant might have been unmarried and continued so (עַבְדִּי: with his body, *i.e.* alone, single): in that case, of course, there was no one else to set at liberty. Or he might have brought a wife with him; and in that case his wife was to be set at liberty as well. Or his master might have given him a wife in his bondage, and she might have borne him children: in that case the wife and children were to continue the property of the master. This may appear oppressive, but it was an equitable consequence of the possession of property in slaves at all. At the same time, in order to modify the harshness of such a separation of husband and wife, the option was given to the servant to remain in his master's service, provided he was willing to renounce his liberty for ever (vers. 5, 6). This would very likely be the case as a general rule; for there were various legal arrangements, which are mentioned in other places, by which the lot of Hebrew slaves was greatly softened and placed almost on an equality with that of hired labourers (cf. chap. xxiii. 12; Lev. xxv. 6, 39, 43, 53; Deut. xii. 18, xvi. 11). In this case the master was to take his servant אֵלֹהֵי הָאֲדָמָה, *lit. to God, i.e.,* according to the correct rendering of the LXX., πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον, to the place where judgment was given in the name of God (Deut. i. 17; cf. chap. xxii. 7, 8, and Deut. xix. 17), in order that he might make a declaration there that he gave up his liberty. His ear was then to be bored with an awl against the door or lintel of the house, and by this sign, which was customary in many of the nations of antiquity, to be fastened as it were to the house for ever. That this was the meaning of the piercing of the ear against the door of the house, is evident from the unusual expression in Deut. xv. 17, “and put (the awl) into his ear and into the door, that he may be thy servant for ever,” where the ear and the door are co-ordinates. “*For ever,*” *i.e.* as long as he lives. *Josephus* and the Rabbins would restrict the service to the time ending with the year of jubilee, but without sufficient reason, and contrary to the usage of the language, as אָלְמֵד is used in Lev. xxv. 46 to denote service which did not terminate with the year of jubilee. (See the remarks on Lev. xxv. 10; also my *Archäologie.*)

Vers. 7–11. The *daughter* of an Israelite, who had been sold by her father as a maid-servant (אִמָּה), *i.e.,* as the sequel shows,

as a housekeeper and concubine, stood in a different relation to her master's house. She was not to go out like the men-servants, *i.e.* not to be sent away as free at the end of six years of service; but the three following regulations, which are introduced by אִם (ver. 8), אִם־אֵל (ver. 9), and אִם־אֵל (ver. 11), were to be observed with regard to her. In the *first* place (ver. 8), "*if she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed.*" The אֵל before $\text{עָרַב$ is one of the fifteen cases in which אֵל has been marked in the Masoretic text as standing for לֹא ; and it cannot possibly signify *not* in the passage before us. For if it were to be taken as a negative, "that he do not appoint her," *sc.* as a concubine for himself, the pronoun לֹא would certainly not be omitted. הִפְדָּוָהּ (for הִפְדָּוָהּ , see Ges. § 53, Note 6), to let her be redeemed, *i.e.* to allow another Israelite to buy her as a concubine; for there can hardly have been any thought of redemption on the part of the father, as it would no doubt be poverty alone that caused him to sell his daughter (Lev. xxv. 39). But "*to sell her unto a strange nation (i.e. to any one but a Hebrew), he shall have no power, if he acts unfaithfully towards her,*" *i.e.* if he do not grant her the promised marriage. In the *second* place (vers. 9, 10), "*if he appoint her as his son's wife, he shall act towards her according to the rights of daughters,*" *i.e.* treat her as a daughter; "*and if he take him (the son) another (wife),—*whether because the son was no longer satisfied, or because the father gave the son another wife in addition to her,—"*her food* (בָּרֶזֶק flesh as the chief article of food, instead of לֶחֶם , bread, because the lawgiver had persons of property in his mind, who were in a position to keep concubines), *her raiment, and her duty of marriage he shall not diminish,*" *i.e.* the claims which she had as a daughter for support, and as his son's wife for conjugal rights, were not to be neglected; he was not to allow his son, therefore, to put her away or treat her badly. With this explanation the difficulties connected with every other are avoided. For instance, if we refer the words of ver. 9 to the son, and understand them as meaning, "if the son should take another wife," we introduce a change of subject without anything to indicate it. If, on the other hand, we regard them as meaning, "if the father (the purchaser) should take to himself another wife," this ought to have come before ver. 9. In the *third* place (ver. 11), "*if he do not (do not grant) these three*

unto her, she shall go out for nothing, without money." "These three" are food, clothing, and conjugal rights, which are mentioned just before; not "*si eam non desponderit sibi nec filio, nec redimi sit passus*" (Rabbins and others), nor "if he did not give her to his son as a concubine, but diminished her," as *Knobel* explains it.

Vers. 12-17. Still higher than personal liberty, however, is life itself, the right of existence and personality; and the infliction of injury upon this was not only prohibited, but to be followed by punishment corresponding to the crime. The principle of retribution, *jus talionis*, which is the only one that embodies the idea of justice, lies at the foundation of these threats.—Vers. 12-14. A death-blow was to be punished with death (cf. Gen. ix. 6; Lev. xxiv. 17). "*He that smiteth a man and (so that) he die (whether on the spot or directly afterwards did not matter), he shall be put to death.*" This general rule is still further defined by a distinction being drawn between accidental and intentional killing. "*But whoever has not lain in wait (for another's life), and God has caused it to come to his hand*" (to kill the other); *i.e.* not only if he did not intend to kill him, but did not even cherish the intention of smiting him, or of doing him harm from hatred and enmity (Num. xxxv. 16-23; Deut. xix. 4, 5), and therefore did so quite unawares, according to a dispensation of God, which is generally called an accident because it is above our comprehension. For such a man God would appoint places of refuge, where he should be protected against the avenger of blood. (On this point, see Num. xxxv. 9 sqq.)—Ver. 14. "*But he who acts presumptuously against his neighbour, to slay him with guile, thou shalt take him from Mine altar that he may die.*" These words are not to be understood as meaning, that only intentional and treacherous killing was to be punished with death; but, without restricting the general rule in ver. 12, they are to be interpreted from their antithesis to ver. 13, as signifying that even the altar of Jehovah was not to protect a man who had committed intentional murder, and carried out his purpose with treachery. (More on this point at Num. xxxv. 16 sqq.) By this regulation, the idea, which was common to the Hebrews and many other nations, that the altar as God's abode afforded protection to any life that was in danger from men, was brought back to the

true measure of its validity, and the place of expiation for sins of weakness (cf. Lev. iv. 2, v. 15, 18; Num. xv. 27-31) was prevented from being abused by being made a place of refuge for criminals who were deserving of death. Maltreatment of a father and mother through striking (ver. 15), man-stealing (ver. 16), and cursing parents (ver. 17, cf. Lev. xx. 9), were all to be placed on a par with murder, and punished in the same way. By the "smiting" (הִכָּה) of parents we are not to understand smiting to death, for in that case תָּמַת would be added as in ver. 12, but any kind of maltreatment. The murder of parents is not mentioned at all, as not likely to occur and hardly conceivable. The cursing (קָלַל as in Gen. xii. 3) of parents is placed on a par with smiting, because it proceeds from the same disposition; and both were to be punished with death, because the majesty of God was violated in the persons of the parents (cf. chap. xx. 12). *Man-stealing* was also no less a crime, being a sin against the *dignity* of man, and a violation of the image of God. For אָדָם "a man," we find in Deut. xxiv. 7, נֶפֶשׁ "a soul," by which both man and woman are intended, and the still more definite limitation, "of his brethren of the children of Israel." The crime remained the same whether he had sold him (the stolen man), or whether he was still found in his hand. (For וְ— as a sign of an alternative in the linking together of short sentences, see Prov. xxix. 9, and Ewald, § 361.) This is the rendering adopted by most of the earlier translators, and we get no intelligent sense if we divide the clauses thus: "and sell him so that he is found in his hand."

Vers. 18-32. Fatal blows and the crimes placed on a par with them are now followed in simple order by the laws relating to *bodily injuries*.—Vers. 18, 19. If in the course of a quarrel one man should hit another with a stone or with his fist, so that, although he did not die, he "*lay upon his bed*," i.e. became bed-ridden; if the person struck should get up again and walk out with his staff, the other would be innocent, he should "*only give him his sitting and have him cured*," i.e. compensate him for his loss of time and the cost of recovery. This certainly implies, on the one hand, that if the man died upon his bed, the injury was to be punished with death, according to ver. 12; and on the other hand, that if he died after getting up and going out, no further punishment was to be inflicted for the injury done.—

Vers. 20, 21. The case was different with regard to a slave. The master had always the right to punish or "chasten" him with a stick (Prov. x. 13, xiii. 24); this right was involved in the paternal authority of the master over the servants in his possession. The law was therefore confined to the abuse of this authority in outbursts of passion, in which case, "if the servant or the maid should die under his hand (*i.e.* under his blows), he was to be punished" (נָקַם יְלָם: "vengeance shall surely be taken"). But in what the נָקַם was to consist is not explained; certainly not in slaying by the sword, as the Jewish commentators maintain. The lawgiver would have expressed this by מוֹת יָמָת. No doubt it was left to the authorities to determine this according to the circumstances. The law in ver. 12 could hardly be applied to a case of this description, although it was afterwards extended to foreigners as well as natives (Lev. xxiv. 21, 22), for the simple reason, that it is hardly conceivable that a master would intentionally kill his slave, who was his possession and money. How far the lawgiver was from presupposing any such intention here, is evident from the law which follows in ver. 21, "Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two (*i.e.* remain alive), it shall not be avenged, for he is his money." By the continuance of his life, if only for a day or two, it would become perfectly evident that the master did not wish to kill his servant; and if nevertheless he died after this, the loss of the slave was punishment enough for the master. There is no ground whatever for restricting this regulation, as the Rabbins do, to slaves who were not of Hebrew extraction.—Vers. 22–25. If men strove and thrust against a woman with child, who had come near or between them for the purpose of making peace, so that her children come out (come into the world), and no injury was done either to the woman or the child that was born,¹ a pecuniary

¹ The words יָרָה וְיָלַד are rendered by the LXX. *καὶ ἐξέληθη τὸ παιδίον αὐτῆς μὴ ἐξεικονισμένον*, and the corresponding clause יָרָה וְיָלַד אֶת הַבָּנִים by *ἐὰν δὲ ἐξεικονισμένον ᾖ*; consequently the translators have understood the words as meaning that the fruit, the premature birth of which was caused by the blow, if not yet developed into a human form, was not to be regarded as in any sense a human being, so that the giver of the blow was only required to pay a pecuniary compensation,—as *Philo* expresses it, "on account of the injury done to the woman, and because he prevented nature, which forms and shapes a man into the most beautiful being, from bringing him forth alive." But the arbitrary character of this explanation is apparent at once;

compensation was to be paid, such as the husband of the woman laid upon him, and he was to give it בַּפְּסָלִים by (by an appeal to) arbitrators. A fine is imposed, because even if no injury had been done to the woman and the fruit of her womb, such a blow might have endangered life. (For נִצַּץ to go out of the womb, see Gen. xxv. 25, 26.) The plural יְלָדִים is employed for the purpose of speaking indefinitely, because there might possibly be more than one child in the womb. "*But if injury occur (to the mother or the child), thou shalt give soul for soul, eye for eye, . . . wound for wound.*" thus perfect retribution was to be made.—Vers. 26, 27. But the *lex talionis* applied to the free Israelite only, not to slaves. In the case of the latter, if the master struck out an eye and destroyed it, *i.e.* blinded him with the blow, or struck out a tooth, he was to let him go free, as a compensation for the loss of the member. Eye and tooth are individual examples selected to denote all the members, from the most important and indispensable down to the very least.—Vers. 28-32. The life of man is also protected against injury from cattle (cf. Gen. ix. 5). "*If an ox gore a man or a woman, that they die, the ox shall be stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten;*" because, as the stoning already shows, it was laden with the guilt of murder, and therefore had become unclean (cf. Num. xxxv. 33). The master or owner of the ox was innocent, *sc.* if his ox had not been known to do so before. But if this were the case, "*if his master have been warned (וְהוּעַר בְּבַעְלָיו, lit. testimony laid against its master), and notwithstanding this he have not kept it in,*" then the master was to be put to death, because through his carelessness in keeping the ox he had caused the death, and therefore shared the guilt. As this guilt, however, had not been incurred through an intentional crime, but had arisen simply from carelessness, he was allowed to redeem

for יָלֵד only denotes a child, as a fully developed human being, and not the fruit of the womb before it has assumed a human form. In a manner no less arbitrary אָדָם has been rendered by *Onkelos* and the *Rabbins* מוֹתָא, death, and the clause is made to refer to the death of the mother alone, in opposition to the penal sentence in vers. 23, 24, which not only demands life for life, but eye for eye, etc., and therefore presupposes not death alone, but injury done to particular members. The omission of לָהּ, also, apparently renders it impracticable to refer the words to injury done to the woman alone.

his forfeited life by the payment of expiation money (כִּפּוּר, *lit.* covering, expiation, cf. chap. xxx. 12), "according to all that was laid upon him," *sc.* by the judge.—Vers. 31, 32. The death of a son or a daughter through the goring of an ox was also to be treated in the same way; but that of a slave (man-servant or maid-servant) was to be compensated by the payment of thirty shekels of silver (*i.e.* probably the ordinary price for the redemption of a slave, as the redemption price of a free Israelite was fifty shekels, Lev. xxvii. 3) on the part of the owner of the ox; but the ox was to be killed in this case also. There are other ancient nations in whose law books we find laws relating to the punishment of animals for killing or wounding a man, but not one of them had a law which made the owner of the animal responsible as well, for they none of them looked upon human life in its likeness of God.

Vers. 33–36. Passing from life to *property*, in connection with the foregoing, the life of the animal, the most important possession of the Israelites, is first of all secured against destruction through carelessness. If any one opened or dug a pit or cistern, and did not close it up again, and another man's ox or ass (mentioned, for the sake of example, as the most important animals among the live stock of the Israelites) fell in and was killed, the owner of the pit was to pay its full value, and the dead animal to belong to him. If an ox that was not known to be vicious gored another man's ox to death, the vicious animal was to be sold, and its money (what it fetched) to be divided; the dead animal was also to be divided, so that both parties bore an equal amount of damage. If, on the other hand, the ox had been known to be vicious before, and had not been kept in, carefully secured, by its possessor, he was to compensate the owner of the one that had been killed with the full value of an ox, but to receive the dead one instead.

Chap. xxii. 1–4 (or ver. 37—chap. xxii. 3). With regard to *cattle-stealing*, the law makes a distinction between what had been killed or sold, and what was still alive and in the thief's hand (or possession). In the latter case, the thief was to restore piece for piece twofold (ver. 4); in the former, he was to restore an ox fivefold and a small animal (a sheep or a goat) fourfold (ver. 1). The difference between the compensation for an ox and a small animal is to be accounted for from the compara-

tive worth of the cattle to the possessor, which determined the magnitude of the theft and the amount of the compensation. But the other distinctions of twofold, fourfold, and fivefold restitution cannot be accounted for, either by supposing "that the animal slain or sold was lost to its master, and might have been of peculiar value to him" (*Knobel*), for such a consideration of personal feelings would have been quite foreign to the law,—not to mention the fact that an animal that had been sold might be recovered by purchase; or from the fact that "the thief in this case had carried his crime still further" (*Baumgarten*), for the main thing was still the theft, not the consumption or sale of the animal stolen. The reason can only have lain in the educational purpose of the law: viz. in the intention to lead the thief to repent of his crime, to acknowledge his guilt, and to restore what he had stolen. Now, as long as he still retained the stolen animal in his own possession, having neither consumed nor parted with it, this was always in his power; but the possibility was gone as soon as it had either been consumed or sold (see my *Archæologie*, § 154, Note 3).¹

Vers. 2, 3. Into the midst of the laws relating to theft, we have one introduced here, prescribing what was to be done with the thief. "If the thief be found breaking in (i.e. by night according to ver. 3), and be smitten so that he die, there shall be no blood to him (the person smiting him); if the sun has risen upon him (the thief breaking in), there is blood to him:" i.e. in the latter case the person killing him drew upon himself blood-guiltiness (דִּימָתָא *lit.* drops of blood, blood shed), in the former case he did not. "The reason for this disparity between a thief by night and one in the day is, that the power and intention of a nightly thief are uncertain, and whether he may not have come for the purpose of committing murder; and that by night, if thieves are resisted, they often proceed to murder in their rage; and also that they can neither be recognised, nor resisted and apprehended with safety" (*Calovius*). In the latter case the slayer contracted blood-guiltiness, because even the life of a thief was

¹ Calvin gives the same explanation: *Major in scelere obstinatio se prodit, ubi res furtiva in quæstum conversa est, nec spes est ulla respicientiæ, atque ita continuo progressu duplicatur malæ fidei crimen. Fieri potest ut fur statim post delictum contremiscat: qui vero animal occidere ausus est, aut vendere, prorsus in maleficio obduruit.*

to be spared, as he could be punished for his crime, and what was stolen be restored according to the regulations laid down in vers. 1 and 4. But if he had not sufficient to make retribution, he was to be sold "for his stolen," i.e. for the value of what he had stolen, that he might earn by his labour the compensation to be paid.

Vers. 5, 6. *Injury done to another man's field or corn was also to be made good by compensation for the injury done.* If any one should consume a field or a vineyard, and let loose his beast, so that it fed in another man's field, he was to give the best of his field and vineyard as restitution. These words do not refer to wilful injury, for שָׁלַח does not mean to drive in, but simply to let loose, set at liberty; they refer to injury done from carelessness, when any one neglected to take proper care of a beast that was feeding in his field, and it strayed in consequence, and began grazing in another man's. Hence simple compensation was all that was demanded; though this was to be made "from the best of his field," i.e. *quicquid optimum habebit in agro vel vinea* (Jerome).¹—Ver. 6 also relates to unintentional injury, arising from want of proper care: "If fire break out and catch thorns (thorn-hedges surrounding a corn-field, Isa. v. 5; Sir. xxviii. 24), and sheaves, or the standing seed (הַקֶּמַח the corn standing in the straw), or the field be consumed, he that kindleth the fire shall make compensation (for the damage done)."

Vers. 7–15. In cases of *dishonesty, or the loss of property entrusted*, the following was to be the recognised right: If money or articles (בָּלִים, not merely tools and furniture, but clothes and ornaments, cf. Deut. xxii. 5; Isa. lxi. 10) given to a neighbour to keep should be stolen out of his house, the thief was to restore double if he could be found; but if he could not be discovered, the master of the house was to go before the judicial court (אֵל הַאֱלֹהִים, see chap. xxi. 6; אֶל נֶקֶדְבָּא to draw near to), to see "whether he has not stretched out his hand to his neighbour's goods." מִלְאָכָה: lit. employment, then something earned by employment, a possession. Before the judicial court he was

¹ The LXX. have expanded this law by interpolating ἀποτίσει ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ γέννημα αὐτοῦ· ἴαν δὲ πάντα τὸν ἀγρὸν καταβοσκήσῃ before מִיִּטְבֵּךְ. And the Samaritan does the same. But this expansion is proved to be an arbitrary interpolation, by the simple fact that πάντα τὸν ἀγρὸν forms no logical antithesis to ἀγρὸν ἕτερον.

to cleanse himself of the suspicion of having fraudulently appropriated what had been entrusted to him ; and in most cases this could probably be only done by an oath of purification. The Sept. and Vulg. both point to this by interpolating *καὶ ὀμείνται*, *et jurabit* ("and he shall swear"), though we are not warranted in supplying *וַיִּשְׁבַּע* in consequence. For, apart from the fact that *וַיִּשְׁבַּע* is not to be regarded as a particle of adjuration here, as *Rosenmüller* supposes, since this particle signifies "truly" when employed in an oath, and therefore would make the declaration affirmative, whereas the oath was unquestionably to be taken as a release from the suspicion of fraudulent appropriation, and in case of confession an oath was not requisite at all ;—apart from all this, if the lawgiver had intended to prescribe an oath for such a case, he would have introduced it here, just as he has done in ver. 11. If the man could free himself before the court from the suspicion of unfaithfulness, he would of course not have to make compensation for what was lost, but the owner would have to bear the damage. This legal process is still further extended in ver. 9 : *עַל־כָּל־דְּבַר־פֶּשַׁע*, "*upon every matter of trespass*" (by which we are to understand, according to the context, unfaithfulness with regard to, or unjust appropriation of, the property of another man, not only when it had been entrusted, but also if it had been found), "*for ox, for ass, etc., or for any manner of lost thing, of which one says that it is this*" ("this," viz. the matter of trespass), *the cause of both* (the parties contending about the right of possession) *shall come to the judicial court ; and he whom the court (Elohim) shall pronounce guilty* (of unjust appropriation) *shall give double compensation to his neighbour* : only double as in vers. 4 and 7, not four or fivefold as in ver. 1, because the object in dispute had not been consumed.—Vers. 10 sqq. If an animal entrusted to a neighbour to take care of had either died or hurt itself (*נִשְׁבַּר*, broken a limb), or been driven away by robbers when out at grass (1 Chron. v. 21 ; 2 Chron. xiv. 14, cf. Job i. 15, 17), without any one (else) seeing it, an oath was to be taken before Jehovah between both (the owner and the keeper of it), "whether he had not stretched out his hand to his neighbour's property," i.e. either killed, or mutilated, or disposed of the animal. This case differs from the previous one, not only in the fact that the animal had either become useless to the owner

or was altogether lost, but also in the fact that the keeper, if his statement were true, had not been at all to blame in the matter. The only way in which this could be decided, if there was **אין ראיין**, *i.e.* no other eye-witness present than the keeper himself at the time when the fact occurred, was by the keeper taking an oath before Jehovah, that is to say, before the judicial court. And if he took the oath, the master (owner) of it (the animal that had perished, or been lost or injured) was to accept (*sc.* the oath), and he (the accused) was not to make reparation. "But if it had been stolen **מֵעִמּוֹ** from with him (*i.e.* from his house or stable), he was to make it good," because he might have prevented this with proper care (cf. Gen. xxxi. 39). On the other hand, if it had been torn in pieces (*viz.* by a beast of prey, while it was out at grass), he was not to make any compensation, but only to furnish a proof that he had not been wanting in proper care. **יִבְאֵהוּ עֵר** "let him bring it as a witness," *viz.* the animal that had been torn in pieces, or a portion of it, from which it might be seen that he had chased the wild beast to recover its prey (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 34, 35; Amos iii. 12).—Vers. 14, 15. If any one borrowed an animal of his neighbour (to use it for some kind of work), and it got injured and died, he was to make compensation to the owner, unless the latter were present at the time; but not if he were. "For either he would see that it could not have been averted by any human care; or if it could, seeing that he, the owner himself, was present, and did not avert it, it would only be right that he should suffer the consequence of his own neglect to afford assistance" (*Calovius*). The words which follow, **אם שָׂכִיר וְגו'**, cannot have any other meaning than this, "if it was hired, it has come upon his hire," *i.e.* he has to bear the injury or loss for the money which he got for letting out the animal. The suggestion which *Knobel* makes with a "perhaps," that **שָׂכִיר** refers to a hired labourer, to whom the word is applied in other places, and that the meaning is this, "if it is a labourer for hire, he goes into his hire,—*i.e.* if the hirer is a daily labourer who has nothing with which to make compensation, he is to enter into the service of the person who let him the animal, for a sufficiently long time to make up for the loss,"—is not only opposed to the grammar (the perfect **בָּא** for which **יָבֵא** should be used), but is also at variance with the context, "not make it good."

Vers. 16, 17. The *seduction of a girl*, who belonged to her father as long as she was not betrothed (cf. chap. xxi. 7), was also to be regarded as an attack upon the family possession. Whoever persuaded a girl to let him lie with her, was to obtain her for a wife by the payment of a dowry (מִהָר see Gen. xxxiv. 12); and if her father refused to give her to him, he was to weigh (pay) money equivalent to the dowry of maidens, *i.e.* to pay the father just as much for the disgrace brought upon him by the seduction of his daughter, as maidens would receive for a dowry upon their marriage. The seduction of a girl who was betrothed, was punished much more severely (see Deut. xxii. 23, 24).

Vers. 18-31. The laws which follow, from ver. 18 onwards, differ both in form and subject-matter from the determinations of right which we have been studying hitherto: in *form*, through the omission of the ׀ with which the others were almost invariably introduced; in subject-matter, inasmuch as they make demands upon Israel on the ground of its election to be the holy nation of Jehovah, which go beyond the sphere of natural right, not only prohibiting every inversion of the natural order of things, but requiring the manifestation of love to the infirm and needy out of regard to Jehovah. The transition from the former series to the present one is made by the command in ver. 18, "*Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live;*" witchcraft being, on the one hand, "the vilest way of injuring a neighbour in his property, or even in his body and life" (*Ranke*), whilst, on the other hand, employment of powers of darkness for the purpose of injuring a neighbour was a practical denial of the divine vocation of Israel, as well as of Jehovah the Holy One of Israel. The witch is mentioned instead of the wizard, "not because witchcraft was not to be punished in the case of men, but because the female sex was more addicted to this crime" (*Calovius*). לֹא תִחַיֶּה (shalt not suffer to live) is chosen instead of the ordinary כִּוֶּת יָמָה (shall surely die), which is used in Lev. xx. 27 of wizards also, not "because the lawgiver intended that the Hebrew witch should be put to death in any case, and the foreigner only if she would not go when she was banished" (*Knobel*), but because *every* Hebrew witch was not to be put to death, but regard was to be had to the fact that witchcraft is often nothing but jugglery, and only those witches were to be put to death who would not give up their witchcraft when

it was forbidden. Witchcraft is followed in ver. 19 by the unnatural crime of lying with a beast; and this is also threatened with the punishment of death (see Lev. xviii. 23, and xx. 15, 16).—Ver. 20. Whoever offered sacrifice to strange gods instead of to Jehovah alone, was liable to death. **כְּרֵם** he shall be banned, put under the ban (*cherem*), *i.e.* put to death, and by death devoted to the Lord, to whom he would not devote himself in life (cf. Lev. xxvii. 29, and my *Archäologie*, § 70).—Ver. 21. The Israelites were not to offer sacrifice to foreign deities; but a foreigner himself they were not only to tolerate, but were not to vex or oppress him, bearing in mind that they also had been foreigners in Egypt (cf. chap. xxiii. 9, and Lev. xix. 33, 34).—Whilst the foreigner, as having no rights, is thus commended to the kindness of the people through their remembrance of what they themselves had experienced in Egypt, those members of the nation itself who were most in need of protection (*viz.* widows and orphans) are secured from humiliation by an assurance of the special care and watchfulness of Jehovah, under which such forsaken ones stand, inasmuch as Jehovah Himself would take their troubles upon Himself, and punish their oppressors with just retribution. **עָנָה** to humiliate, includes not only unjust oppression, but every kind of cold and contemptuous treatment. The suffix in **אִתּוֹ** (ver. 23) refers to both **אֶלְמֵנָה** and **יָתוֹם**, according to the rule that when there are two or more subjects of different genders, the masculine is employed (Ges. § 148, 2). The **וְ** before **אִם** expresses a strong assurance: “yea, if he cries to Me, I will hearken to him” (see *Ewald*, § 330*b*). “Killing with the sword” points to wars, in which men and fathers of families perish, and their wives and children are made widows and orphans.—Vers. 25–27. If a man should lend to one of the poor of his own people, he was not to oppress him by demanding interest; and if he gave his upper garment as a pledge, he was to give it him back towards sunset, because it was his only covering; as the poorer classes in the East use the upper garment, consisting of a large square piece of cloth, to sleep in. “*It is his clothing for his skin:*” *i.e.* it serves for a covering to his body. “*Wherein shall he lie?*” *i.e.* in what shall he wrap himself to sleep? (cf. Deut. xxiv. 6, 10–13).—With vers. 28 sqq. God directs Himself at once to the hearts of the Israelites, and attacks the sins of selfishness and covetousness, against which the

precepts in vers. 21-27 were directed in their deepest root, for the purpose of opposing all inward resistance to the promotion of His commands.—Ver. 28. “*Thou shalt not despise God, and the prince among thy people thou shalt not curse.*” *Elohim* does not mean either the gods of other nations, as *Josephus*, *Philo*, and others, in their dead and work-holy monotheism, have rendered the word; or the rulers, as *Onkelos* and others suppose; but simply GOD, deity in general, whose majesty was despised in every breach of the commandments of Jehovah, and who was to be honoured in the persons of the rulers (cf. Prov. xxiv. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 17). Contempt of God consists not only in blasphemies of Jehovah openly expressed, which were to be punished with death (Lev. xxiv. 11 sqq.), but in disregard of His threats with reference to the oppression of the poorer members of His people (vers. 22-27), and in withholding from them what they ought to receive (vers. 29-31). Understood in this way, the command is closely connected not only with what precedes, but also with what follows. The prince (נָשִׂיךְ, *lit.* the elevated one) is mentioned by the side of God, because in his exalted position he has to administer the law of God among His people, and to put a stop to what is wrong.—Vers. 29, 30. “*Thy fulness and thy flowing thou shalt not delay (to Me).*” מְלֵאֲוֹת fulness, signifies the produce of corn (Deut. xxii. 9); and זָרָה (*lit.* tear, flowing, liquor stillans), which only occurs here, is a poetical epithet for the produce of the press, both wine and oil (cf. δάκρυον τῶν δένδρων, LXX.; *arborum lacrimæ*, Plin. xi. 6). The meaning is correctly given by the LXX.: ἀπαρχὰς ἄλωνος καὶ ληνοῦ σοῦ. That the command not to delay and not to withhold the fulness, etc., relates to the offering of the first-fruits of the field and vineyard, as is more fully defined in chap. xxiii. 19 and Deut. xxvi. 2-11, is evident from what follows, in which the law given at the exodus from Egypt, with reference to the sanctification of the first-born of man and beast (xiii. 2, 12), is repeated and incorporated in the *rights* of Israel, inasmuch as the adoption of the first-born on the part of Jehovah was a perpetual guarantee to the whole nation of the right of covenant fellowship. (On the rule laid down in ver. 30, see Lev. xxii. 27.)—Ver. 31. As the whole nation sanctified itself to the Lord in the sanctification of the first-born, the Israelites were to show themselves to be holy men unto the Lord by not eating “flesh torn to pieces in

the field," *i.e.* the flesh of an animal that had been torn to pieces by a wild beast in the field. Such flesh they were to throw to the dogs, because eating it would defile (cf. Lev. xvii. 15).

Chap. xxiii. 1-13.—Vers. 1-9. Lastly, no one was to violate another's rights.—Ver. 1. "*Thou shalt not raise (bring out) an empty report.*" שָׁמַע שְׁוֵא, a report that has no foundation, and, as the context shows, does injury to another, charges him with wrongdoing, and involves him in legal proceedings. "*Put not thine hand with a wicked man (do not offer him thy hand, or render him assistance), to be a witness of violence.*" This clause is unquestionably connected with the preceding one, and implies that raising a false report furnishes the wicked man with a pretext for bringing the man, who is suspected of crime on account of this false report, before a court of law; in consequence of which the originator or propagator of the empty report becomes a witness of injustice and violence.—Ver. 2. Just as little should a man follow a multitude to pervert justice. "*Thou shalt not be behind many (follow the multitude) to evil things, nor answer concerning a dispute to incline thyself after many (i.e. thou shalt not give such testimony in connection with any dispute, in which thou takest part with the great majority), so as to pervert*" (לְהַפְּסוֹת), *sc. justice.* But, on the other hand, "*neither shalt thou adorn the poor man in his dispute*" (ver. 3), *i.e.* show partiality to the poor or weak man in an unjust cause, out of weak compassion for him. (Compare Lev. xix. 15, a passage which, notwithstanding the fact that הִרְרָ is applied to favour shown to the great or mighty, overthrows *Knobel's* conjecture, that נִרְלָ should be read for וְרָל, inasmuch as it prohibits the showing of favour to the one as much as to the other.)—Vers. 4, 5. Not only was their conduct not to be determined by public opinion, the direction taken by the multitude, or by weak compassion for a poor man; but personal antipathy, enmity, and hatred were not to lead them to injustice or churlish behaviour. On the contrary, if the Israelite saw his enemy's beast straying, he was to bring it back again; and if he saw it lying down under the weight of its burden, he was to help it up again (cf. Deut. xxii. 1-4). The words וְהִרְלֵתָּ מֵעֵיב וְנֹ, "*cease (desist) to leave it to him (thine enemy); thou shalt loosen it (let it loose) with him,*" which have been so variously explained, cannot have any other signification than this: "*beware of leaving an ass which has sunk down be-*

neath its burden in a helpless condition, even to thine enemy, to try whether he can help it up alone; rather help him to set it loose from its burden, that it may get up again." This is evident from Deut. xxii. 4, where *לֹא תִעָלַמְתָּ*, "withdraw not thyself," is substituted for *תָּרַלְתָּ מֵעֵיב*, and *הָקִים עִמּוֹ*, "set up with him," for "*עָזַב הָעֵיב עִמּוֹ*." From this it is obvious that *עָזַב* is used in the first instance in the sense of leaving it alone, leaving it in a helpless condition, and immediately afterwards in the sense of undoing or letting loose. The peculiar turn given to the expression, "thou shalt cease from leaving," is chosen because the ordinary course, which the natural man adopts, is to leave an enemy to take care of his own affairs, without troubling about either him or his difficulties. Such conduct as this the Israelite was to give up, if he ever found his enemy in need of help.—Vers. 6 sqq. The warning against unkindness towards an enemy is followed by still further prohibitions of injustice in questions of right: viz. in ver. 6, a warning against perverting the right of the poor in his cause; in ver. 7, a general command to keep far away from a false matter, and not to slay the innocent and righteous, *i.e.* not to be guilty of judicial murder, together with the threat that God would not justify the sinner; and in ver. 8, the command not to accept presents, *i.e.* to be bribed by gifts, because "*the gift makes seeing men (פְּתוּחַי עֵינַי) open eyes) blind, and perverts the causes of the just.*" The rendering "*words of the righteous*" is not correct; for even if we are to understand the expression "*seeing men*" as referring to judges, the "*righteous*" can only refer to those who stand at the bar, and have right on their side, which judges who accept of bribes may turn into wrong.—Ver. 9. The warning against oppressing the foreigner, which is repeated from chap. xxii. 20, is not tautological, as *Bertheau* affirms for the purpose of throwing suspicion upon this verse, but refers to the oppression of a stranger in judicial matters by the refusal of justice, or by harsh and unjust treatment in court (Deut. xxiv. 17, xxvii. 19). "*For ye know the soul (animus, the soul as the seat of feeling) of the stranger,*" *i.e.* ye know from your own experience in Egypt how a foreigner feels.

Vers. 10-12. Here follow directions respecting the year of rest and day of rest, the first of which lays the foundation for the keeping of the sabbatical and jubilee years, which are afterwards instituted in Lev. xxv., whilst the latter gives prominence to

the element of rest and refreshment involved in the Sabbath, which had been already instituted (chap. xx. 9–11), and presses it in favour of beasts of burden, slaves, and foreigners. Neither of these instructions is to be regarded as laying down laws for the feasts; so that they are not to be included among the rights of Israel, which commence at ver. 14. On the contrary, as they are separated from these by ver. 13, they are to be reckoned as forming part of the laws relating to their mutual obligations one towards another. This is evident from the fact, that in both of them the care of the poor stands in the foreground. From this characteristic and design, which are common to both, we may explain the fact, that there is no allusion to the keeping of a Sabbath unto the Lord, as in chap. xx. 10 and Lev. xxv. 2, in connection with either the seventh year or seventh day: all that is mentioned being their sowing and reaping for six years, and working for six days, and then letting the land lie fallow in the seventh year, and their ceasing or resting from labour on the seventh day. “*The seventh year thou shalt let (thy land) loose* (צמץ to leave unemployed), *and let it lie; and the poor of thy people shall eat* (the produce which grows of itself), *and their remainder* (what they leave) *shall the beast of the field eat.*” שָׁנָה: *lit.* to breathe one’s self, to draw breath, *i.e.* to refresh one’s self (cf. chap. xxxi. 17; 2 Sam. xvi. 14).—With ver. 13a the laws relating to the rights of the people, in their relations to one another, are concluded with the formula enforcing their observance, “*And in all that I say to you, take heed,*” viz. that ye carefully maintain all the rights which I have given you. There is then attached to this, in ver. 13b, a warning, which forms the transition to the relation of Israel to Jehovah: “*Make no mention of the name of other gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth.*” This forms a very fitting boundary line between the two series of *mishpatim*, inasmuch as the observance and maintenance of both of them depended upon the attitude in which Israel stood towards Jehovah.

Chap. xxiii. 14–19. THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF ISRAEL IN ITS RELIGIOUS AND THEOCRATICAL RELATION TO JEHOVAH. —As the observance of the Sabbath and sabbatical year is not instituted in vers. 10–12, so vers. 14–19 do not contain either the original or earliest appointment of the feasts, or a complete

law concerning the yearly feasts. They simply command the observance of three feasts during the year, and the appearance of the people three times in the year before the Lord; that is to say, the holding of three national assemblies to keep a feast before the Lord, or three annual pilgrimages to the sanctuary of Jehovah. The leading points are clearly set forth in vers. 14 and 17, to which the other verses are subordinate. These leading points are מִשְׁפָּטִים or *rights*, conferred upon the people of Israel in their relation to Jehovah; for keeping a feast to the Lord, and appearing before Him, were both of them privileges bestowed by Jehovah upon His covenant people. Even in itself the festal rejoicing was a blessing in the midst of this life of labour, toil, and trouble; but when accompanied with the right of appearing before the Lord their God and Redeemer, to whom they were indebted for everything they had and were, it was one that no other nation enjoyed. For though they had their joyous festivals, these festivals bore the same relation to those of Israel, as the dead and worthless gods of the heathen to the living and almighty God of Israel.

Of the three feasts at which Israel was to appear before Jehovah, the feast of *Mazzoth*, or unleavened bread, is referred to as already instituted, by the words "*as I have commanded thee,*" and "*at the appointed time of the earing month,*" which point back to chaps. xii. and xiii.; and all that is added here is, "*ye shall not appear before My face empty.*" "*Not empty:*" i.e. not with empty hands, but with sacrificial gifts, answering to the blessing given by the Lord (Deut. xvi. 16, 17). These gifts were devoted partly to the general sacrifices of the feast, and partly to the burnt and peace-offerings which were brought by different individuals to the feasts, and applied to the sacrificial meals (Num. xxviii. and xxix.). This command, which related to all the feasts, and therefore is mentioned at the very outset in connection with the feast of unleavened bread, did indeed impose a duty upon Israel, but such a duty as became a source of blessing to all who performed it. The gifts demanded by God were the tribute, it is true, which the Israelites paid to their God-King, just as all Eastern nations are required to bring presents when appearing in the presence of their kings; but they were only gifts from God's own blessing, a portion of that which He had bestowed in rich abundance, and they were offered to

God in such a way that the offerer was thereby more and more confirmed in the rights of covenant fellowship. The other two festivals are mentioned here for the first time, and the details are more particularly determined afterwards in Lev. xxiii. 15 sqq., and Num. xxviii. 26 sqq. One was called the *feast of Harvest*, "of the first-fruits of thy labours which thou hast sown in the field," *i.e.* of thy field-labour. According to the subsequent arrangements, the first of the field-produce was to be offered to God, not the first grains of the ripe corn, but the first loaves of bread of white or wheaten flour made from the new corn (Lev. xxiii. 17 sqq.). In chap. xxxiv. 22 it is called the "feast of Weeks," because, according to Lev. xxiii. 15, 16, Deut. xvi. 9, it was to be kept seven weeks after the feast of *Mazzoth*; and the "feast of the first-fruits of wheat harvest," because the loaves of first-fruits to be offered were to be made of wheaten flour. The other of these feasts, *i.e.* the third in the year, is called "*the feast of Ingathering*, at the end of the year, in the gathering in of thy labours out of the field." This general and indefinite allusion to time was quite sufficient for the preliminary institution of the feast. In the more minute directions respecting the feasts given in Lev. xxiii. 34, Num. xxix. 12, it is fixed for the fifteenth day of the seventh month, and placed on an equality with the feast of *Mazzoth* as a seven days' festival. *בַּצֵּאת הַשָּׁנָה* does not mean after the close of the year, *finito anno*, any more than the corresponding expression in chap. xxxiv. 22, *תְּקִיפַת הַשָּׁנָה*, signifies at the turning of the year. The year referred to here was the so-called civil year, which began with the preparation of the ground for the harvest-sowing, and ended when all the fruits of the field and garden had been gathered in. No particular day was fixed for its commencement, nor was there any new year's festival; and even after the beginning of the earing month had been fixed upon for the commencement of the year (chap. xii. 2), this still remained in force, so far as all civil matters connected with the sowing and harvest were concerned; though there is no evidence that a double reckoning was carried on at the same time, or that a civil reckoning existed side by side with the religious. *בְּאִסְפָּךָ* does not mean, "when thou hast gathered," *postquam collegisti*; for *אָסַף* does not stand for *אָסַף*, nor has the infinitive the force of the preterite. On the contrary, the expression "*at thy gathering*

in," i.e. when thou gatherest in, is kept indefinite both here and in Lev. xxiii. 39, where the month and days in which this feast was to be kept are distinctly pointed out; and also in Deut. xvi. 13, in order that the time for the feast might not be made absolutely dependent upon the complete termination of the gathering in, although as a rule it would be almost over. The gathering in of "*thy labours out of the field*" is not to be restricted to the vintage and gathering of fruits: this is evident not only from the expression "out of the field," which points to field-produce, but also from the clause in Deut. xvi. 13, "gathering of the floor and wine-press," which shows clearly that the words refer to the gathering in of the whole of the year's produce of corn, fruit, oil, and wine.—Ver. 17. "*Three times in the year*" (i.e., according to ver. 14 and Deut. xvi. 16, at the three feasts just mentioned) "*all thy males shall appear before the face of the Lord Jehovah.*" The command to appear, i.e. to make a pilgrimage to the sanctuary, was restricted to the male members of the nation, probably to those above 20 years of age, who had been included in the census (Num. i. 3). But this did not prohibit the inclusion of women and boys (cf. 1 Sam. i. 3 sqq., and Luke ii. 41 sqq.).

Vers. 18, 19. The blessing attending their appearing before the Lord was dependent upon the feasts being kept in the proper way, by the observance of the three rules laid down in vers. 18 and 19. "*Thou shalt not offer the blood of My sacrifice upon leavened bread.*" בַּז upon, as in chap. xii. 8, denoting the basis upon which the sacrifice was offered. The meaning has been correctly given by the early commentators, viz. "as long as there is any leavened bread in your houses," or "until the leaven has been entirely removed from your houses." The reference made here to the removal of leaven, and the expression "*blood of My sacrifice,*" both point to the paschal lamb, which was regarded as the sacrifice of Jehovah כַּס' עֶזְרוֹתָו , on account of its great importance. *Onkelos* gives this explanation: "My Pass-over" for "My sacrifice."—"Neither shall the fat of My feast remain ($\text{לֹא יִשְׁרָף$ to pass the night) until the morning." "The fat of My feast" does not mean the fat of My festal sacrifice, for זֶהוּ , a feast, is not used for the sacrifice offered at the feast; it signifies rather the best of My feast, i.e. the paschal sacrifice, as we may see from chap. xxxiv. 25, where "the sacrifice of the feast

of the Passover" is given as the explanation of "the fat of My feast." As the paschal sacrifice was the sacrifice of Jehovah *par excellence*, so the feast of the Passover was *the* feast of Jehovah *par excellence*. The expression "fat of My feast" is not to be understood as referring at all to the fat of the lamb, which was burned upon the altar in the case of the expiatory and whole offerings; for there could have been no necessity for the injunction not to keep this till the morning, inasmuch as those parts of every sacrifice which were set apart for the altar were burned immediately after the sprinkling of the blood. The allusion is to the flesh of the paschal lamb, which was eaten in the night before daybreak, after which anything that remained was to be burned. עַרְבֵי־בֶקֶר (without the article) *till morning*, has the same meaning as לְבֹקֶר "for the (following) morning" in chap. xxxiv. 25.—The next command in ver. 19a has reference to the feast of Harvest, or feast of Weeks. In "*the first-fruits of thy land*" there is an unmistakable allusion to "the first-fruits of thy labours" in ver. 16. It is true the words, "the first of the first-fruits of thy land thou shalt bring into the house of the Lord thy God," are so general in their character, that we can hardly restrict them to the wave-loaves to be offered as first-fruits at the feast of Weeks, but must interpret them as referring to all the first-fruits, which they had already been commanded not to delay to offer (chap. xxii. 29), and the presentation of which is minutely prescribed in Num. xviii. 12, 13, and Deut. xxvi. 2–11,—including therefore the sheaf of barley to be offered in the second day of the feast of unleavened bread (Lev. xxiii. 9 sqq.). At the same time the reference to the feast of Weeks is certainly to be retained, inasmuch as this feast was an express admonition to Israel, to offer the first of the fruits of the Lord. In the expression רְאִישֵׁי תְבָאֵי, the latter might be understood as explanatory of the former and in apposition to it, since they are both of them applied to the first-fruits of the soil (*vid.* Deut. xxvi. 2, 10, and Num. xviii. 13). But as רְאִישֵׁי תְבָאֵי could hardly need any explanation in this connection, the partitive sense is to be preferred; though it is difficult to decide whether "the first of the first-fruits" signifies the first selection from the fruits that had grown, ripened, and been gathered first,—that is to say, not merely of the entire harvest, but of every separate production of the field and soil, according to the rendering of the LXX. ἀπαρχὰς

τῶν πρωτογεννημάτων τῆς γῆς,—or whether the word ראשית is used figuratively, and signifies the best of the first-fruits. There is no force in the objection offered to the former view, that “in no other case in which the offering of first-fruits generally is spoken of, is one particular portion represented as holy to Jehovah, but the first-fruits themselves are that portion of the entire harvest which was holy to Jehovah.” For, apart from Num. xviii. 12, where a different rendering is sometimes given to ראשית, the expression מראשית in Deut. xxvi. 2 shows unmistakably that only a portion of the first of all the fruit of the ground had to be offered to the Lord. On the other hand, this view is considerably strengthened by the fact, that whilst בכורים, בכורים signify those fruits which ripened first, *i.e.* earliest, ראשית is used to denote the ἀπαρχή, the first portion or first selection from the whole, not only in Deut. xxvi. 2, 10, but also in Lev. xxiii. 10, and most probably in Num. xviii. 12 as well.—Now if these directions do not refer either exclusively or specially to the loaves of first-fruits of the feast of Weeks, the opinion which has prevailed from the time of *Abarbanel* to that of *Knobel*, that the following command, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother’s milk,” refers to the feast of Ingathering, is deprived of its principal support. And any such allusion is rendered very questionable by the fact, that in Deut. xiv. 21, where this command is repeated, it is appended to the prohibition against eating the flesh of an animal that had been torn to pieces. Very different explanations have been given to the command. In the *Targum*, *Mishnah*, etc., it is regarded as a general prohibition against eating flesh prepared with milk. *Luther* and others suppose it to refer to the cooking of the kid, before it has been weaned from its mother’s milk. But the actual reference is to the cooking of a kid in the milk of its own mother, as indicating a contempt of the relation which God has established and sanctified between parent and young, and thus subverting the divine ordinances. As kids were a very favourite food (Gen. xxvii. 9, 14; Judg. vi. 19, xiii. 15; 1 Sam. xvi. 20), it is very likely that by way of improving the flavour they were sometimes cooked in milk. According to *Aben Ezra* and *Abarbanel*, this was a custom adopted by the *Ishmaelites*; and at the present day the Arabs are in the habit of cooking lamb in sour milk. A restriction is placed upon this custom in the prohibition before us, but there is no intention to prevent the intro-

duction of a superstitious usage customary at the sacrificial meals of other nations, which *Spencer* and *Knobel* have sought to establish as at all events probable, though without any definite historical proofs, and for the most part on the strength of far-fetched analogies.

✓ Chap. xxiii. 20-33. RELATION OF JEHOVAH TO ISRAEL.
 —The declaration of the rights conferred by Jehovah upon His people is closed by promises, through which, on the one hand, God insured to the nation the gifts and benefits involved in their rights, and, on the other hand, sought to promote that willingness and love which were indispensable to the fulfilment of the duties incumbent upon every individual in consequence of the rights conferred upon them. These promises secured to the people not only the protection and help of God during their journey through the desert, and in the conquest of Canaan, but also preservation and prosperity when they had taken possession of the land.—Ver. 20. Jehovah would send an angel before them, who should guard them on the way from injury and destruction, and bring them to the place prepared for them, *i.e.* to Canaan. The name of Jehovah was in this angel (ver. 21), that is to say, Jehovah revealed Himself in him; and hence he is called in chap. xxxiii. 15, 16, the face of Jehovah, because the essential nature of Jehovah was manifested in him. This angel was not a created spirit, therefore, but the manifestation of Jehovah Himself, who went before them in the pillar of cloud and fire, to guide and to defend them (chap. xiii. 21). But because it was Jehovah who was guiding His people in the person of the angel, He demanded unconditional obedience (ver. 21), and if they provoked Him (תִּצְרֹק for תִּצְרֹק, see chap. xiii. 18) by disobedience, He would not pardon their transgression; but if they followed Him and hearkened to His voice, He would be an enemy to their enemies, and an adversary to their adversaries (ver. 22). And when the angel of the Lord had brought them to the Canaanites and exterminated the latter, Israel was still to yield the same obedience, by not serving the gods of the Canaanites, or doing after their works, *i.e.* by not making any idolatrous images, but destroying them (these works), and smiting to pieces the pillars of their idolatrous worship (מַצֵּבֹת does not mean statues erected as idols, but memorial stones or columns

dedicated to idols: see my comm. on 1 Kings xiv. 23), and serving Jehovah alone. Then would He bless them in the land with bountiful provision, health, fruitfulness, and length of life (vers. 23-26). "Bread and water" are named, as being the provisions which are indispensable to the maintenance of life, as in Isa. iii. 1, xxx. 20, xxxiii. 16. The taking-away of "sickness" (cf. xv. 26) implied the removal of everything that could endanger life. The absence of anything that miscarried, or was barren, insured the continuance and increase of the nation; and the promise that their days should be fulfilled, *i.e.* that they should not be liable to a premature death (cf. Isa. lxxv. 20), was a pledge of their well-being.—Vers. 27 sqq. But the most important thing of all for Israel was the previous conquest of the promised land. And in this God gave it a special promise of His almighty aid. — "I will send My fear before thee." This fear was to be the result of the terrible acts of God performed on behalf of Israel, the rumour of which would spread before them and fill their enemies with fear and trembling (cf. chap. xv. 14 sqq.; Deut. ii. 25; and Josh. ii. 11, where the beginning of the fulfilment is described), throwing into confusion and putting to flight every people against whom (בָּהֶם — אֲשֶׁר) Israel came. נָתַן אֶת-אֵיב עֹרְוֹ to give the enemy to the neck, *i.e.* to cause him to turn his back, or flee (cf. Ps. xviii. 41, xxi. 13; Josh. vii. 8, 12). אֲלֵיךָ: in the direction towards thee.—Ver. 28. In addition to the fear of God, hornets (הַצִּרְעָרָה construed as a generic word with the collective article), a very large species of wasp, that was greatly dreaded both by man and beast on account of the acuteness of its sting, should come and drive out the Canaanites, of whom three tribes are mentioned *instar omnium*, from before the Israelites. Although it is true that *Ælian* (*hist. anim.* 11, 28) relates that the Phaseliens, who dwelt near the Solymites, and therefore probably belonged to the Canaanites, were driven out of their country by wasps, and *Bochart* (*Hieroz.* iii. pp. 409 sqq.) has collected together accounts of different tribes that have been frightened away from their possessions by frogs, mice, and other vermin, "the sending of hornets before the Israelites" is hardly to be taken literally, not only because there is not a word in the book of Joshua about the Canaanites being overcome and exterminated in any such way, but chiefly on account of Josh. xxiv. 12, where Joshua says that

God sent the hornet before them, and drove out the two kings of the Amorites, referring thereby to their defeat and destruction by the Israelites through the miraculous interposition of God, and thus placing the figurative use of the term hornet beyond the possibility of doubt. These hornets, however, which are very aptly described in Wisdom xii. 8, on the basis of this passage, as *προδρομους*, the pioneers of the army of Jehovah, do not denote merely *varii generis mala*, as Rosenmüller supposes, but *acerrimos timoris aculeos, quibus quodammodo volantibus rumoribus pungebantur, ut fugerent* (Augustine, *quæst. 27 in Jos.*). If the fear of God which fell upon the Canaanites threw them into such confusion and helpless despair, that they could not stand before Israel, but turned their backs towards them, the stings of alarm which followed this fear would completely drive them away. Nevertheless God would not drive them away at once, "in one year," lest the land should become a desert for want of men to cultivate it, and the wild beasts should multiply against Israel; in other words, lest the beasts of prey should gain the upper hand and endanger the lives of man and beast (Lev. xxvi. 22; Ezek. xiv. 15, 21), which actually was the case after the carrying away of the ten tribes (2 Kings xvii. 25, 26). He would drive them out by degrees (*בְּמַדְבָּר*, only used here and in Deut. vii. 22), until Israel was sufficiently increased to take possession of the land, *i.e.* to occupy the whole of the country. This promise was so far fulfilled, according to the books of Joshua and Judges, that after the subjugation of the Canaanites in the south and north of the land, when all the kings who fought against Israel had been smitten and slain and their cities captured, the entire land was divided among the tribes of Israel, in order that they might exterminate the remaining Canaanites, and take possession of those portions of the land that had not yet been conquered (Josh. xiii. 1-7). But the different tribes soon became weary of the task of exterminating the Canaanites, and began to enter into alliance with them, and were led astray by them to the worship of idols; whereupon God punished them by withdrawing His assistance, and they were oppressed and humiliated by the Canaanites because of their apostasy from the Lord (Judg. i. and ii.).

Vers. 31 sqq. The divine promise closes with a general indication of the boundaries of the land, whose inhabitants Je-

hovah would give up to the Israelites to drive them out, and with a warning against forming alliances with them and their gods, lest they should lead Israel astray to sin, and thus become a snare to it. On the basis of the promise in Gen. xv. 18, certain grand and prominent points are mentioned, as constituting the boundaries towards both the east and west. On the west the boundary extended from the Red Sea (see chap. xiii. 18) to the sea of the Philistines, or Mediterranean Sea, the south-eastern shore of which was inhabited by the Philistines; and on the east from the desert, *i.e.*, according to Deut. xi. 24, the desert of Arabia, to the river (Euphrates). The poetic suffix **טו** affixed to **יְרֵשׁוּ** answers to the elevated oratorical style. Making a covenant with them and their gods would imply the recognition and toleration of them, and, with the sinful tendencies of Israel, would be inevitably followed by the worship of idols. The first **י** in ver. 33 signifies *if*; the second, *imo*, verily, and serves as an energetic introduction to the apodosis. **מִקִּישׁ**, a snare (*vid.* chap. x. 7); here a cause of destruction, inasmuch as apostasy from God is invariably followed by punishment (Judg. ii. 3).

Chap. xxiv. 1, 2. These two verses form part of the address of God in chap. xx. 22–xxiii. 33; for **וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה אֲמַר** (“*but to Moses He said*”) cannot be the commencement of a fresh address, which would necessarily require **וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים** (cf. ver. 12, chap. xix. 21, xx. 22). The turn given to the expression **וַיֹּאמֶר מֹשֶׁה** presupposes that God had already spoken to others, or that what had been said before related not to Moses himself, but to other persons. But this cannot be affirmed of the decalogue, which applied to Moses quite as much as to the entire nation (a sufficient refutation of *Knobel's* assertion, that these verses are a continuation of chap. xix. 20–25, and are linked on to the decalogue), but only of the address concerning the *mishpatim*, or “rights,” which commences with chap. xx. 22, and, according to chap. xx. 22 and xxi. 1, was intended for the nation, and addressed to it, even though it was through the medium of Moses. What God said to the people as establishing its rights, is here followed by what He said to Moses himself, namely, that he was to go up to Jehovah, along with Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy elders. At the same time, it is of course implied that Moses, who had ascended the mountain with Aaron alone (chap.

xx. 21), was first of all to go down again and repeat to the people the "*rights*" which God had communicated to him, and only when this had been done, to ascend again with the persons named. According to vers. 3 and 12 (? 9), this is what Moses really did. But Moses alone was to go near to Jehovah: the others were to worship afar off, and the people were not to come up at all.

CONCLUSION OF THE COVENANT.—CHAP. XXIV. 3-18.

The ceremony described in vers. 3-11 is called "the covenant which Jehovah made with Israel" (ver. 8). It was opened by Moses, who recited to the people "*all the words of Jehovah*" (*i.e.* not the decalogue, for the people had heard this directly from the mouth of God Himself, but the words in chap. xx. 22-26), and "*all the rights*" (chap. xxi.-xxiii.); whereupon the people answered unanimously (קִלְ אָחֵר), "*All the words which Jehovah hath spoken will we do.*" This constituted the preparation for the conclusion of the covenant. It was necessary that the people should not only know what the Lord imposed upon them in the covenant about to be made with them, and what He promised them, but that they should also declare their willingness to perform what was imposed upon them. The covenant itself was commenced by Moses writing all the words of Jehovah in "*the book of the covenant*" (vers. 4 and 7), for the purpose of preserving them in an official record. The next day, early in the morning, he built an altar at the foot of the mountain, and erected twelve boundary-stones or pillars for the twelve tribes, most likely round about the altar and at some distance from it, so as to prepare the soil upon which Jehovah was about to enter into union with the twelve tribes. As the altar indicated the presence of Jehovah, being the place where the Lord would come to His people to bless them (chap. xx. 24), so the twelve pillars, or boundary-stones, did not serve as mere memorials of the conclusion of the covenant, but were to indicate the place of the twelve tribes, and represent their presence also.—Ver. 5. After the foundation and soil had been thus prepared in the place of sacrifice, for the fellowship which Jehovah was about to establish with His people; Moses sent young men of the children of Israel to prepare the sacrifices, and directed them to offer burnt-offering and sacrifice slain-offerings, viz. שְׁלָמִים, "*peace-*

offerings (see at Lev. iii. 1) for *Jehovah*," for which purpose פָּרִים, bullocks, or young oxen, were used. The young men were not first-born sons, who had officiated as priests previous to the institution of the Levitical priesthood, according to the natural right of primogeniture, as *Onkelos* supposes; nor were they the sons of Aaron, as *Augustine* maintains: they simply acted as servants of Moses; and the priestly duty of sprinkling the blood was performed by him as the mediator of the covenant. It is merely as *young men*, therefore, *i.e.* as strong and active, that they are introduced in this place, and not as representatives of the nation, "by whom the sacrifice was presented, and whose attitude resembled that of a youth just ready to enter upon his course" (*Kurtz*, O. C. iii. 143). For, as *Oehler* says, "this was not a sacrifice presented by the nation on its own account. The primary object was to establish that fellowship, by virtue of which it could draw near to *Jehovah* in sacrifice. Moreover, according to vers. 1 and 9, the nation possessed its proper representatives in the seventy elders" (*Herzog's Cyclopædia*). But even though these sacrifices were not offered by the representatives of the nation, and for this very reason Moses selected young men from among the people to act as servants at this ceremony, they had so far a substitutionary position, that in their persons the nation was received into fellowship with God by means of the sprinkling of the blood, which was performed in a peculiar manner, to suit the unique design of this sacrificial ceremony.—Vers. 6-8. The blood was divided into two parts. One half was swung by Moses upon the altar (רָץ to swing, shake, or pour out of the vessel, in distinction from הָרַץ to sprinkle); the other half he put into basins, and after he had read the book of the covenant to the people, and they had promised to do and follow all the words of *Jehovah*, he sprinkled it upon the people with these words: "*Behold the blood of the covenant, which *Jehovah* has made with you over all these words.*" As several animals were slaughtered, and all of them young oxen, there must have been a considerable quantity of blood obtained, so that the one half would fill several basins, and many persons might be sprinkled with it as it was being swung about. The division of the blood had reference to the two parties to the covenant, who were to be brought by the covenant into a living unity; but it had no connection whatever with the heathen

customs adduced by *Bähr* and *Knobel*, in which the parties to a treaty mixed their own blood together. For this was not a mixture of different kinds of blood, but it was a division of one blood; and that *sacrificial* blood, in which animal life was offered instead of human life, making expiation as a pure life for sinful man, and by virtue of this expiation restoring the fellowship between God and man which had been destroyed by sin. But the sacrificial blood itself only acquired this signification through the sprinkling or swinging upon the altar, by virtue of which the human soul was received, in the soul of the animal sacrificed for man, into the fellowship of the divine grace manifested upon the altar, in order that, through the power of this sin-forgiving and sin-destroying grace, it might be sanctified to a new and holy life. In this way the sacrificial blood acquired the signification of a vital principle endued with the power of divine grace; and this was communicated to the people by means of the sprinkling of the blood. As the only reason for dividing the sacrificial blood into two parts was, that the blood sprinkled upon the altar could not be taken off again and sprinkled upon the people; the two halves of the blood are to be regarded as one blood, which was first of all sprinkled upon the altar, and then upon the people. In the blood sprinkled upon the altar, the natural life of the people was given up to God, as a life that had passed through death, to be pervaded by His grace; and then through the sprinkling upon the people it was restored to them again, as a life renewed by the grace of God. In this way the blood not only became a bond of union between Jehovah and His people, but as the blood of the covenant, it became a vital power, holy and divine, uniting Israel and its God; and the sprinkling of the people with this blood was an actual renewal of life, a transposition of Israel into the kingdom of God, in which it was filled with the powers of God's spirit of grace, and sanctified into a kingdom of priests, a holy nation of Jehovah (chap. xix. 6). And this covenant was made "upon all the words" which Jehovah had spoken, and the people had promised to observe. Consequently it had for its foundation the divine law and right, as the rule of life for Israel.

Vers. 9-11. Through their consecration with the blood of the covenant, the Israelites were qualified to ascend the mountain, and there behold the God of Israel and celebrate the covenant

meal: of course, not the whole of the people, for that would have been impracticable on physical grounds, but the nation in the persons of its representatives, viz. the seventy elders, with Aaron and his two eldest sons. The fact that the latter were summoned along with the elders had reference to their future election to the priesthood, the bearers of which were to occupy the position of mediators between Jehovah and the nation, an office for which this was a preparation. The reason for choosing *seventy* out of the whole body of elders (ver. 3) is to be found in the historical and symbolical significance of this number (see vol. i. p. 374). "*They saw the God of Israel.*" This title is very appropriately given to Jehovah here, because He, the God of the fathers, had become in truth the God of Israel through the covenant just made. We must not go beyond the limits drawn in chap. xxxiii. 20-23 in our conceptions of what constituted the sight (הִרְאָה, ver. 11) of God; at the same time we must regard it as a vision of God in some form of manifestation which rendered the divine nature discernible to the human eye. Nothing is said as to the form in which God manifested Himself. This silence, however, is not intended "to indicate the imperfection of their sight of God," as *Baumgarten* affirms, nor is it to be explained, as *Hofmann* supposes, on the ground that "what they saw differed from what the people had constantly before their eyes simply in this respect, that after they had entered the darkness, which enveloped the mountain that burned as it were with fire at its summit, the fiery sign separated from the cloud, and assumed a shape, beneath which it was bright and clear, as an image of untroubled bliss." The words are evidently intended to affirm something more than, that they saw the fiery form in which God manifested Himself to the people, and that whilst the fire was ordinarily enveloped in a cloud, they saw it upon the mountain without the cloud. For, since Moses saw the form (תְּמוּנָה) of Jehovah (Num. xii. 8), we may fairly conclude, notwithstanding the fact that, according to ver. 2, the representatives of the nation were not to draw near to Jehovah, and without any danger of contradicting Deut. iv. 12 and 15, that they also saw a form of God. Only this form is not described, in order that no encouragement might be given to the inclination of the people to make likenesses of Jehovah. Thus we find that Isaiah gives no description of the form in which he saw the Lord sitting upon a

high and lofty throne (Isa. vi. 1). Ezekiel is the first to describe the form of Jehovah which he saw in the vision, "as the appearance of a man" (Ezek. i. 26; compare Dan. vii. 9 and 13). "And there was under His feet as it were work of clear sapphire (לְבִנְתָּהּ, from לְבָנָהּ whiteness, clearness, not from לְבִנְתָּהּ a brick¹), and as the material (עֲצָם body, substance) of heaven in brilliancy,"—to indicate that the God of Israel was enthroned above the heaven in super-terrestrial glory and undisturbed blessedness. And God was willing that His people should share in this blessedness, for "He laid not His hand upon the nobles of Israel," i.e. did not attack them. "They saw God, and did eat and drink," i.e. they celebrated thus near to Him the sacrificial meal of the peace-offerings, which had been sacrificed at the conclusion of the covenant, and received in this covenant meal a foretaste of the precious and glorious gifts with which God would endow and refresh His redeemed people in His kingdom. As the promise in chap. xix. 5, 6, with which God opened the way for the covenant at Sinai, set clearly before the nation that had been rescued from Egypt the ultimate goal of its divine calling; so this termination of the ceremony was intended to give to the nation, in the persons of its representatives, a tangible pledge of the glory of the goal that was set before it. The sight of the God of Israel was a foretaste of the blessedness of the sight of God in eternity, and the covenant meal upon the mountain before the face of God was a type of the marriage supper of the Lamb, to which the Lord will call, and at which He will present His perfected Church in the day of the full revelation of His glory (Rev. xix. 7-9).

Vers. 12-18 prepare the way for the subsequent revelation recorded in chap. xxv.-xxxi., which Moses received concerning the erection of the sanctuary. At the conclusion of the covenant meal, the representatives of the nation left the mountain along with Moses. This is not expressly stated, indeed; since it followed as a matter of course that they returned to the camp, when the festival for which God had called them up was concluded. A command was then issued again to Moses to ascend the mountain, and remain there (וַיֵּשֶׁב שָׁמָּה), for He was about to give him the tables of stone, with (לְ) as in Gen. iii. 24) the law and commandments, which He had written for their instruction

¹ This is the derivation adopted by the English translators in their rendering "paved work."—Tr.

(cf. xxxi. 18).—Vers. 13, 14: When Moses was preparing to ascend the mountain with his servant Joshua (*vid.* xvii. 9), he ordered the elders to remain in the camp (בִּזְהָ, *i.e.* where they were) till their return, and appointed Aaron and Hur (*vid.* xvii. 10) as administrators of justice in case of any disputes occurring among the people. מִי־בָעַל דְּבָרִים: whoever has matters, matters of dispute (on this meaning of בָּעַל see Gen. xxxvii. 19).—Vers. 15–17. When he ascended the mountain, upon which the glory of Jehovah dwelt, it was covered for six days with the cloud, and the glory itself appeared to the Israelites in the camp below like devouring fire (cf. xix. 16); and on the seventh day He called Moses into the cloud. Whether Joshua followed him we are not told; but it is evident from chap. xxxii. 17 that he was with him on the mountain, though, judging from ver. 2 and chap. xxxiii. 11, he would not go into the immediate presence of God.—Ver. 18. “*And Moses was on the mountain forty days and forty nights,*” including the six days of waiting,—the whole time without eating and drinking (Deut. ix. 9). The number *forty* was certainly significant, since it was not only repeated on the occasion of his second protracted stay upon Mount Sinai (xxxiv. 28; Deut. ix. 18), but occurred again in the forty days of Elijah’s journey to Horeb the mount of God in the strength of the food received from the angel (1 Kings xix. 8), and in the fasting of Jesus at the time of His temptation (Matt. iv. 2; Luke iv. 2), and even appears to have been significant in the forty years of Israel’s wandering in the desert (Deut. viii. 2). In all these cases the number refers to a period of temptation, of the trial of faith, as well as to a period of the strengthening of faith through the miraculous support bestowed by God.

DIRECTIONS CONCERNING THE SANCTUARY AND PRIESTHOOD.—CHAP. XXV.—XXXI.

To give a definite external form to the covenant concluded with His people, and construct a visible bond of fellowship in which He might manifest Himself to the people and they might draw near to Him as their God, Jehovah told Moses that the Israelites were to erect Him a sanctuary, that He might dwell in the midst of them (chap. xxv. 8). The construction and arrangement of this sanctuary were determined in all respects by

God Himself, who showed to Moses, when upon the mountain, a pattern of the dwelling and its furniture, and prescribed with great minuteness both the form and materials of all the different parts of the sanctuary and all the things required for the sacred service. If the sanctuary was to answer its purpose, the erection of it could not be left to the inventive faculty of any man whatever, but must proceed from Him, who was there to manifest Himself to the nation, as the Holy One, in righteousness and grace. The people could only carry out what God appointed, and could only fulfil their covenant duty, by the readiness with which they supplied the materials required for the erection of the sanctuary and completed the work with their own hands. The divine directions extended to all the details, because they were all of importance in relation to the design of God. The account therefore is so elaborate, that it contains a description not only of the directions of God with reference to the whole and every separate part (chap. xxv.—xxxi.), but also of the execution of the work in all its details (chap. xxxv.—xl.).

The following is the plan upon which this section is arranged. After the command of God to the people to offer gifts for the sanctuary about to be erected, which forms the introduction to the whole (chap. xxv. 1-9), the further directions commence with a description of the ark of the covenant, which Jehovah had appointed as His throne in the sanctuary, that is to say, as it were, with the sanctuary in the sanctuary (chap. xxv. 10-22). Then follow—(1) the table of shew-bread and the golden candlestick (vers. 23-40), as the two things by means of which the continual communion of Israel with Jehovah was to be maintained; (2) the construction of the dwelling, with an account of the position to be occupied by the three things already named (chap. xxvi.); (3) the altar of burnt-offering, together with the court which was to surround the holy dwelling (chap. xxvii. 1-19). This is immediately followed by the command respecting the management of the candlestick (vers. 20, 21), which prepares the way for an account of the institution of the priesthood, and the investiture and consecration of the priests (chap. xxviii. and xxix.), and by the directions as to the altar of incense, and the service to be performed at it (chap. xxx. 1-10); after which, there only remain a few subordinate instructions to complete the whole (chap. xxx. 11-xxxi. 17). "The description

of the entire sanctuary commences, therefore," as *Ranke* has aptly observed, "with the ark of the law, the place of the manifestation of Jehovah, and terminates with the altar of incense, which stood immediately in front of it." The dwelling was erected round Jehovah's seat, and round this the court. The priests first of all presented the sacrifices upon the altar of burnt-offering, and then proceeded into the holy place and drew near to Jehovah. The highest act in the daily service of the priests was evidently this standing before Jehovah at the altar of incense, which was only separated by the curtain from the most holy place.

Chap. xxv. 1-9 (cf. chap. xxxv. 1-9). The Israelites were to bring to the Lord a heave-offering (הֲרִימָה, from רָם, a gift lifted, or heaved by a man from his own property to present to the Lord; see at Lev. ii. 9), "on the part of every one whom his heart drove," i.e. whose heart was willing (cf. וְרִיב לְבוֹ chap. xxxv. 5, 22): viz. gold, silver, brass, etc.—Ver. 4. תְּכֵלֶת, *ύάκινθος*, purple of a dark blue shade, approaching black rather than bright blue. אַרְבָּנָה, *πορφύρα* (Chald. אַרְבָּנָה, 2 Chron. ii. 6; Dan. v. 7, 16;—Sanskrit, *rágaman* or *rágavan*, *colore rubro præditus*), true purple of a dark red colour. תּוֹלַעַת שָׁנִי, literally the crimson prepared from the dead bodies and nests of the glow-worm,¹ then the scarlet-red purple, or crimson. שֵׁשׁ, *βύσσος*, from שָׁשׁ to be white, a fine white cotton fabric, not linen, muslin, or net. עֵיזִים, goats, here goats' hair (*τρίχες αἰγείλαι*, LXX.).—Ver. 5. אֵילִים מְאֻדָּמִים עֲרִתְרָה rams' skins reddened, i.e. dyed red. תַּחַשׁ is either the seal, *phoca*, or else, as this is not known to exist in the Arabian Gulf, the *φῶκος* = *φῶκαινα* of the ancients, as *Knobel* supposes, or *κῆτος θαλάσσιον ὁμοιον δελφίνι*, the sea-cow (*Manati*, *Halicora*), which is found in the Red Sea, and has a skin that is admirably adapted for sandals. *Hesychius* supposes it to have been the latter, which is probably the same as the large fish *Tún* or *Atúm*, that is caught in the Red Sea, and belongs to the same species as the *Halicora* (*Robinson*, Pal. i. p. 170); as its skin is also used by the Bedouin Arabs for making sandals (*Burckhardt*, Syr. p. 861). In the *Manati* the upper skin differs from the under; the former being larger, thicker, and coarser than the latter, which is only two

¹ *Glanzwurm*: "the Linnean name is *coccus ilicis*. It frequents the boughs of a species of *ilex*; on these it lays its eggs in groups, which become covered with a kind of down." *Smith's Dictionary*, Art. Colours.—TR.

lines in thickness and very tough, so that the skin would be well adapted either for the thick covering of tents or for the finer kinds of ornamental sandals (Ezek. xvi. 10). עֲצֵי שֵׁטִים acacia-wood. שֵׁטִים for שֵׁטִים, the true acacia (*acacia vera*), which grows in Egypt and on the Arabian peninsula into a tree of the size of a nut-tree, or even larger;¹ the only tree in *Arabia deserta* from which planks could be cut, and the wood of which is very light and yet very durable.—Ver. 6. *Oil for the candlestick* (see at chap. xxvii. 20). בְּשֵׁמִים perfumes, spices for the anointing oil (see at chap. xxx. 22 sqq.), and for the incense (הַפְּסִים, *lit.* the scents, because the materials of which it was composed were not all of them fragrant; see at chap. xxx. 34 sqq.).—Ver. 7. Lastly, *precious stones*, אֲבִנֵי שֵׁהִם probably beryls (see at Gen. ii. 12), for the ephod (chap. xxviii. 9), and אֲבִנֵי מְלֵאִים, *lit.* stones of filling, *i.e.* jewels that are set (see chap. xxviii. 16 sqq.). On *ephod* (אֶפֶד), see at chap. xxviii. 6; and on הַשֵּׁן, at chap. xxviii. 15. The precious stones were presented by the princes of the congregation (chap. xxxv. 27).

Vers. 8, 9. With these freewill-offerings they were to make the Lord a sanctuary, that He might dwell in the midst of them (see at ver. 22). “*According to all that I let thee see (show thee), the pattern of the dwelling and the pattern of all its furniture, so shall ye make it.*” The participle מְרַאֶה does not refer to the past; and there is nothing to indicate that it does, either in ver. 40,

¹ See *Abdallatif's Merkwürdigkeiten Aegyptens*, and *Rosenmüller, Althk.* iv. i. pp. 278-9. This genuine acacia, *Sont*, must not be confounded, according to *Robinson* (Pal. 2, 350), with the *Acacia gumnifera* (*Talh*). *Seetzen* also makes a distinction between the *Thollhh*, the *Szont* of the Egyptians, and the *Szeiäl*, and between an acacia which produces gum and one which does not; but he also observes that the same tree is called both *Thollhh* and *Szeiäl* in different places. He then goes on to say that he did not find a single tree large enough to furnish planks of ten cubits in length and one and a half in breadth for the construction of the ark (he means, of the tabernacle), and he therefore conjectures that the Israelites may have gone to Egypt for the materials with which to build the tabernacle. But he has overlooked the fact, that it is not stated in the text of the Bible that the boards of the tabernacle, which were a cubit and a half in breadth, were cut from one plank of the breadth named; and also that the trees in the valleys of the peninsula of Sinai are being more and more sacrificed to the charcoal trade of the Bedouin Arabs (see p. 71), and therefore that no conclusion can be drawn from the present condition of the trees as to what they were in the far distant antiquity.

where "in the mount" occurs, or in the use of the preterite in chap. xxvi. 30, xxvii. 8. It does not follow from the expression, "which is showed thee *in the mount*," that Moses had already left the mountain and returned to the camp; and the use of the preterite in the passages last named may be simply explained, either on the supposition that the sight of the pattern or model of the whole building and its component parts preceded the description of the different things required for the completion of the building, or that the instructions to make the different parts in such and such a way, pointed to a time when the sight of the model really belonged to the past. On the other hand, the model for the building could not well be shown to Moses, before he had been told that the gifts to be made by the people were to be devoted to the building of a sanctuary. תבנית, from בנה to build, *lit.* a building, then a figure of anything, a copy or representation of different things, Deut. iv. 17 sqq.; a drawing or sketch, 2 Kings xvi. 10: it never means the original, not even in Ps. cxliv. 12, as *Delitzsch* supposes (see his Com. on Heb. viii. 5). In such passages as 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, 12, 19, where it may be rendered plan, it does not signify an original, but simply means a model or drawing, founded upon an idea, or taken from some existing object, according to which a building was to be constructed. Still less can the object connected with תבנית in the genitive be understood as referring to the original, from which the תבנית was taken; so that we cannot follow the Rabbins in their interpretation of this passage, as affirming that the heavenly originals of the tabernacle and its furniture had been shown to Moses in a vision upon the mountain. What was shown to him was simply a picture or model of the earthly tabernacle and its furniture, which were to be made by him. Both Acts vii. 44 and Heb. viii. 5 are perfectly reconcilable with this interpretation of our verse, which is the only one that can be grammatically sustained. The words of Stephen, that Moses was to make the tabernacle *κατὰ τὸν τύπον ὃν ἑώρακει*, "according to the fashion that he had seen," are so indefinite, that the text of Exodus must be adduced to explain them. And when the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews cites the words, "See that thou make all things *κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει*" (according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount), from ver. 40 of this chapter, as a proof the

Levitical priests only served the type and shadow of heavenly things (τῶν ἐπουρανίων); it is true, his words may be understood as showing that he regarded the earthly tabernacle with all its arrangements as only the counterpart and copy of a heavenly original. But this interpretation is neither necessary nor well founded. For although the author, by following the Sept., in which כְּתִבְתָּהּ is rendered κατὰ τὸν τύπον, the suffix being dropped, leaves it just a possible thing to understand the τύπος shown to Moses as denoting a heavenly tabernacle (or temple); yet he has shown very clearly that this was not his own view, when he explains the "patterns of things in the heavens" (ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς) and "the true" things (τὰ ἀληθινά) of both the tabernacle and its furniture as denoting the "heaven" (οὐρανός) into which Christ had entered, and not any temple in heaven. If the ἐπουράνια are heaven itself, the τύπος showed to Moses cannot have been a temple in heaven, but either heaven itself, or, more probably still, as there could be no necessity for this to be shown to Moses in a pictorial representation, a picture of heavenly things or divine realities, which was shown to Moses that he might copy and embody it in the earthly tabernacle.¹ If we understand the verse before us in this sense, it merely expresses what is already implied in the fact itself. If God showed Moses a picture or model of the tabernacle, and in-

¹ The conclusion drawn by *Delitzsch* (Hebräerbrief, p. 337), that because the author does not refer to anything between the ἐπουράνια and their ἀντίτυπα (chap. ix. 24), the τύπος can only have consisted of the ἐπουράνια themselves, is a mistake. All that the premises preclude, is the intervention of any objective reality, or third material object, but not the introduction of a pictorial representation, through which Moses was shown how to copy the heavenly realities and embody them in an earthly form. The earthly tent would no more be a copy of the copy of a heavenly original in this case, than a palace built according to a model is a copy of that model. Moreover, *Delitzsch* himself thinks it is "not conceivable that, when Moses was favoured with a view of the heavenly world, it was left to him to embody what he saw in a material form, to bring it within the limits of space." He therefore assumes, both for the reason assigned, and because "no mortal has ever looked directly at heavenly things," that "inasmuch as what was seen could not be directly reflected in the mirror of his mind, not to mention the retina of his eye, it was set before him in a visible form, and according to the operation of God who showed it, in a manner adapted to serve as a model of the earthly sanctuary to be erected." Thus he admits that it is true that Moses did not see the heavenly world itself, but only a copy of it that was shown to him by God.

structed him to make everything exactly according to this pattern, we must assume that in the tabernacle and its furniture heavenly realities were to be expressed in earthly forms; or, to put it more clearly, that the thoughts of God concerning salvation and His kingdom, which the earthly building was to embody and display, were visibly set forth in the pattern shown. The symbolical and typical significance of the whole building necessarily follows from this, though without our being obliged to imitate the Rabbins, and seek in the tabernacle the counterpart or copy of a heavenly temple. What these divine thoughts were that were embodied in the tabernacle, can only be gathered from the arrangement and purpose of the whole building and its separate parts; and upon this point the description furnishes so much information, that when read in the light of the whole of the covenant revelation, it gives to all the leading points precisely the clearness that we require.

Vers. 10-22. THE ARK OF THE COVENANT (cf. chap. xxxvii. 1-9).—They were to make an ark (אֲרוֹן) of acacia-wood, two cubits and a half long, one and a half broad, and one and a half high, and to plate it with pure gold both within and without. Round about it they were to construct a golden כֶּרֶךְ, *i.e.* probably a golden rim, encircling it like an ornamental wreath. They were also to cast four golden rings and fasten them to the four feet (רַגְלֵי) walking feet, feet bent as if for walking) of the ark, two on either side; and to cut four poles of acacia-wood and plate them with gold, and put them through the rings for carrying the ark. The poles were to remain in the rings, without moving from them, *i.e.* without being drawn out, that the bearers might not touch the ark itself (Num. iv. 15).—Ver. 16. Into this ark Moses was to put “the testimony” (תְּעֻדָה; cf. chap. xl. 20). This is the name given to the two tables of stone, upon which the ten words spoken by God to the whole nation were written, and which Moses was to receive from God (chap. xxiv. 12). Because these ten words were the declaration of God upon the basis of which the covenant was concluded (chap. xxxiv. 27, 28; Deut. iv. 13, x. 1, 2), these tables were called the tables of testimony (chap. xxxi. 18, xxxiv. 29), or tables of the covenant (Deut. ix. 9, xi. 15).—Vers. 17 sq. In addition to this, Moses was to make a *capporeth* (ἱλαστήριον ἐπιθεμα,

LXX.; *propitiatorium*, *Vulg.*), an atoning covering. The meaning *operculum*, lid (*Ges.*), cannot be sustained, notwithstanding the fact that the *capporeth* was placed upon the ark (ver. 21) and covered the tables laid within it; for the verb *כַּפַּר* has not the literal signification of covering or covering up either in *Kal* or *Piel*. In *Kal* it only occurs in Gen. vi. 14, where it means to pitch or tar; in *Piel* it is only used in the figurative sense of covering up sin or guilt, *i.e.* of making atonement. 1 Chron. xxviii. 11 is decisive on this point, where the holy of holies, in which the *capporeth* was, is called *בַּיִת הַכֹּפֶרֶת*, which cannot possibly mean the covering-house, but must signify the house of atonement. The force of this passage is not weakened by the remark made by *Delitzsch* and others, to the effect that it was only in the later usage of the language that the idea of covering gave place to that of the covering up or expiation of sin; for neither in the earlier nor earliest usage of the language can the supposed primary meaning of the word be anywhere discovered. *Knobel's* remark has still less force, *viz.* that the ark must have had a lid, and it must have been called a lid. For if from the very commencement this lid had a more important purpose than that of a simple covering, it might also have received its name from this special purpose, even though this was not fully explained to the Israelites till a later period in the giving of the law (Lev. xvi. 15, 16). It must, however, have been obvious to every one, that it was to be something more than the mere lid of the ark, from the simple fact that it was not to be made, like the ark, of wood plated with gold, but to be made of pure gold, and to have two golden cherubs upon the top. The *cherubim* (see vol. i. p. 107) were to be made of gold *כְּקֶשֶׁת* (from *קָשָׁה* to turn), *i.e.*, literally, turned work (cf. Isa. iii. 24), here, according to *Onkelos*, *נִיָּד* *opus ductile*, work beaten with the hammer and rounded, so that the figures were not solid but hollow (see *Bähr*, i. p. 380).—Ver. 19. “Out of the *capporeth* shall ye make the cherubs at its two ends,” *i.e.* so as to form one whole with the *capporeth* itself, and be inseparable from it.—Ver. 20. “And let the cherubs be stretching out wings on high, screening (*כְּכַבֵּי*, *συσκιάζοντες*) with their wings above the *capporeth*, and their faces (turned) one to the other; towards the *capporeth* let the faces of the cherubs be.” That is to say, the cherubs were to spread out their wings in such a manner as to form a screen

over the *capporeth*, with their faces turned towards one another, but inclining or stooping towards the *capporeth*. The reason for this is given in ver. 22. There—viz. above the *capporeth* that was placed upon the ark containing the testimony—Jehovah would present Himself to Moses (נִצַּח, from נָצַח to appoint, to present one's self to a person at an appointed place, to meet with him), and talk with him “*from above the capporeth, out from between the two cherubs upon the ark of testimony, all that I shall command thee for the sons of Israel*” (cf. chap. xxix. 42). Through this divine promise and the fulfilment of it (chap. xl. 35; Lev. i. 1; Num. i. 1, xvii. 19), the ark of the covenant together with the *capporeth* became the throne of Jehovah in the midst of His chosen people, the footstool of the God of Israel (1 Chron. xxviii. 2, cf. Ps. cxxxii. 7, xcix. 5; Lam. ii. 1). The ark, with the tables of the covenant as the self-attestation of God, formed the foundation of this throne, to show that the kingdom of grace which was established in Israel through the medium of the covenant, was founded in justice and righteousness (Ps. lxxxix. 15, xcvi. 2). The gold plate upon the ark formed the footstool of the throne for Him, who caused His name, *i.e.* the real presence of His being, to dwell in a cloud between the two cherubim above their outspread wings; and there He not only made known His will to His people in laws and commandments, but revealed Himself as the jealous God who visited sin and showed mercy (chap. xx. 5, 6, xxxiv. 6, 7),—the latter more especially on the great day of atonement, when, through the medium of the blood of the sin-offering sprinkled upon and in front of the *capporeth*, He granted reconciliation to His people for all their transgressions in all their sins (Lev. xvi. 14 sqq.). Thus the footstool of God became a throne of grace (Heb. iv. 16, cf. ix. 5), which received its name *capporeth* or *ἱλαστήριον* from the fact that the highest and most perfect act of atonement under the Old Testament was performed upon it. Jehovah, who betrothed His people to Himself in grace and mercy for an everlasting covenant (Hos. ii. 2), was enthroned upon it, above the wings of the two cherubim, which stood on either side of His throne; and hence He is represented as “dwelling (between) the cherubim” יֹשֵׁב הַכְּרֻבִים (1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; Ps. lxxx. 2, etc.). The cherubs were not combinations of animal forms, taken from man, the lion, the ox, and the eagle, as many have inferred from Ezek.

i. and x., for even the composite beings which Ezekiel saw with four faces had a human figure (Ezek. i. 5); but they are to be regarded as figures made in a human form, and not in a kneeling posture, but, according to the analogy of 2 Chron. iii. 13, standing upright. Consequently, as the union of four faces in one cherub is peculiar to Ezekiel, and the cherubs of the ark of the covenant, like those of Solomon's temple, had but one face each, not only did the human type form the general basis of these figures, but in every respect, with the exception of the wings, they were made in the likeness of men. And this is the only form which would answer the purpose for which they were intended, viz. to represent the cherubim, or heavenly spirits, who were stationed to prevent the return of the first man to the garden of Eden after his expulsion thence, and keep the way to the tree of life (see vol. i. p. 107). Standing upon the capporeth of the ark of the covenant, the typical foundation of the throne of Jehovah, which Ezekiel saw in the vision as *קַמַרְתִּי רִקְיָה* "the likeness of a firmament" (Ezek. i. 22, 25), with their wings outspread and faces lowered, they represented the spirits of heaven, who surround Jehovah, the heavenly King, when seated upon His throne, as His most exalted servants and the witnesses of His sovereign and saving glory; so that Jehovah enthroned above the wings of the cherubim was set forth as the God of Hosts who is exalted above all the angels, surrounded by the assembly or council of the holy ones (Ps. lxxxix. 6-9), who bow their faces towards the capporeth, studying the secrets of the divine counsels of love (1 Pet. i. 12), and worshipping Him that liveth for ever and ever (Rev. iv. 10).

Vers. 23-30. THE TABLE OF SHEW-BREAD (cf. chap. xxxvii. 10-16).—The table for the shew-bread (ver. 30) was to be made of acacia-wood, two cubits long, one broad, and one and a half high, and to be plated with pure gold, having a golden wreath round, and a "*finish* (*מַסְבֵּי־יָד*) of a hand-breadth round about," i.e. a border of a hand-breadth in depth surrounding and enclosing the four sides, upon which the top of the table was laid, and into the four corners of which the feet of the table were inserted. A golden wreath was to be placed round this rim. As there is no article attached to *יָרֵחַ* in ver. 25 (cf. xxxvii. 12), so as to connect it with the *יָרֵחַ* in ver. 24, we must conclude that

there were two such ornamental wreaths, one round the slab of the table, the other round the rim which was under the slab. At the four corners of the four feet, near the point at which they joined the rim, four rings were to be fastened for רְתִימֹת , *i.e.* to hold the poles with which the table was carried, as in the case of the ark.—Ver. 29. Vessels of pure gold were also to be made, to stand upon the table (cf. xxxvii. 16). טָבַחִים , *τὰ τευβλία* (LXX.), large deep plates, in which the shew-bread was not only brought to the table, but placed upon it. These plates cannot have been small, for the silver הַקָּעֵרֶת , presented by Nahshon the tribe prince, weighed 130 shekels (Num. vii. 13). חַבְּזִים , from חָבַז a hollow hand, small scoops, according to Num. vii. 14, only ten shekels in weight, used to put out the incense belonging to the shew-bread upon the table (cf. Lev. xxiv. 7 and Num. vii. 14): LXX. *θύσκη*, *i.e.*, according to the *Etymol. Magn.*, *σκάφη ἢ τὰ θύματα δεχομένη*. There were also two vessels “to pour out,” *sc.* the drink-offering, or libation of wine: *viz.* חֲשֻׁבִּים , *σπονδεία* (LXX.), sacrificial spoons to make the libation of wine with, and קַיִמֹת , *κύαθοι* (LXX.), goblets into which the wine was poured, and in which it was placed upon the table. (See chap. xxxvii. 16 and Num. iv. 7, where the goblets are mentioned before the sacrificial spoons.)—Ver. 30. Bread of the face (לֶחֶם פָּנִים), the mode of preparing and placing which is described in Lev. xxiv. 5 sqq., was to lie continually before (לְפָנֶיךָ) Jehovah. These loaves were called “bread of the face” (shew-bread), because they were to lie before the face of Jehovah as a meat-offering presented by the children of Israel (Lev. xxiv. 8), not as food for Jehovah, but as a symbol of the spiritual food which Israel was to prepare (John vi. 27, cf. iv. 32, 34), a figurative representation of the calling it had received from God; so that bread and wine, which stood upon the table by the side of the loaves, as the fruit of the labour bestowed by Israel upon the soil of its inheritance, were a symbol of its spiritual labour in the kingdom of God, the spiritual vineyard of its Lord.

Vers. 31-40 (cf. xxxvii. 17-24). THE CANDLESTICK was to be made of pure gold, “beaten work.” מְקֻשָׁת : see ver 18. For the form מְקֻשָׁת instead of מְקֻשָׁת (which is probably the work of a copyist, who thought the reading should be מְקֻשָׁת in

the *Niphal*, as the ' is wanting in many MSS.), see *Gesenius*, *Lehrgeb.* p. 52, and *Ewald*, § 83 b. "Of it shall be (*i.e.* there shall issue from it so as to form one complete whole) *its יָרֵךְ*" (*lit.* the loins, the upper part of the thigh, which is attached to the body, and from which the feet proceed,—in this case the base or pedestal, upon which the candelabrum stood); its קִנֵּה, or reed, *i.e.* the hollow stem of the candelabrum rising up from the pedestal;—"its נְבִיעִים," cups, resembling the calix of a flower;—*בַּפְּתָרִים*, knobs, in a spherical shape (cf. *Amos ix. 1*, *Zeph. ii. 14*);—"and פְּרָחִים," flowers, ornaments in the form of buds just bursting.—*Ver. 32.* From the sides of the candlestick, *i.e.* of the upright stem in the middle, there were to be six branches, three on either side.—*Vers. 33–34.* On each of these branches (the repetition of the same words expresses the distributive sense) there were to be "three cups in the form of an almond-flower, (with knob and flower," and on the shaft of the candlestick, of central stem, "four cups in the form of almond-flowers, its knobs and its flowers." As both *וּפְרָח וּבַתָּר* (*ver. 33*) and *בַּפְּתָרִיהָ וּפְרָחֶיהָ* (*ver. 34*) are connected with the previous words without a copula, *Knobel* and *Thenius* regard these words as standing in explanatory apposition to the preceding ones, and suppose the meaning to be that the flower-cups were to consist of knobs with flowers issuing from them. But apart from the singular idea of calling a knob or bulb with a flower bursting from it a flower-cup, *ver. 31* decidedly precludes any such explanation; for cups, knobs, and flowers are mentioned there in connection with the base and stem, as three separate things which were quite as distinct the one from the other as the base and the stem. The words in question are appended in both verses to *נְבִיעִים מְשֻׁקְרִים* in the sense of subordination; ׀ is generally used in such cases, but it is omitted here before *בַּתָּר*, probably to avoid ambiguity, as the two words to be subordinated are brought into closer association as one idea by the use of this copula. And if *בַּתָּר* and *פְּרָח* are to be distinguished from *נְבִיעִ*, the objection made by *Thenius* to our rendering *מְשֻׁקְרִים* "almond-blossom-shaped," namely, that neither the almond nor the almond-blossom has at all the shape of a basin, falls entirely to the ground; and there is all the less reason to question this rendering, on account of the unanimity with which it has been adopted in the ancient versions, whereas the rendering proposed by *Thenius*, "wakened up, *i.e.* a burst or

opened calix," has neither foundation nor probability.—Ver. 35. "And every pipe under the two branches shall be out from them (be connected with them) for the six (side) pipes going out from the candlestick;" i.e. at the point where the three pairs of the six side pipes or arms branched off from the main pipe or stem of the candlestick, a knob should be so placed that the arms should proceed from the knob, or from the main stem immediately above the knob.—Ver. 36. "Their knobs and their pipes (i.e. the knobs and pipes of the three pairs of arms) shall be of it (the candlestick, i.e. combined with it so as to form one whole), all one (one kind of) beaten work, pure gold." From all this we get the following idea of the candlestick: Upon the base there rose an upright central pipe, from which three side pipes branched out one above another on either side, and curved upwards in the form of a quadrant to the level of the central stem. On this stem a calix and a knob and blossom were introduced four separate times, and in such a manner that there was a knob wherever the side pipes branched off from the main stem, evidently immediately below the branches; and the fourth knob, we may suppose, was higher up between the top branches and the end of the stem. As there were thus four calices with a knob and blossom in the main stem, so again there were three in each of the branches, which were no doubt placed at equal distances from one another. With regard to the relative position of the calix, the knob, and the blossom, we may suppose that the spherical knob was underneath the calix, and that the blossom sprang from the upper edge of the latter, as if bursting out of it. The candlestick had thus seven arms, and seven lights or lamps were to be made and placed upon them (הַעֲלֵהָ). "And they (all the lamps) are to give light upon the opposite side of its front" (ver. 37): i.e. the lamp was to throw its light upon the side that was opposite to the front of the candlestick. The פָּנֵי of the candlestick (ver. 37 and Num. viii. 2) was the front shown by the seven arms, as they formed a straight line with their seven points; and עֲבֵר does not mean the side, but the opposite side, as is evident from Num. viii. 2, where we find אֶל מִלֵּךְ instead. As the place assigned to the candlestick was on the south side of the dwelling-place, we are to understand by this opposite side the north, and imagine the lamp to be so placed that the line of lamps formed by the seven arms ran from front

to back, by which arrangement the holy place would be better lighted, than if the candlestick had stood with the line of lamps from south to north, and so had turned all its seven lamps towards the person entering the holy place. The lamps were the receptacles for the wick and oil, which were placed on the top of the arms, and could be taken down to be cleaned. The hole from which the wick projected was not made in the middle, but at the edge, so that the light was thrown upon one side.—Ver. 38. The other things belonging to the candlestick were מלקחים tongs (Isa. vi. 6), *i.e.* snuffers, and מרחות snuff-dishes, *i.e.* dishes to receive the snuff when taken from the wicks; elsewhere the word signifies an ash-pan, or vessel used for taking away the coal from the fire (chap. xxvii. 3; Lev. xvi. 12; Num. xvii. 3 sqq.).—Ver. 39. “*Of a talent of pure gold (i.e. 822,000 Parisian grains) shall he make it (the candlestick) and all these vessels,*” *i.e.*, according to chap. xxxvii. 24, all the vessels belonging to the candlestick. From this quantity of gold it was possible to make a candlestick of very considerable size. The size is not given anywhere in the Old Testament, but, according to *Bähr’s* conjecture, it corresponded to the height of the table of shew-bread, namely, a cubit and a half in height and the same in breadth, or a cubit and a half between the two outside lamps.

The signification of the seven-armed candlestick is apparent from its purpose, *viz.* to carry seven lamps, which were trimmed and filled with oil every morning, and lighted every evening, and were to burn throughout the night (chap. xxvii. 20, 21, xxx. 7, 8; Lev. xxiv. 3, 4). As the Israelites were to prepare spiritual food in the shew-bread in the presence of Jehovah, and to offer continually the fruit of their labour in the field of the kingdom of God, as a spiritual offering to the Lord; so also were they to present themselves continually to Jehovah in the burning lamps, as the vehicles and media of light, as a nation letting its light shine in the darkness of this world (cf. Matt. v. 14, 16; Luke xii. 35; Phil. ii. 15). The oil, through which the lamps burned and shone, was, according to its peculiar virtue in imparting strength to the body and restoring vital power, a representation of the Godlike spirit, the source of all the vital power of man; whilst the oil, as offered by the congregation of Israel, and devoted to sacred purposes according to the command of God, is throughout the Scriptures a symbol of the

Spirit of God, by which the congregation of God was filled with higher light and life. By the power of this Spirit, Israel, in covenant with the Lord, was to let its light shine, the light of its knowledge of God and spiritual illumination, before all the nations of the earth. In its *seven* arms the stamp of the covenant relationship was impressed upon the candlestick; and the almond-blossom with which it was ornamented represented the seasonable offering of the flowers and fruits of the Spirit, the almond-tree deriving its name אֲמָלִי from the fact that it is the earliest of all the trees in both its blossom and its fruit (cf. Jer. i. 11, 12). The symbolical character of the candlestick is clearly indicated in the Scriptures. The prophet Zechariah (chap. iv.) sees a golden candlestick with seven lamps and two olive-trees, one on either side, from which the oil-vessel is supplied; and the angel who is talking with him informs him that the olive-trees are the two sons of oil, that is to say, the representatives of the kingdom and priesthood, the divinely appointed organs through which the Spirit of God was communicated to the covenant nation. And in Rev. i. 20, the seven churches, which represent the new people of God, *i.e.* the Christian Church, are shown to the holy seer in the form of seven candlesticks standing before the throne of God.—On ver. 40, see at ver. 9.

Chap. xxvi. (cf. xxxvi. 8–38). THE DWELLING-PLACE.—This was to be formed of a framework of wood, and of tapestry and curtains. The description commences with the tapestry or tent-cloth (vers. 1–14), which made the framework (vers. 15–30) into a dwelling. The inner lining is mentioned first (vers. 1–6), because this made the dwelling into a tent (tabernacle). This *inner tent-cloth* was to consist of ten curtains (אֲוֹלָאִים , *avla'im*), or, as Luther has more aptly rendered it, *Teppiche*, pieces of tapestry, *i.e.* of cloth composed of byssus yarn, hyacinth, purple, and scarlet. מִשְׁפָּרָה twisted, signifies yarn composed of various colours twisted together, from which the finer kinds of byssus, for which the Egyptians were so celebrated, were made (*vid. Hengstenberg, Egypt, pp. 139 sqq.*). The byssus yarn was of a clear white, and this was woven into mixed cloth by combination with dark blue, and dark and fiery red. It was not to be in simple stripes or checks, however; but the variegated yarn was to be woven (embroidered) into the

white byssus, so as to form artistic figures of cherubim ("cherubim, work of the artistic weaver, shalt thou make it"). מַעֲשֵׂה חֵשֶׁב (*lit.* work or labour of the thinker) is applied to artistic weaving, in which either figures or gold threads (chap. xxviii. 6, 8, 15) are worked into the cloth, and which is to be distinguished from מַעֲשֵׂה רִקְמָה variegated weaving (ver. 36).—Vers. 2, 3. The length of each piece was to be 28 cubits, and the breadth 4 cubits, one measure for all; and five of these pieces were to be "joined together one to another," *i.e.* joined or sewed together into a piece of 28 cubits in length and 20 in breadth, and the same with the other five.—Vers. 4, 5. They were also to make 50 hyacinth loops "*on the border of the one piece of tapestry, from the end in the join,*" *i.e.* on the extreme edge of the five pieces that were sewed together; and the same "*on the border of the last piece in the second joined tapestry.*" Thus there were to be fifty loops in each of the two large pieces, and these loops were to be מַקְבִּילֹת "taking up the loops one the other;" that is to say, they were to be so made that the loops in the two pieces should exactly meet.—Ver. 6. Fifty golden clasps were also to be made, to fasten the pieces of drapery (the two halves of the tent-cloth) together, "*that it might be a dwelling-place.*" This necessarily leads to *Bähr's* conclusion, that the tent-cloth, which consisted of two halves fastened together with the loops and clasps, answering to the two compartments of the dwelling-place (ver. 33), enclosed the whole of the interior, not only covering the open framework above, but the side walls also, and therefore that it hung down inside the walls, and that it was not spread out upon the wooden framework so as to form the ceiling, but hung down on the walls on the outside of the wooden beams, so that the gilded beams were left uncovered in the inside. For if this splendid tent-cloth had been intended for the ceiling only, and therefore only 30 cubits had been visible out of the 40 cubits of its breadth, and only 10 out of the 28 of its length,—that is to say, if not much more than a third of the whole had been seen and used for the inner lining of the dwelling,—it would not have been called "the dwelling" so constantly as it is (cf. chap. xxxvi. 8, xl. 18), nor would the goats'-hair covering which was placed above it have been just as constantly called the "tent above the dwelling" (ver. 7, chap. xxxvi. 14, xl. 19). This inner tent-cloth was so spread out, that whilst it was fastened to

the upper ends of the beams in a way that is not explained in the text, it formed the ceiling of the whole, and the joining came just above the curtain which divided the dwelling into two compartments. One half therefore, viz. the front half, formed the ceiling of the holy place with its entire breadth of 20 cubits and 10 cubits of its length, and the remaining 18 cubits of its length hung down over the two side walls, 9 cubits down each wall,—the planks that formed the walls being left uncovered, therefore, to the height of 1 cubit from the ground. In a similar manner the other half covered the holy of holies, 10 cubits of both length and breadth forming the ceiling, and the 10 cubits that remained of the entire length covering the end wall; whilst the folds in the corners that arose from the 9 cubits that hung down on either side, were no doubt so adjusted that the walls appeared to be perfectly smooth. (For further remarks, see chap. xxxix. 33.)

Vers. 7-13. The *outer tent-cloth*, “for the tent over the dwelling,” was to consist of eleven lengths of goats’ hair, *i.e.* of cloth made of goats’ hair;¹ each piece being thirty cubits long and four broad.—Ver. 9. Five of these were to be connected (sewed together) by themselves (קָרָן), and the other six in the same manner; and the sixth piece was to be made double, *i.e.* folded together, towards the front of the tent, so as to form a kind of gable, as *Josephus* has also explained the passage (*Ant.* iii. 6, 4).—Vers. 10, 11. Fifty loops and clasps were to be made to join the two halves together, as in the case of the inner tapestry, only the clasps were to be of brass or copper.—Vers. 12, 13. This tent-cloth was two cubits longer than the inner one, as each piece was 30 cubits long instead of 28; it was also two cubits broader, as it was composed of 11 pieces, the eleventh only reckoning as two cubits, as it was to be laid double. Consequently there was an excess (שֵׁרָטָה that which is over) of two cubits each way; and according to vers. 12 and 13 this was to be disposed of in the following manner: “*As for the spreading out of the excess in the tent-cloths, the half of the cloth in excess shall spread out over the back of the dwelling; and the cubit from here and from there in the excess in the length of the tent-cloths (i.e. the*

¹ The coverings of the tents of the Bedouin Arabs are still made of cloth woven from black goats’ hair, which the women spin and weave (see *Lynch’s Expedition of the United States to the Jordan and Dead Sea*).

cubit over in the length in each of the cloths) *shall be spread out on the sides of the dwelling from here and from there to cover it.*" Now since, according to this, one half of the two cubits of the sixth piece which was laid double was to hang down the back of the tabernacle, there only remained one cubit for the gable of the front. It follows, therefore, that the joining of the two halves with loops and clasps would come a cubit farther back, than the place where the curtain of the holy of holies divided the dwelling. But in consequence of the cloth being a cubit longer in every direction, it nearly reached the ground on all three sides, the thickness of the wooden framework alone preventing it from reaching it altogether.

Ver. 14. *Two other coverings* were placed on the top of this tent: one made of rams' skins dyed red, "as a covering for the tent," and another upon the top of this, made of the skins of the sea-cow (רִשְׁתֵּי, see at chap. xxv. 5).

Vers. 15–30. The *wooden framework*.—Vers. 15, 16. The boards for the dwelling were to be made "of acacia-wood standing," *i.e.* so that they could stand upright; each ten cubits long and one and a half broad. The thickness is not given; and if, on the one hand, we are not to imagine them too thin, as *Josephus* does, for example, who says they were only four fingers thick (Ant. iii. 6, 3), we have still less reason for following *Rashi*, *Lund*, *Bähr* and others, who suppose them to have been a cubit in thickness, thus making simple boards into colossal blocks, such as could neither have been cut from acacia-trees, nor carried upon desert roads.¹ To obtain boards of the required breadth, two or three planks were no doubt joined together according to the size of the trees.—Ver. 17. Every board was to have two יָדַי (lit. hands or holders) to hold them upright, pegs

¹ *Kamphausen* (*Stud. und Krit.* 1859, p. 117) appeals to *Bähr's Symbolik* 1, p. 261–2, and *Knobel, Exod.* p. 261, in support of the opinion, that at any rate formerly there were genuine acacias of such size and strength, that beams could have been cut from them a cubit and a half broad and a cubit thick; but we look in vain to either of these writings for such authority as will establish this fact. Expressions like those of *Jerome* and *Hasselquist*, viz. *grandes arbores* and *arbor ingens ramosissima*, are far too indefinite. It is true that, according to *Abdullatif*, the *Sont* is "a very large tree," but he gives a quotation from *Dinuri*, in which it is merely spoken of as "a tree of the size of a nut-tree." See the passages cited in *Rosenmüller's bibl. Althk.* iv. 1, p. 278, Not. 7, where we find the following remark of *Westling*

therefore; and they were to be "bound to one another" (משלֵב, from שָׁלַב in Chald. to connect, hence שְׁלֵבִים in 1 Kings vii. 28, the corner plates that hold together the four sides of a chest), not "pegged into one another," but joined together by a fastening dovetailed into the pegs, by which the latter were fastened still more firmly to the boards, and therefore had greater holding power than if each one had been simply sunk into the edge of the board.—Vers. 18-21. Twenty of these boards were to be prepared for the side of the dwelling that was turned towards the south, and forty sockets (סֻדָּיִם foundations, Job xxxviii. 6) or bases for the pegs, i.e. to put the pegs of the boards into, that the boards might stand upright; and the same number of boards and sockets for the north side. תִּימְנָה, "southward," is added to לְפָנֶיךָ נֶגֶב in ver. 18, to give a clearer definition of *negeb*, which primarily means the dry, and then the country to the south; an evident proof that at that time *negeb* was not established as a geographical term for the south, and therefore that it was not written here by a Palestinian, as *Knobel* supposes, but by Moses in the desert. The form of the "sockets" is not explained, and even in chap. xxxviii. 27, in the summing up of the gifts presented for the work, it is merely stated that a talent of silver (about 93 lb.) was applied to every socket.—Vers. 22-24. Six boards were to be made for the back of the dwelling westwards (יָפֶה), and two boards "for the corners or angles of the dwelling at the two outermost (hinder) sides." לְמִקְצֵת (for cornered), from מִקְצֵעַ, equivalent to מִקְצֵעַ an angle (ver. 24; Ezek. xlvi. 21, 22), from קָצַע to cut off, *lit.* a section, something cut off, hence an angle, or corner-piece. These corner boards (ver. 24) were to be "doubled (תְּמִימִם) from below, and whole (תְּמִימִם, *integri*, forming a whole) at its head (or towards its head, cf. לֵא chap. xxxvi.

on *Prosper. Alpin. de plantis Æg.: Caudicem non raro ampliorem deprehendi, quam ut brachio meo circumdari possit.* Even the statement of *Theophrast (hist. plant. 4, 3)*, to the effect that rafters are cut from these trees 12 cubits long (δωδεκάπηγυς ἐπέψιμος ὕλη), is no proof that they were beams a cubit and a half broad and a cubit thick. And even if there had been trees of this size in the peninsula of Sinai in Moses' time, a beam of such dimensions, according to *Kamphausen's* calculation, which is by no means too high, would have weighed more than twelve *cwt.* And certainly the Israelites could never have carried beams of this weight with them through the desert; for the waggons needed would have been such as could never be used where there are no beaten roads.

29) *with regard to the one ring, so shall it be to both of them* (so shall they both be made); *to the two corners shall they be* (i.e. designed for the two hinder corners). The meaning of these words, which are very obscure in some points, can only be the following: the two corner beams at the back were to consist of two pieces joined together at a right angle, so as to form as double boards one single whole from the bottom to the top. The expressions "from below" and "up to its head" are divided between the two predicates "doubled" (תִּפְּסָמִים) and "whole" (תְּחִלָּה), but they belong to both of them. Each of the corner beams was to be double from the bottom to the top, and still to form one whole. There is more difficulty in the words אֶל-הַמַּבְעֵת הָאֶחָד in ver. 24. It is impossible to attach any intelligible meaning to the rendering "to the first ring," so that even *Knobel*, who proposed it, has left it unexplained. There is hardly any other way of explaining it, than to take the word לָאֵץ in the sense of "having regard to a thing," and to understand the words as meaning, that the corner beams were to form one whole, from the fact that each received only one ring, probably at the corner, and not two, viz. one on each side. This one ring was placed half-way up the upright beam in the corner or angle, in such a manner that the central bolt, which stretched along the entire length of the walls (ver. 28), might fasten into it from both the side and back.—Ver. 25. Sixteen sockets were to be made for these eight boards, two for each.—Vers. 26–29. To fasten the boards, that they might not separate from one another, bars of acacia-wood were to be made and covered with gold, five for each of the three sides of the dwelling; and though it is not expressly stated, yet the reference to rings in ver. 29 as holders of the bars (בָּרִיחִים לְבָרִיחִים) is a sufficient indication that they were passed through golden rings fastened into the boards.—Ver. 28. "And the middle bar in the midst of the boards (i.e. at an equal distance from both top and bottom) shall be fastening (מְבַרֵּיחַ) from one end to the other." As it thus expressly stated with reference to the middle bar, that it was to fasten, i.e. to reach along the walls from one end to the other, we necessarily conclude, with *Rashi* and others, that the other four bars on every side were not to reach the whole length of the walls, and may therefore suppose that they were only half as long as the middle one, so that there were only three rows of bars on each wall, the upper and lower

being composed of two bars each.—Ver. 30. “*And set up the dwelling according to its right, as was shown thee upon the mountain*” (cf. chap. xxv. 9). Even the setting up and position of the dwelling were not left to human judgment, but were to be carried out *כְּמִשְׁפָּטוֹ*, *i.e.* according to the direction corresponding to its meaning and purpose. From the description which is given of the separate portions, it is evident that the dwelling was to be set up in the direction of the four quarters of the heavens, the back being towards the west, and the entrance to the east; whilst the whole of the dwelling formed an oblong of thirty cubits long, ten broad, and ten high. The length we obtain from the twenty boards of a cubit and a half in breadth; and the breadth, by adding to the nine cubits covered by the six boards at the back, half a cubit as the inner thickness of each of the corner beams. The thickness of the corner beams is not given, but we may conjecture that on the outside which formed part of the back they were three-quarters of a cubit thick, and that half a cubit is to be taken as the thickness towards the side. In this case, on the supposition that the side beams were a quarter of a cubit thick, the inner space would be exactly ten cubits broad and thirty and a quarter long; but the surplus quarter would be taken up by the thickness of the pillars upon which the inner curtain was hung, so that the room at the back would form a perfect cube, and the one at the front an oblong of exactly twenty cubits in length, ten in breadth, and ten in height.

Vers. 31-37. To divide the *dwelling* into two rooms, a *curtain* was to be made, of the same material, and woven in the same artistic manner as the inner covering of the walls (ver. 1). This was called *פְּרִיקָה*, *lit.* division, separation, from *פָּרַק* to divide, or *פְּרִיקַת טָסָה* (chap. xxxv. 12, xxxix. 34, xl. 21) division of the covering, *i.e.* the covering separation, or veil. They were to put (*נָתַן*), *i.e.* to hang this “*upon four pillars of gilded acacia-wood and their golden hooks, (standing) upon four silver sockets,*” under the loops (*קְרָסִים*) which held the two halves of the inner covering together (ver. 6). Thus the curtain divided the dwelling into two compartments, the one occupying ten cubits and the other twenty of its entire length.—Ver. 33. “*Thither (where the curtain hangs under the loops) within the curtain shalt thou bring the ark of testimony (chap. xxv. 16-22), and the curtain shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy*”

(קֹדֶשׁ הַקֹּדְשִׁים the holy of holies). The inner compartment was made into the most holy place through the ark of the covenant with the throne of grace upon it.—Ver. 35. The two other things (already described) were to be placed outside the curtain, viz. in the holy place; the candlestick opposite to the table, the former on the south side of the dwelling, the latter towards the north.—Vers. 36, 37. For the entrance to the tent they were also to make a curtain (כִּפְתָּן, *lit.* a covering, from כָּפַף to cover) of the same material as the inner curtain, but of work in mixed colours, *i.e.* not woven with figures upon it, but simply in stripes or checks. כְּעֵשֶׂה רֶקֶם does not mean coloured needle-work, with figures or flowers embroidered with the needle upon the woven fabric (as I asserted in my *Archäologie*, in common with the Rabbins, *Gesenius*, *Bähr*, and others); for in the only other passage in which רֶקֶם occurs, viz. Ps. cxxxix. 15, it does not mean to embroider, but to weave, and in the Arabic it signifies to make points, stripes, or lines, to work in mixed colours (see *Hartmann die Hebräerin am Putztisch* iii. 138 sqq.). This curtain was to hang on five gilded pillars of acacia-wood with golden hooks, and for these they were to cast sockets of brass. In the account of the execution of this work in chap. xxxvi. 38, it is still further stated, that the architect covered the heads (capitals) of the pillars and their girders (רִשְׁקִים, see chap. xxvii. 10) with gold. From this it follows, that the pillars were not entirely gilded, but only the capitals, and that they were fastened together with gilded girders. These girders were either placed upon the hooks that were fastened to the tops of the pillars, or, what I think more probable, formed a kind of architrave above the pillars, in which case the covering as well as the inner curtain merely hung upon the hooks of the columns. But if the pillars were not gilded all over, we must necessarily imagine the curtain as hung upon that side of the pillars which was turned towards the holy place, so that none of the white wood was to be seen inside the holy place; and the gilding of the capitals and architrave merely served to impress upon the forefront of the tabernacle the glory of a house of God.

If we endeavour to understand the reason for building the dwelling in this manner, there can be no doubt that the design of the wooden walls was simply to give stability to the tabernacle. Acacia-wood was chosen, because the acacia was the

only tree to be found in the desert of Arabia from which planks and beams could be cut, whilst the lightness and durability of this wood rendered it peculiarly suitable for a portable temple. The wooden framework was covered both within and without with hangings of drapery and other coverings, to give it the character of a tent, which is the term really applied to it in chap. xxvii. 21, and in most instances afterwards. The sanctuary of Jehovah in the midst of His people was to be a tent, because, so long as the people were wandering about and dwelt in tents, the dwelling of their God in the midst of them must be a tent also. The division of the dwelling into two parts corresponded to the design of the tabernacle, where Jehovah desired not to dwell alone by Himself, but to come and meet with His people (chap. xxv. 22). The most holy place was the true dwelling of Jehovah, where He was enthroned in a cloud, the visible symbol of His presence, above the cherubim, upon the capporeth of the ark of the covenant (see p. 169). The holy place, on the other hand, was the place where His people were to appear before Him, and draw near to Him with their gifts, the fruits of their earthly vocation, and their prayers, and to rejoice before His face in the blessings of His covenant grace. By the establishment of the covenant of Jehovah with the people of Israel, the separation of man from God, of which the fall of the progenitors of our race had been the cause, was to be brought to an end; an institution was to be set up, pointing to the reunion of man and God, to true and full vital communion with Him; and by this the kingdom of God was to be founded on earth in a local and temporal form. This kingdom of God, which was founded in Israel, was to be embodied in the tabernacle, and shadowed forth in its earthly and visible form as confined within the limits of time and space. This meaning was indicated not only in the instructions to set up the dwelling according to the four quarters of the globe and heavens, with the entrance towards sunrise and the holy of holies towards the west, but also in the quadrangular form of the building, the dwelling as a whole assuming the form of an oblong of thirty cubits in length, and ten in breadth and height, whilst the most holy place was a cube of ten cubits in every direction. In the symbolism of antiquity, the square was a symbol of the universe or *cosmos*; and thus, too, in the symbolism of the Scriptures it

is a type of the world as the scene of divine revelation, the sphere of the kingdom of God, for which the world from the very first had been intended by God, and to which, notwithstanding the fall of man, who was created lord of the earth, it was to be once more renewed and glorified. Hence the seal of the kingdom of God was impressed upon the sanctuary of God in Israel through the quadrangular form that was given to its separate rooms. And whilst the direction in which it was set up, towards the four quarters of the heavens, showed that the kingdom of God that was planted in Israel was intended to embrace the entire world, the oblong shape given to the whole building set forth the idea of the present incompleteness of the kingdom, and the cubic form of the most holy place its ideal and ultimate perfection.¹ Yet even in its temporal form, it was perfect of its kind, and therefore the component parts of the quadrangular building were regulated by the number ten, the stamp of completeness.

The splendour of the building, as the earthly reflection of the glory of the kingdom of God, was also in harmony with this explanation of its meaning. In the dwelling itself everything was either overlaid with gold or made of pure gold, with the exception of the foundations or sockets of the boards and inner pillars, for which silver was used. In the gold, with its glorious, yea, godlike splendour (Job xxxvii. 22), the glory of the dwelling-

¹ The significant character of these different quadrangular forms is placed beyond all doubt, when we compare the tabernacle and Solomon's temple, which was built according to the same proportions, with the prophetic description of the temple and holy city in Ezek. xl.-xlviii., and that of the heavenly Jerusalem in Rev. xxi. and xxii. Just as in both the tabernacle and Solomon's temple the most holy place was in the form of a perfect cube (of 10 and 20 cubits respectively), so John saw the city of God, which came down from God out of heaven, in the form of a perfect cube. "The length, and the breadth, and the height of it were equal," viz. 12,000 furlongs on every side (Rev. xxi. 16), a symbolical representation of the idea, that the holy of holies in the temple will be seen in its perfected form in the heavenly Jerusalem, and God will dwell in it for ever, along with the just made perfect. This city of God is "the tabernacle of God with men;" it has no longer a temple, but the Lord God of Hosts and the Lamb are the temple of it (ver. 22), and those who dwell therein see the face of God and the Lamb (chap. xxii. 4). The square comes next to the cube, and the regular oblong next to this. The tabernacle was in the form of an oblong: the dwelling was 30 cubits long and 10 broad, and the court 100 cubits long and 50 broad. Solomon's temple, when regarded as a whole, was in the same form; it was 60 cubits long and 20 cubits broad, apart from the

place of God was reflected; whilst the silver, as the symbol of moral purity, shadowed forth the holiness of the foundation of the house or kingdom of God. The four colours, and the figures upon the drapery and curtains of the temple, were equally significant. Whilst the *four* colours, like the same number of coverings, showed their general purpose as connected with the building of the kingdom of God, the brilliant white of the byssus stands prominently out among the rest of the colours as the ground of the woven fabrics, and the colour which is invariably mentioned first. The splendid white byssus represented the holiness of the building; the hyacinth, a dark blue approaching black rather than bright blue, but the true colour of the sky in southern countries, its heavenly origin and character; the purple, a dark rich red, its royal glory; whilst the crimson, a light brilliant red, the colour of blood and vigorous life, set forth the strength of imperishable life in the abode and kingdom of the holy and glorious God-King. Lastly, through the figures of cherubim woven into these fabrics the dwelling became a symbolical representation of the kingdom of glory, in which the heavenly spirits surround the throne of God, the heavenly Jerusalem with its myriads of angels, the city of the living God, to which the people of God will come when their heavenly calling is fulfilled (Heb. xii. 22, 23).

porch and side buildings. In Ezekiel's vision not only is the sanctuary a square of 500 reeds (Ezek. xlii. 15-20, xlv. 2), but the inner court (chap. xl. 23, 27, 47), the paved space in the outer court (xl. 19), and other parts also, are all in the form of squares. The city opposite to the temple was a square of 4500 reeds (chap. xlviii. 16), and the suburbs a square of 250 reeds on every side (ver. 17). The idea thus symbolically expressed is, that the temple and city, and in fact the whole of the holy ground, already approximate to the form of the most holy place. Both the city and temple are still distinct from one another, although they both stand upon holy ground in the midst of the land (chap. xlvii. and xlviii.); and in the temple itself the distinction between the holy place and the most holy is still maintained, although the most holy place is no longer separated by a curtain from the holy place; and in the same manner the distinction is still maintained between the temple-building and the courts, though the latter have acquired much greater importance than in Solomon's temple, and are very minutely described, whereas they are only very briefly referred to in the case of Solomon's temple. The sanctuary which Ezekiel saw, however, was only a symbol of the renewed and glorified kingdom of God, not of the perfected kingdom. This was first shown to the holy seer in Patmos, in the vision of the heavenly Jerusalem, as it appeared in a perfect cubical form.

Chap. xxvii. 1-8. THE ALTAR OF BURNT-OFFERING (cf. chap. xxxviii. 1-7).—“*Make the altar* (the altar of burnt-offering, according to chap. xxxviii. 1) *of acacia-wood, five cubits long, and five cubits broad* (רַבֵּי “foured,” i.e. four-sided or quadrangular), *and three cubits high. At its four corners shall its horns be from* (out of) *it,*” i.e. not removable, but as if growing out of it. These horns were projections at the corners of the altar, formed to imitate in all probability the horns of oxen, and in these the whole force of the altar was concentrated. The blood of the sin-offering was therefore smeared upon them (Lev. iv. 7), and those who fled to the altar to save their lives laid hold of them (*vid.* chap. xxi. 14, and 1 Kings i. 50; also my commentary on the passage). The altar was to be covered with copper or brass, and all the things used in connection with it were to be made of brass. These were,—(1) the *pans*, to cleanse it of the ashes of the fat (ver. 3: וַיִּשָּׂן, a denom. verb from רִשָּׂן the ashes of fat, that is to say, the ashes that arose from burning the flesh of the sacrifice upon the altar, has a privative meaning, and signifies “to ash away,” i.e. to cleanse from ashes); (2) *shovels*, from יָעָה to take away (Isa. xxviii. 17); (3) *מַזְרְקוֹת* things used for *sprinkling the blood*, from זָרַק to sprinkle; (4) *מַזְלָגוֹת* forks, flesh-hooks (cf. מִזְלָג 1 Sam. ii. 13); (5) *מַחֲתֹת* coal-scoops (cf. xxv. 38). לְכֹל־כֵּלָיו וְנֹ: either “for all the vessels thereof thou shalt make brass,” or “as for all its vessels, thou shalt make (them) of brass.”—Ver. 4. The altar was to have *מַכְבֵּר* a *grating*, מַעֲשֵׂה רֶשֶׁת *net-work*, i.e. a covering of brass made in the form of a net, of larger dimensions than the sides of the altar, for this grating was to be under the “compass” (פְּרֹכֶת) of the altar from beneath, and to reach to the half of it (half-way up, ver. 5); and in it, i.e. at the four ends (or corners) of it, four brass rings were to be fastened, for the poles to carry it with. פְּרֹכֶת (from פָּרַכְתָּ *circum-dedit*) only occurs here and in chap. xxxviii. 4, and signifies a border (סִבְכָּא *Targums*), i.e. a projecting framework or bench running round the four sides of the altar, about half a cubit or a cubit broad, nailed to the walls (of the altar) on the outside, and fastened more firmly to them by the copper covering which was common to both. The copper grating was below this bench, and on the outside. The bench rested upon it, or rather it hung from the outer edge of the bench and rested upon the ground, like the inner chest, which it surrounded on all four sides, and in

which there were no perforations. It formed with the bench or *carcob* a projecting footing, which caused the lower half of the altar to look broader than the upper on every side. The priest stood upon this *carcob* or bench when offering sacrifice, or when placing the wood, or doing anything else upon the altar. This explains Aaron's coming down (רָדַף) from the altar (Lev. ix. 22); and there is no necessity to suppose that there were steps to the altar, as *Knobel* does in opposition to chap. xx. 26. For even if the height of the altar, viz. three cubits, would be so great that a bench half-way up would be too high for any one to step up to, the earth could be slightly raised on one side so as to make the ascent perfectly easy; and when the priest was standing upon the bench, he could perform all that was necessary upon the top of the altar without any difficulty.—Vers. 6, 7. The poles were to be made of acacia-wood, and covered with brass, and to be placed in the rings that were fixed in the two sides for the purpose of carrying the altar. The additional instructions in ver. 8, "hollow with tables shalt thou make it, as it was showed thee in the mount" (cf. xxv. 9), refer apparently, if we judge from chap. xx. 24, 25, simply to the wooden framework of the altar, which was covered with brass, and which was filled with earth, or gravel and stones, when the altar was about to be used, the whole being levelled so as to form a hearth. The shape thus given to the altar of burnt-offering corresponded to the other objects in the sanctuary. It could also be carried about with ease, and fixed in any place, and could be used for burning the sacrifices without the wooden walls being injured by the fire.

Vers. 9-19 (cf. chap. xxxviii. 9-20). The COURT of the dwelling was to consist of קַלְעִים "hangings" of spun byssus, and pillars with brass (copper) sockets, and hooks and fastenings for the pillars of silver. The pillars were of course made of acacia-wood; they were five cubits high, with silvered capitals (chap. xxxviii. 17, 19), and carried the hangings, which were fastened to them by means of the hooks and fastenings. There were twenty of them on both the southern and northern sides, and the length of the drapery on each of these sides was 100 cubits (מֵאָה בְּאַמָּה, 100 (*sc.* measured) by the cubit), so that the court was a hundred cubits long (ver. 18).—Vers. 12, 13. "As for the

breadth of the court on the west side, (there shall be) curtains fifty cubits; their pillars twenty; and the breadth of the court towards the front, on the east side, fifty cubits." The front is divided in vers. 14-16 into two אַתְּנָי, *lit.* shoulders, *i.e.* sides or side-pieces, each consisting of 15 cubits of hangings and three pillars with their sockets, and a doorway (אֲשֵׁר) naturally in the middle, which was covered by a curtain (אֲרָמֶז) formed of the same material as the covering at the entrance to the dwelling, of 20 cubits in length, with four pillars and the same number of sockets. The pillars were therefore equidistant from one another, viz. 5 cubits apart. Their total number was 60 (not 56), which was the number required, at the distance mentioned, to surround a quadrangular space of 100 cubits long and 50 cubits broad.¹—Ver. 17. *All the pillars of the court round about (shall be) bound with connecting rods of silver.*" As the rods connecting the pillars of the court were of silver, and those connecting the pillars at the entrance to the dwelling were of wood overlaid with gold, the former must have been intended for a different purpose from the latter, simply serving as rods to which to fasten the hangings, whereas those at the door of the dwelling formed an architrave. The height of the hangings of the court and the covering of the door is given in chap. xxxviii. 18 as 5 cubits, corresponding to the height of the pillars given in ver. 18 of the chapter before

¹ Although any one may easily convince himself of the correctness of these numbers by drawing a figure, *Knobel* has revived *Philo's* erroneous statement about 56 pillars and the double reckoning of the pillars in the corner. And the statement in vers. 14-16, that three pillars were to be made in front to carry the hangings on either side of the door, and four to carry the curtain which covered the entrance, may be easily shown to be correct, notwithstanding the fact that, as every drawing shows, four pillars would be required, and not three only, to carry 15 cubits of hangings, and five (not four) to carry a curtain 20 cubits broad, if the pillars were to be placed 5 cubits apart; for the corner pillars, as belonging to both sides, and the pillars which stood between the hangings and the curtain on either side, could only be reckoned as halves in connection with each side or each post; and in reckoning the number of pillars according to the method adopted in every other case, the pillar from which you start would not be reckoned at all. Now, if you count the pillars of the eastern side upon this principle (starting from a corner pillar, which is not reckoned, because it is the starting-point and is the last pillar of the side wall), you have 1, 2, 3, then 1, 2, 3, 4, and then again 1, 2, 3; that is to say, 3 pillars for each wing and 4 for the curtain, although the hangings of each wing would really be supported by 4 pillars, and the curtain in the middle by 5.

us; but the expression in chap. xxxviii. 18, "the height in the breadth," is a singular one, and בַּחַיְת is probably to be understood in the sense of בֵּית door-place or door-way,—the meaning of the passage being, "the height of the covering in the door-way." In ver. 18, "50 everywhere," *πεντήκοντα ἐπὶ πενήκοντα* (LXX.), *lit.* 50 by 50, is to be understood as relating to the extent towards the north and south; and the reading of the Samaritan text, *viz.* בַּחַיְת for בַּחַיְת , is merely the result of an arbitrary attempt to bring the text into conformity with the previous בַּחַיְת , whilst the LXX., on the other hand, by an equally arbitrary change, have rendered the passage *ἐκατὸν ἐφ' ἑκατόν*.—Ver. 19. "*All the vessels of the dwelling in all the work thereof (i.e. all the tools needed for the tabernacle), and all its pegs, and all the pegs of the court, (shall be of) brass or copper.*" The vessels of the dwelling are not the things required for the performance of worship, but the tools used in setting up the tabernacle and taking it down again.

If we inquire still further into the design and meaning of the court, the erection of a court surrounding the dwelling on all four sides is to be traced to the same circumstance as that which rendered it necessary to divide the dwelling itself into two parts, *viz.* to the fact, that on account of the unholiness of the nation, it could not come directly into the presence of Jehovah, until the sin which separates unholy man from the holy God had been atoned for. Although, by virtue of their election as the children of Jehovah, or their adoption as the nation of God, it was intended that the Israelites should be received by the Lord into His house, and dwell as a son in his father's house; yet under the economy of the law, which only produced the knowledge of sin, uncleanness, and unholiness, their fellowship with Jehovah, the Holy One, could only be sustained through mediators appointed and sanctified by God: *viz.* at the institution of the covenant, through His servant Moses; and during the existence of this covenant, through the chosen priests of the family of Aaron. It was through them that the Lord was to be approached, and the nation to be brought near to Him. Every day, therefore, they entered the holy place of the dwelling, to offer to the Lord the sacrifices of prayer and the fruits of the people's earthly vocation. But even they were not allowed to go into the immediate presence of the holy God. The most

holy place, where God was enthroned, was hidden from them by the curtain, and only once a year was the high priest permitted, as the head of the whole congregation, which was called to be the holy nation of God, to lift this curtain and appear before God with the atoning blood of the sacrifice and the cloud of incense (Lev. xvi.). The access of the nation to its God was restricted to the court. There it could receive from the Lord, through the medium of the sacrifices which it offered upon the altar of burnt-offering, the expiation of its sins, His grace and blessing, and strength to live anew. Whilst the dwelling itself represented the house of God, the dwelling-place of Jehovah in the midst of His people (chap. xxiii. 19; Josh. vi. 24; 1 Sam. i. 7, 24, etc.), the palace of the God-King, in which the priestly nation drew near to Him (1 Sam. i. 9, iii. 3; Ps. v. 8, xxvii. 4, 6); the court which surrounded the dwelling represented the kingdom of the God-King, the covenant land or dwelling-place of Israel in the kingdom of its God. In accordance with this purpose, the court was in the form of an oblong, to exhibit its character as part of the kingdom of God. But its pillars and hangings were only five cubits high, *i.e.* half the height of the dwelling, to set forth the character of incompleteness, or of the threshold to the sanctuary of God. All its vessels were of copper-brass, which, being allied to the earth in both colour and material, was a symbolical representation of the earthly side of the kingdom of God; whereas the silver of the capitals of the pillars, and of the hooks and rods which sustained the hangings, as well as the white colour of the byssus-hangings, might point to the holiness of this site for the kingdom of God. On the other hand, in the gilding of the capitals of the pillars at the entrance to the dwelling, and the brass of their sockets, we find gold and silver combined, to set forth the union of the court with the sanctuary, *i.e.* the union of the dwelling-place of Israel with the dwelling-place of its God, which is realized in the kingdom of God.

The design and significance of the court culminated in the altar of burnt-offering, the principal object in the court; and upon this the burnt-offerings and slain-offerings, in which the covenant nation consecrated itself as a possession to its God, were burnt. The heart of this altar was of earth or unhewn stones, having the character of earth, not only on account of its

being appointed as the place of sacrifice and as the hearth for the offerings, but because the earth itself formed the real or material sphere for the kingdom of God in the Old Testament stage of its development. This heart of earth was elevated by the square copper covering into a vessel of the sanctuary, a place where Jehovah would record His name, and come to Israel and bless them (chap. xx. 24, cf. xxix. 42, 44), and was consecrated as a place of sacrifice, by means of which Israel could raise itself to the Lord, and ascend to Him in the sacrifice. And this significance of the altar culminated in its horns, upon which the blood of the sin-offering was smeared. Just as, in the case of the horned animals, their strength and beauty are concentrated in the horns, and the horn has become in consequence a symbol of strength, or of fulness of vital energy; so the significance of the altar as a place of the saving and life-giving power of God, which the Lord bestows upon His people in His kingdom, was concentrated in the horns of the altar.

Vers. 20 and 21. The instructions concerning the OIL FOR THE CANDLESTICK, and the daily trimming of the lamps by the priests, form a transition from the fitting up of the sanctuary to the installation of its servants.—Ver. 20. The sons of Israel were to bring to Moses (*lit.* fetch to thee) olive oil, *pure* (*i.e.* prepared from olives “which had been cleansed from leaves, twigs, dust, etc., before they were crushed”), *beaten*, *i.e.*, obtained not by crushing in oil-presses, but by beating, when the oil which flows out by itself is of the finest quality and a white colour. This oil was to be “for the candlestick to set up a continual light.”—Ver. 21. Aaron and his sons were to prepare this light in the tabernacle outside the curtain, which was over the testimony (*i.e.* which covered or concealed it), from evening to morning, before Jehovah. “The tabernacle of the congregation,” *lit.* tent of assembly: this expression is applied to the sanctuary for the first time in the present passage, but it afterwards became the usual appellation, and accords both with its structure and design, as it was a tent in style, and was set apart as the place where Jehovah would meet with the Israelites and commune with them (chap. xxv. 22). The ordering of the light from evening to morning consisted, according to chap. xxx. 7, 8, and Lev. xxiv. 3, 4, in placing the lamps upon the candlestick in

the evening and lighting them, that they might give light through the night, and then cleaning them in the morning and filling them with fresh oil. The words "a statute for ever unto their generations (see at chap. xii. 14) on the part of the children of Israel," are to be understood as referring not merely to the gift of oil to be made by the Israelites for all time, but to the preparation of the light, which was to be regarded as of perpetual obligation and worth. "For ever," in the same sense as in Gen. xvii. 7 and 13 (see vol. i. p. 227).

Chap. xxviii. (cf. xxxix. 1-31). APPOINTMENT AND CLOTHING OF THE PRIESTS.—Vers. 1, 5. "*Let Aaron thy brother draw near to thee from among the children of Israel, and his sons with him, that he may be a priest to Me.*" Moses is distinguished from the people as the mediator of the covenant. Hence he was to cause Aaron and his sons to come to him, *i.e.* to separate them from the people, and install them as priests, or perpetual mediators between Jehovah and His people. The primary meaning of *cohen*, the priest, has been retained in the Arabic, where it signifies *administrator alieni negotii*, *viz.* to act as a mediator for a person, or as his plenipotentiary, from which it came to be employed chiefly in connection with priestly acts. Among the heathen Arabs it is used "*maxime de hariolis vatibusque*;" by the Hebrews it was mostly applied to the priests of Jehovah; and there are only a few places in which it is used in connection with the higher officers of state, who stood next to the king, and acted as it were as mediators between the king and the nation (thus 2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 26; 1 Kings iv. 5). For the duties of their office the priests were to receive "*holy garments for glory and for honour.*" Before they could draw near to Jehovah the Holy One (Lev. xi. 45), it was necessary that their unholiness should be covered over with holy clothes, which were to be made by men endowed with wisdom, whom Jehovah had filled with the spirit of wisdom. "*Wise-hearted,*" *i.e.* gifted with understanding and judgment; the heart being regarded as the birth-place of the thoughts. In the Old Testament *wisdom* is constantly used for practical intelligence in the affairs of life; here, for example, it is equivalent to artistic skill surpassing man's natural ability, which is therefore described as being filled with the divine spirit of wisdom. These clothes were to

be used "to sanctify him (Aaron and his sons), that he might be a priest to Jehovah." Sanctification, as the indispensable condition of priestly service, was not merely the removal of the uncleanness which flowed from sin, but, as it were, the transformation of the natural into the glory of the image of God. In this sense the holy clothing served the priest for glory and ornament. The different portions of the priest's state-dress mentioned in ver. 4 are described more fully afterwards. For making them, the skilled artists were to take *the* gold, *the* hyacinth, etc. The definite article is used before gold and the following words, because the particular materials, which would be presented by the people, are here referred to.

Vers. 6-14. The *first* part mentioned of Aaron's holy dress, *i.e.* of the official dress of the high priest, is the *ephod*. The etymology of this word is uncertain; the *Sept.* rendering is *ἐπιώμῳ* (*Vulg. superhumeralē*, shoulder-dress; *Luther*, "body-coat"). It was to be made of gold, hyacinth, etc., artistically woven,—of the same material, therefore, as the inner drapery and curtain of the tabernacle; but instead of having the figures of cherubim woven into it, it was to be worked throughout with gold, *i.e.* with gold thread. According to chap. xxxix. 3, the gold plates used for the purpose were beaten out, and then threads were cut (from them), to be worked into the hyacinth, purple, scarlet, and byssus. It follows from this, that gold threads were taken for every one of these four yarns, and woven with them.¹—Ver. 7. "Two connecting shoulder-pieces shall it have for its two ends, that it may be bound together." If we compare the statement in chap. xxxix. 4,—“shoulder-pieces they made for it, connecting; at its two ends was it connected,”—there can hardly be any doubt that the ephod consisted of two pieces, which were connected together at the top upon (over) the shoulders; and that *Knobel* is wrong in supposing that it consisted of a single piece, with a hole cut on each side for the arms to be put through. If it had been a compact garment, which had to be drawn over the head like the robe (vers. 31, 32), the

¹ The art of weaving fabrics with gold thread (cf. *Plin. h. n.* 33, c. 3, s. 19, "aurum netur ac texitur lanæ modo et sine lana"), was known in ancient Egypt. "Among the coloured Egyptian costumes which are represented upon the monuments, there are some that are probably woven with gold thread."—*Wilkinson* 3, 131. *Hengstenberg*, Egypt, etc., p. 140.

opening for the head would certainly have been mentioned, as it is in the case of the latter (ver. 32). The words of the text point most decidedly to the rabbinical idea, that it consisted of two pieces reaching to about the hip, one hanging over the breast, the other down the back, and that it was constructed with two shoulder-pieces which joined the two together. These shoulder-pieces were not made separate, however, and then sewed upon one of the pieces; but they were woven along with the front piece, and that not merely at the top, so as to cover the shoulders when the ephod was worn, but according to ver. 25 (? 27), reaching down on both sides from the shoulders to the girdle (ver. 8).—Ver. 8. “*And the girdle of its putting on which (is) upon it, shall be of it, like its work, gold, etc.*” There was to be a girdle upon the ephod, of the same material and the same artistic work as the ephod, and joined to it, not separated from it. The בִּשְׂמֹנֶה mentioned along with the ephod cannot mean *ὑφασμα, textura* (LXX., *Cler.*, etc.), but is to be traced to שָׁבַח = שָׁבַח to bind, to fasten, and to be understood in the sense of *cingulum*, a girdle (compare chap. xxix. 5 with Lev. viii. 7, “he girded him with the girdle of the ephod”). מִשְׁנֵהוּ is no doubt to be derived from שָׁבַח , and signifies the putting on of the ephod. In Isa. xxx. 22 it is applied to the covering of a statue; at the same time, this does not warrant us in attributing to the verb, as used in chap. ix. 5 and Lev. viii. 7, the meaning, to put on or clothe. This girdle, by which the two parts of the ephod were fastened tightly to the body, so as not to hang loose, was attached to the lower part or extremity of the ephod, so that it was fastened round the body below the breastplate (cf. vers. 27, 28, chap. xxxix. 20, 21).—Vers. 9–12. Upon the shoulder-piece of the ephod two beryls (precious stones) were to be placed, one upon each shoulder; and upon these the names of the sons of Israel were to be engraved, six names upon each “according to their generations,” i.e. according to their respective ages, or, as *Josephus* has correctly explained it, so that the names of the six elder sons were engraved upon the precious stone on the right shoulder, and those of the six younger sons upon that on the left.—Ver. 11. “*Work of the engraver in stone, of seal-cutting shalt thou engrave the two stones according to the names of the sons of Israel.*” The engraver in stone: *lit.* one who works stones; here, one who cuts and polishes precious stones.

The meaning is, that just as precious stones are cut, and seals engraved upon them, so these two stones were to be engraved according to the names of the sons of Israel, *i.e.*, so that the engraving should answer to their names, or their names be cut into the stones. “*Surrounded by gold-twist shalt thou make it.*” מִשְׁבְּצוֹת זָהָב, from שָׁבַץ to twist, is used in ver. 39 (cf. Ps. xlv. 14) for a texture woven in checks; and here it denotes not merely a simple gold-setting, but, according to ver. 13, gold-twists or ornaments representing plaits, which surrounded the golden setting in which the stones were fixed, and not only served to fasten the stones upon the woven fabric, but formed at the same time clasps or brooches, by which the two parts of the ephod were fastened together. Thus Josephus says (*Ant.* iii. 7, 5) there were two sardonyxes upon the shoulders, to be used for clasps.—Ver. 12. The precious stones were to be upon the shoulder-pieces of the ephod, stones of memorial for the sons of Israel; and Aaron was to bear their names before Jehovah upon his two shoulders for a memorial, *i.e.* that Jehovah might remember the sons of Israel when Aaron appeared before Him clothed with the ephod (cf. ver. 29). As a shoulder-dress, the ephod was *par excellence* the official dress of the high priest. The burden of the office rested upon the shoulder, and the insignia of the office were also worn upon it (*Isa.* xxii. 22). The duty of the high priest was to enter into the presence of God and make atonement for the people as their mediator. To show that as mediator he brought the nation to God, the names of the twelve tribes were engraved upon precious stones on the shoulders of the ephod. The precious stones, with their richness and brilliancy, formed the most suitable earthly substratum to represent the glory into which Israel was to be transformed as the possession of Jehovah (*xix.* 5); whilst the colours and material of the ephod, answering to the colours and texture of the hangings of the sanctuary, indicated the service performed in the sanctuary by the person clothed with the ephod, and the gold with which the coloured fabric was worked, the glory of that service.—Vers. 13, 14. There were also to be made for the ephod two (see ver. 25) golden plaits, golden borders (probably small plaits in the form of rosettes), and two small chains of pure gold: “*close shalt thou make them, corded*” (*lit.* work of cords or strings), *i.e.* not formed of links, but of gold thread

twisted into cords, which were to be placed upon the golden plaits or fastened to them. As these chains served to fasten the *choshen* to the ephod, a description of them forms a fitting introduction to the account of this most important ornament upon the state dress of the high priest.

Vers. 15-30. The *second* ornament consisted of the *choshen* or *breastplate*. *Choshen mishpat*, λογείον τῶν κρίσεων (LXX.), *rationale judicii* (Vulg.). מִשְׁפָּט probably signifies an ornament (*Arab. pulcher fuit*; *Ges.*); and the appended word *mishpat*, right, decision of right, points to its purpose (see at ver. 30). This breastplate was to be a woven fabric of the same material and the same kind of work as the ephod. “*Fourfold shall it be, doubled (laid together), a span (half a cubit) its length, and a span its breadth.*” The woven cloth was to be laid together double like a kind of pocket, of the length and breadth of half a cubit, *i.e.* the quarter of a square cubit.—Ver. 17. “*And fill thereon (put on it) a stone-setting, four rows of stones,*” *i.e.* fix four rows of set jewels upon it. The stones, so far as their names can be determined with the help of the ancient versions, the researches of *L. de Dieu* (*animadv. ad Ex. xxviii.*) and *Braun* (*vestit. ii. c. 8-10*), and other sources pointed out in *Winer’s R. W.* (*s. v. Edelsteine*), were the following:—In the *first* or upper row, *odem* (σάρδιος), *i.e.* our cornelian, of a blood-red colour; *pitdah*, τοπάξιον, the golden topaz; *bareketh*, lit. the flashing, σμάραγδος, the emerald, of a brilliant green. In the *second* row, *nophek*, ἀνθραξ, *carbunculus*, the ruby or carbuncle, a fire-coloured stone; *sappir*, the sapphire, of a sky-blue colour; *jahalom*, ἴασπις according to the LXX., but this is rather to be found in the *jaspeh*,—according to the *Græc., Ven., and Pers.*, to *Aben Ezra*, etc., the diamond, and according to others the *onyx*, a kind of chalcedony, of the same colour as the nail upon the human finger through which the flesh is visible. In the *third* row, *leshem*, λυγύριον, *ligurius*, *i.e.*, according to *Braun* and others, a kind of hyacinth, a transparent stone chiefly of an orange colour, but running sometimes into a reddish brown, at other times into a brownish or pale red, and sometimes into an approach to a pistachio green; *shevo*, ἀχάτης, a composite stone formed of quartz, chalcedony, cornelian, flint, jasper, etc., and therefore glittering with different colours; and *achlamah*, ἀμέθυστος, amethyst, a stone for the most part of a violet colour.

In the *fourth* row, *tarshish*, χρυσόλιθος, chrysolite, a brilliant stone of a golden colour, not like what is now called a chrysolite, which is of a pale green with a double refraction; *shoham*, beryl (see at Gen. ii. 12); and *jaspeh*, no doubt the jasper, an opaque stone, for the most part of a dull red, often with cloudy and flame-like shadings, but sometimes yellow, red, brown, or some other colour.—Ver. 20. “*Gold borders shall be on their settings*” (see at vers. 11 and 13). The golden capsules, in which the stones were “*filled,*” *i.e.* set, were to be surrounded by golden ornaments, which not only surrounded and ornamented the stones, but in all probability helped to fix them more firmly and yet more easily upon the woven fabric.—Ver. 21. “*And the stones shall be according to the names of the sons of Israel, twelve according to their names; seal-engraving according to each one’s name shall be for the twelve tribes.*” (On שָׁבֵט before עֲלֵי־שֵׁמוֹ see at Gen. xv. 10.)—Vers. 22-25. To bind the *choshen* to the ephod there were to be two close, corded chains of pure gold, which are described here in precisely the same manner as in ver. 14; so that ver. 22 is to be regarded as a simple repetition of ver. 14, not merely because these chains are only mentioned once in the account of the execution of the work (chap. xxxix. 15), but because, according to ver. 25, these chains were to be fastened upon the rosettes noticed in ver. 14, exactly like those described in ver. 13. These chains, which are called cords or strings at ver. 24, were to be attached to two golden rings at the two (upper) ends of the *choshen*, and the two ends of the chains were to be put, *i.e.* bound firmly to the golden settings of the shoulder-pieces of the ephod (ver. 13), upon the front of it (see at chap. xxvi. 9 and xxv. 37).—Ver. 26. Two other golden rings were to be “*put at the two ends of the choshen, at its edge, which is on the opposite side* (see at chap. xxv. 37) *of the ephod inwards,*” *i.e.* at the two ends or corners of the lower border of the *choshen*, upon the inner side—the side turned towards the ephod.—Vers. 27, 28. Two golden rings were also to be put “*upon the shoulder-pieces of the ephod underneath, toward the fore-part thereof, near the joining above the girdle of it,*” and to fasten the *choshen* from its (lower) rings to the (lower) rings of the ephod with threads of hyacinth, that it might be over the girdle (above it), and not move away (חָזַק Niphel of חָזַק, in Arabic *removit*), *i.e.* that it might keep its place above the girdle and against the ephod

without shifting.—Ver. 29. In this way Aaron was to bear upon his breast the names of the sons of Israel engraved upon this breastplate, as a memorial before Jehovah, whenever he went into the sanctuary.—Ver. 30. Into this *choshen* Moses was to put the *Urim* and *Thummim*, that they might be upon his heart when he came before Jehovah, and that he might thus constantly bear the right (*mishpat*) of the children of Israel upon his heart before Jehovah. It is evident at once from this, that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were to bring the right of the children of Israel before the Lord, and that the breastplate was called *choshen mishpat* because the *Urim* and *Thummim* were in it. Moreover it also follows from the expression לִפְנֵי הַיְהוָה , both heré and in Lev. viii. 8, that the *Urim* and *Thummim* were not only distinct from the *choshen*, but were placed in it, and not merely suspended upon it, as *Knobel* supposes. For although the LXX. have adopted the rendering *ἐπιτιθέναι ἐπὶ*, the phrase is constantly used to denote putting or laying one thing into another, and never (not even in 1 Sam. vi. 8 and 2 Sam. xi. 16) merely placing one thing upon or against another. For this, לִפְנֵי הַיְהוָה is the expression invariably used in the account before us (cf. vers. 14 and 23 sqq.).

What the *Urim* and *Thummim* really were, cannot be determined with certainty, either from the names themselves, or from any other circumstances connected with them.¹ The LXX. render the words *δήλωσις* (or *δηλος*) *καὶ ἀλήθεια*, i.e. revelation and truth. This expresses with tolerable accuracy the meaning of *Urim* (אֲרָמִים light, illumination), but *Thummim* (טֻמִּימִים) means *integritas*, inviolability, perfection, and not *ἀλήθεια*. The rendering given by *Symm.* and *Theod.*, viz. *φωτισμοὶ καὶ τελειώσεις*, illumination and completion, is much better; and there is no good ground for giving up this rendering in favour of that of the LXX., since the analogy between the *Urim* and *Thummim* and the *ἀγαλμα* of sapphire-stones, or the *ζώδιον* of precious stones, which was worn by the Egyptian high priest suspended by a golden chain, and called *ἀλήθεια* (*Aelian. var. hist.* 14, 34; *Diod. Sic.* i. 48, 75), sufficiently explains the rendering *ἀλήθεια*, which the LXX. have given to *Thummim*, but it by no means warrants *Knobel's* conclusion, that the Hebrews had adopted the Egyptian names along with the thing itself.

¹ The leading opinions and the most important writings upon the subject are given in my *Bib. Archæol.* § 39, note 9.

The words are therefore to be explained from the Coptic. The Urim and Thummim are analogous, it is true, to the *εἰκὼν τῆς ἀληθείας*, which the Egyptian ἀρχιδικαστής hung round his neck, but they are by no means identical with it, or to be regarded as two figures which were a symbolical representation of revelation and truth. If Aaron was to bring the right of the children of Israel before Jehovah in the breastplate that was placed upon his breast with the Urim and Thummim, the latter, if they were intended to represent anything, could only be symbolical of the right or rightful condition of Israel. But the words do not warrant any such conclusion. If the Urim and Thummim had been intended to represent any really existing thing, their nature, or the mode of preparing them, would certainly have been described. Now, if we refer to Num. xxvii. 21, where Joshua as the commander of the nation is instructed to go to the high priest Eleazar, that the latter may inquire before Jehovah, through the right of Urim, how the whole congregation should walk and act, we can draw no other conclusion, than that the Urim and Thummim are to be regarded as a certain medium, given by the Lord to His people, through which, whenever the congregation required divine illumination to guide its actions, that illumination was guaranteed, and by means of which the rights of Israel, when called in question or endangered, were to be restored, and that this medium was bound up with the official dress of the high priest, though its precise character can no longer be determined. Consequently the Urim and Thummim did not represent the illumination and right of Israel, but were merely a promise of these, a pledge that the Lord would maintain the rights of His people, and give them through the high priest the illumination requisite for their protection. Aaron was to bear the children of Israel upon his heart, in the precious stones to be worn upon his breast with the names of the twelve tribes. The heart, according to the biblical view, is the centre of the spiritual life,—not merely of the willing, desiring, thinking life, but of the emotional life, as the seat of the feelings and affections (see *Delitzsch bibl. Psychologie*, pp. 203 sqq.). Hence to bear upon the heart does not merely mean to bear in mind, but denotes “that personal intertwining with the life of another, by virtue of which the high priest, as *Philo* expresses it, was τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους συργγενής καὶ ἀγχιστεὺς κοινός (*Spec. leg.* ii. 321),

and so stood in the deepest sympathy with those for whom he interceded" (*Oehler in Herzog's Cycl.*). As he entered the holy place with this feeling, and in this attitude, of which the *choshen* was the symbol, he brought Israel into remembrance before Jehovah that the Lord might accept His people; and when furnished with the Urim and Thummim, he appeared before Jehovah as the advocate of the people's rights, that he might receive for the congregation the illumination required to protect and uphold those rights.

Vers. 31-35. The *third* portion of Aaron's official dress was the *robe*. To the ephod there also belonged a מַעֲטָה (from מָעַף to cover or envelope), an upper garment, called the robe of the ephod, the robe belonging to the ephod, "*all of dark-blue purple*" (hyacinth), by which we are not to imagine a cloak or mantle, but a long, closely-fitting coat; not reaching to the feet, however, as the Alex. rendering *ποδήρης* might lead us to suppose, but only to the knees, so as to show the coat (ver. 39) which was underneath.—Ver. 32. "*And the opening of the head thereof shall be in the middle of it;*" i.e. there was to be an opening in the middle of it to put the head through when it was put on;—"*a hem shall be round the opening of it, weavers' work, like the opening of the habergeon shall it (the seam) be to it; it shall not be torn.*" By the habergeon (θώραξ), or coat-of-mail, we have to understand the λινοθώραξ , the linen coat, such as was worn by Ajax for example (Il. 2, 529). Linen habergeons of this kind were made in Egypt in a highly artistic style (see *Hengstenberg, Egypt, etc.*, pp. 141-2). In order that the *meil* might not be torn when it was put on, the opening for the head was to be made with a strong hem, which was to be of weavers' work; from which it follows as a matter of course that the robe was woven in one piece, and not made in several pieces and then sewed together; and this is expressly stated in chap. xxxix. 22. *Josephus* and the Rabbins explain the words $\text{מַעֲטָה אֵינָהּ אֶרְגוֹן וְיָפָאנְטוֹן}$ (*ἔργον ὑφαντόν*) in this way, and observe at the same time that the *meil* had no sleeves, but only arm-holes.—Vers. 33, 34. On the lower hem (זָבֵה the tail or skirt) there were to be pomegranates of dark-blue and dark-red purple and crimson, made of twisted yarn of these colours (chap. xxxix. 24), and little golden bells between them round about, a bell and a pomegranate occurring alternately all round. According to *Rashi* the pomegranates were "*globi quidam rotundi instar malorum punicorum, quasi essent ova gal-*

linarum.” פֶּעֶמְנִים (from פָּעַם to strike or knock, like the old High German *cloccon*, *clochon*, i.e. to smite) signifies a little bell, not a spherical ball.—Ver. 35. Aaron was to put on this coat, to minister, i.e. to perform the duties of his holy office, “that his sound might be heard when he went into the holy place before Jehovah, and when he came out, and he might not die.” These directions are referred to in Ecclus. xlv. 9, and explained as follows: “He compassed him with pomegranates and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made, that might be heard in the temple, for a memorial to the children of his people.” The probable meaning of these words is either that given by *Hiskuni* (in *Drusius*), *ut sciant tempus cultus divini atque ita præparent cor suum ad patrem suum, qui est in cælis*, or that given by *Oehler*, viz. that the ringing of the bells might announce to the people in the court the entrance of the high priest and the rites he was performing, in order that they might accompany him with their thoughts and prayers. But this is hardly correct. For not only is the expression, “for a memorial to the children of Israel,” evidently intended by the writer of Ecclesiasticus as a translation of the words זָכָר לְבָנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל in ver. 12 (cf. ver. 29), so that he has transferred to the bells of the *meil* what really applies to the precious stones on the ephod, which contained the names of the twelve sons of Israel, but he has misunderstood the words themselves; for Aaron was to bear the names of the sons of Israel before Jehovah in these precious stones for a reminder, i.e. to remind Jehovah of His people. Moreover, the words “and he shall not die” are not in harmony with this interpretation. *Bähr*, *Oehler*, and others, regard the words as referring to the whole of the high priest’s robes, and understand them as meaning, that he would be threatened with death if he appeared before Jehovah without his robes, inasmuch as he was merely a private individual without this holy dress, and could not in that case represent the nation. This is so far justifiable, no doubt, although not favoured by the position of the words in the context, that the bells were inseparably connected with the robe, which was indispensable to the ephod with the *choshen*, and consequently the bells had no apparent significance except in connection with the whole of the robes. But even if we do adopt this explanation of the words, we cannot suppose that Aaron’s not dying depended upon the prayers of

the congregation which accompanied his going in and out before Jehovah; for in that case the intercession of the high priest would have lost its objective meaning altogether, and his life would have been actually given up in a certain sense to the caprice of the people. All that remains, therefore, is to take the words as they occur: Aaron was not to appear before the Lord without the sound of the bells upon his robe being heard, in order that he might not die; so that to understand the reason for his not dying, we must inquire what the ringing of the bells signified, or rather, what was the signification of Aaron's robe, with its border of pomegranates and ringing bells. The trivial explanation given by *Abraham ben David*, viz. that the ringing was to take the place of knocking at the door of Jehovah's palace, as an abrupt entrance into the presence of a great king was punished with death, is no more deserving of a serious refutation than *Knobel's* idea, for which there is no foundation, that the sounding of the bells was to represent a reverential greeting, and a very musical offering of praise (!).

The special significance of the *meil* cannot have resided in either its form or its colour; for the only feature connected with its form, that was at all peculiar to it, was its being woven in one piece, which set forth the idea of wholeness or spiritual integrity; and the dark-blue colour indicated nothing more than the heavenly origin and character of the office with which the robe was associated. It must be sought for, therefore, in the peculiar pendants, the meaning of which is to be gathered from the analogous instructions in Num. xv. 38, 39, where every Israelite is directed to make a fringe in the border of his garment, of dark-blue purple thread, and when he looks at the fringe to remember the commandments of God and do them. In accordance with this, we are also to seek for allusions to the word and testimony of God in the pendant of pomegranates and bells attached to the fringe of the high priest's robe. The simile in Prov. xxv. 11, where the word is compared to an apple, suggests the idea that the pomegranates, with their pleasant odour, their sweet and refreshing juice, and the richness of their delicious kernel, were symbols of the word and testimony of God as a sweet and pleasant spiritual food, that enlivens the soul and refreshes the heart (compare Ps. xix. 8-11, cxix. 25, 43, 50, with Deut. viii. 3, Prov. ix. 8, Eccles. xv. 3), and that the bells

were symbols of the sounding of this word, or the revelation and proclamation of the word. Through the robe, with this pendant attached, Aaron was represented as the recipient and medium of the word and testimony which came down from heaven; and this was the reason why he was not to appear before the Lord without that sound, lest he should forfeit his life. It was not because he would simply have appeared as a private person if he had gone without it, for he would always have the holy dress of a priest upon him, even when he was not clothed in the official decorations of the high priest; but because no mere priest was allowed to enter the immediate presence of the Lord. This privilege was restricted to the representative of the whole congregation, viz. the high priest; and even he could only do so when wearing the robe of the word of God, as the bearer of the divine testimony, upon which the covenant fellowship with the Lord was founded.

Vers. 36-38. The *fourth* article of the high priest's dress was the *diadem* upon his head-band. זָרָזַב, from זָרַז to shine, a plate of pure gold, on which the words קִדְשׁ לַיהוָה, "*holiness (i.e. all holy) to Jehovah,*" were engraved, and which is called the "crown of holiness" in consequence, in chap. xxxix. 30. This gold plate was to be placed upon a riband of dark-blue purple, or, as it is expressed in chap. xxxix. 31, a riband of this kind was to be fastened to it, to attach it to the head-band, "*upon the fore-front (as in chap. xxvi. 9) of the head-band,*" from above (chap. xxxix. 31); by which we are to understand that the gold plate was placed above the lower coil of the head-band and over Aaron's forehead. The word מְצַנֵּפֶת, from צָנַף to twist or coil (Isa. xxii. 18), is only applied to the head-band or turban of the high priest, which was made of simple byssus (ver. 39), and, judging from the etymology, was in the shape of a turban. This is all that can be determined with reference to its form. The diadem was the only thing about it that had any special significance. This was to be placed above (upon) Aaron's forehead, that he "might bear the iniquity of the holy things, which the children of Israel sanctified, with regard to all their holy gifts, . . . as an acceptableness for them before Jehovah." הָעֲוֹנוֹת: to bear iniquity (sin) and take it away; in other words, to exterminate it by taking it upon one's self. The high priest was exalted into an atoning mediator of the whole nation; and

an atoning, sin-exterminating intercession was associated with his office. The qualification for this he received from the diadem upon his forehead with the inscription, "holiness to the Lord." Through this inscription, which was fastened upon his head-dress of brilliant white, the earthly reflection of holiness, he was crowned as the sanctified of the Lord (Ps. cvi. 16), and endowed with the power to exterminate the sin which clung to the holy offerings of the people on account of the unholiness of their nature, so that the gifts of the nation became well-pleasing to the Lord, and the good pleasure of God was manifested to the nation.¹

Ver. 39. In addition to the distinguishing dress of the high priest, Aaron was also to wear, as the official costume of a priest, a *body-coat* (*cetoneth*) made of byssus, and woven in checks or cubes; the *head-band* (for the diadem), also made of simple byssus; and a *girdle* (*abnet*, of uncertain etymology, and only applied to the priest's girdle) of variegated work, *i.e.* made of yarn, of the same four colours as the holy things were to be made of (cf. chap. xxxix. 29).

Vers. 40-43. The *official dress of the sons of Aaron*, *i.e.* of the ordinary priests, was to consist of just the same articles as Aaron's priestly costume (ver. 39). But their *body-coat* is called weavers' work in chap. xxxix. 27, and was therefore quite a plain cloth, of white byssus or cotton yarn, though it was whole throughout, ἀπράφος without seam, like the robe of Christ (John xix. 23). It was worn close to the body, and, according to Jewish tradition, reached down to the ankles (cf. *Josephus*, iii. 7, 2). The *head-dress* of an ordinary priest is called כִּנְוִיָּה, related to כִּנְוִיָּה a basin or cup, and therefore seems to have been in the form of an inverted cup, and to have been a plain white

¹ See my *Archæology* i. pp. 183-4. The following are *Calvin's* admirable remarks: Oblationum sanctorum iniquitas tollenda et purganda fuit per sacerdotem. Frigidum est illud commentum, si quid erroris admissum est in ceremoniis, remissum fuisse sacerdotis precibus. Longius enim respicere nos oportet: ideo oblationum iniquitatem deleri a sacerdote, quia nulla oblatio, quatenus est hominis, omni vitio caret. Dictu hoc asperum est et fere παράδοξον, sanctitates ipsas esse immundas, ut venia indigeant; sed tenendum est, nihil esse sane purum, quod non aliquid labis a nobis contrahat. . . . Nihil Dei cultu præstantius: et tamen nihil offerre potuit populus, etiam a lege præscriptum, nisi intercedente venia, quam non nisi per sacerdotem obtinuit.

cotton cap. The *girdle*, according to chap. xxxix. 29, was of the same material and work for Aaron and his sons. This dress was to be for glory and for beauty to the priests, just as Aaron's dress was to him (ver. 2). The glory consisted in the brilliant white colour, the symbol of holiness; whilst the girdle, which an oriental man puts on when preparing for the duties of an office, contained in the four colours of the sanctuary the indication that they were the officers of Jehovah in His earthly kingdom.—Ver. 41. But since the clothing prescribed was an official dress, Moses was to put it upon Aaron and his sons, to anoint them and fill their hands, *i.e.* to invest them with the requisite sacrificial gifts (see at Lev. vii. 37), and so to sanctify them that they should be priests of Jehovah. For although the holiness of their office was reflected in their dress, it was necessary, on account of the sinfulness of their nature, that they should be sanctified through a special consecration for the administration of their office; and this consecration is prescribed in chap. xxix. and carried out in Lev. viii.—Vers. 42, 43. The covering of their nakedness was an indispensable prerequisite. Aaron and his sons were therefore to receive קַנְיָוִיִּם (from נָכַר to cover or conceal, *lit.* concealers), short drawers, reaching from the hips to the thighs, and serving “to cover the flesh of the nakedness.” For this reason the directions concerning them are separated from those concerning the different portions of the dress, which were for glory and beauty. The material of which these drawers were to be made is called בָּרָז . The meaning of this word is uncertain. According to chap. xxxix. 28, it was made of twined byssus or cotton yarn; and the rendering of the LXX., $\lambda\lambda\upsilon\alpha$ or $\lambda\lambda\upsilon\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ (Lev. vi. 3), is not at variance with this, as the ancients not only apply the term $\lambda\lambda\upsilon\nu$, *linum*, to flax, but frequently use it for fine white cotton as well. In all probability *bad* was a kind of white cloth, from בָּרָז to be white or clean, primarily to separate.—Ver. 43. These drawers the priests were to put on whenever they entered the sanctuary, that they might not “bear iniquity and die,” *i.e.* incur guilt deserving of death, either through disobedience to these instructions, or, what was still more important, through such violation of the reverence due to the holiness of the dwelling of God as they would be guilty of, if they entered the sanctuary with their nakedness uncovered. For as the consciousness of sin and guilt made itself known first

of all in the feeling of nakedness, so those members which subserve the natural secretions are especially *pudenda* or objects of shame, since the mortality and corruptibility of the body, which sin has brought into human nature, are chiefly manifested in these secretions. For this reason these members are also called the "flesh of nakedness." By this we are not to understand merely "the sexual member as the organ of generation or birth, because the existence and permanence of sinful, mortal human nature are associated with these," as *Bähr* supposes. For the frailty and nakedness of humanity are not manifested in the organ and act of generation, which rather serve to manifest the inherent capacity and creation of man for imperishable life, but in the impurities which nature ejects through those organs, and which bear in themselves the character of corruptibility. If, therefore, the priest was to appear before Jehovah as holy, it was necessary that those parts of his body especially should be covered, in which the impurity of his nature and the nakedness of his flesh were most apparent. For this reason, even in ordinary life, they are most carefully concealed, though not, as *Baumgarten* supposes, "because the sin of nature has its principal seat in the flesh of nakedness."—"A statute for ever:" as in chap. xxvii. 31.

Chap. xxix. vers. 1-37. CONSECRATION OF AARON AND HIS SONS through the anointing of their persons and the offering of sacrifices, the directions for which form the subject of vers. 1-35. This can only be fully understood in connection with the sacrificial law contained in Lev. i.-vii. It will be more advisable therefore to defer the examination of this ceremony till we come to Lev. viii., where the consecration itself is described. The same may also be said of the expiation and anointing of the altar, which are commanded in vers. 36 and 37, and carried out in Lev. viii. 11.

Vers. 38-46. THE DAILY BURNT-OFFERING, MEAT-OFFERING, AND DRINK-OFFERING.—The directions concerning these are attached to the instructions for the consecration of the priests, because these sacrifices commenced immediately after the completion of the tabernacle, and, like the shew-bread (xxv. 30), the daily trimming of the lamps (xxvii. 20, 21), and the daily incense-offering (xxx. 7 sqq.), were most intimately connected

with the erection of the sanctuary.—Ver. 38. “*And this is what thou shalt make (offer) upon the altar; yearling lambs two a day continually,*” one in the morning, the other between the two evenings (see at chap. xii. 6); to every one a meat-offering (*minchah*) of a tenth of fine wheaten flour (*soleth*, see at Lev. ii. 1), mixed with a quarter of a hin of beaten oil (*cathith*, see at chap. xxvii. 20), and a drink-offering (*nesek*) of a quarter of a hin of wine. עֶשְׂרִית הָאֵיפָה (a tenth) is equivalent to עֶשְׂרִית הָאֵיפָה, the tenth part of an ephah (Num. xxviii. 5), or 198·5 Parisian cubic inches according to *Bertheau's* measurement. *Thenius*, however, sets it down at 101·4 inches, whilst the Rabbins reckon it as equivalent to 43 hen's eggs of average size, *i.e.* somewhat more than 2½ lbs. A *hin* (a word of Egyptian origin) is 330·9 inches according to *Bertheau*, 168·9 according to *Thenius*, or 72 eggs, so that a quarter of a hin would be 18 eggs.—Ver. 41. לֶחֶם is to be understood *ad sensum* as referring to עֹלֶה. The daily morning and evening sacrifices were to be “for a sweet savour, a firing unto Jehovah” (see at Lev. i. 9). In these Israel was to consecrate its life daily unto the Lord (see at Lev. i. and ii.). In order that the whole of the daily life might be included, it was to be offered continually every morning and evening for all future time (“throughout your generations” as at chap. xii. 14) at the door of the tabernacle, *i.e.* upon the altar erected there, before Jehovah, who would meet with the people and commune with them there (see chap. xxv. 22). This promise is carried out still further in vers. 43-46. First of all, for the purpose of elucidating and strengthening the words, “I will meet with you there” (ver. 42), the presence and communion of God, which are attached to the ark of the covenant in chap. xxv. 22, are ensured to the whole nation in the words, “And there I will meet with the children of Israel, and it (Israel) shall be sanctified through My glory.” As the people were not allowed to approach the ark of the covenant, but only to draw near to the altar of burnt-offering in the sanctuary, it was important to declare that the Lord would manifest Himself to them even there, and sanctify them by His glory. Most of the commentators have taken the altar to be the subject of “shall be sanctified;” but this is certainly an error, not only because the altar is not mentioned in the previous clause, and only slightly hinted at in the לֶחֶם in ver. 41, but principally because the sanctification of the

altar is noticed by itself afterwards in ver. 44. The correct exegesis is that adopted by *Baumgarten* and others, who supply the word *Israel* (viz. regarded as a nation), which they take from the expression "children of Israel" in the previous clause. In ver. 44, the sanctification of the tabernacle and altar on the part of God is promised, also that of His servants, and finally, in vers. 45, 46, the abode of God in the midst of the children of Israel, with an allusion to the blessings that would follow from Jehovah's dwelling in the midst of them as their God (Gen. xvii. 7).

Chap. xxx. 1-10. The ALTAR OF INCENSE AND INCENSE-OFFERING bring the directions concerning the sanctuary to a close. What follows, from xxx. 11-xxxi. 17, is shown to be merely supplementary to the larger whole by the formula "and Jehovah spake unto Moses," with which every separate command is introduced (cf. vers. 11, 17, 22, 34, xxxi. 1, 12).—Vers. 1-5 (cf. chap. xxxvii. 25-28). Moses was directed to make an *altar of burning of incense* (*lit.* incensing of incense), of acacia-wood, one cubit long and one broad, four-cornered, two cubits high, furnished with horns like the altar of burnt-offering (chap. xxvii. 1, 2), and to plate it with pure gold, the roof (יָבֵיט) thereof (*i.e.* its upper side or surface, which was also made of wood), and its walls round about, and its horns; so that it was covered with gold quite down to the ground upon which it stood, and for this reason is often called the golden altar (chap. xxxix. 38, xl. 5, 26; Num. iv. 11). Moreover it was to be ornamented with a golden wreath, and furnished with golden rings at the corners for the carrying-poles, as the ark of the covenant and the table of shewbread were (xxv. 11 sqq., 25 sqq.); and its place was to be in front of the curtain, which concealed the ark of the covenant (xxvi. 31), "before the capporeth" (xl. 5), so that, although it really stood in the holy place between the candlestick on the south side and the table on the north (xxvi. 35, xl. 22, 24), it was placed in the closest relation to the *capporeth*, and for this reason is not only connected with the most holy place in 1 Kings vi. 22, but is reckoned in Heb. ix. 4 as part of the furniture of the most holy place (see *Delitzsch* on Heb. ix. 4).—Vers. 7-9. Upon this altar Aaron was to burn fragrant incense, the preparation of which is described in vers. 34 sqq., every morning

and evening before Jehovah, at the time when he trimmed the lamps. No "strange incense" was to be offered upon it,—*i.e.* incense which Jehovah had not appointed (cf. Lev. x. 1), that is to say, which had not been prepared according to His instructions, —nor burnt sacrifice, nor meat-offering; and no drink-offering was to be poured upon it. As the altar of incense was not only marked as a place of sacrifice by its name **מִזְבֵּחַ**, "place of slain-offering," but was put on a par with the altar of sacrifice by its square shape and its horns, it was important to describe minutely what sacrifices were to be offered upon it. For the burning of fragrant incense is shown to be a sacrifice, by the fact that it was offered upon a place of sacrifice, or altar. Moreover the word **הִקְטִיר**, to cause to ascend in smoke and steam, from **קָטַר** to smoke or steam, is not only applied to the lighting of incense, but also to the lighting and burning of the bleeding and bloodless sacrifices upon the altar of incense. Lastly, the connection between the incense-offering and the burnt-offering is indicated by the rule that they were to be offered at the same time. Both offerings shadowed forth the devotion of Israel to its God, whilst the fact that they were offered every day exhibited this devotion as constant and uninterrupted. But the distinction between them consisted in this, that in the burnt or whole offering Israel consecrated and sanctified its whole life and action in both body and soul to the Lord, whilst in the incense-offering its prayer was embodied as the exaltation of the spiritual man to God (cf. Ps. cxli. 2; Rev. v. 8, viii. 3, 4); and with this there was associated the still further distinction, that the devotion was completed in the burnt-offering solely upon the basis of the atoning sprinkling of blood, whereas the incense-offering presupposed reconciliation with God, and on the basis of this the soul rose to God in this embodiment of its prayer, and was thus absorbed into His Spirit. In this respect, the incense-offering was not only a spiritualizing and transfiguring of the burnt-offering, but a completion of that offering also.—Ver. 10. Once a year Aaron was to expiate the altar of incense with the blood of the sin-offering of atonement, because it was most holy to the Lord, that is to say, as is expressly observed in the directions concerning this expiatory act (Lev. xvi. 18, 19), to purify it from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel. **כָּפַר**, with **עַל** *objecti constr.*, signifies literally to cover over a thing, then to cover over sin, or make expiation. In the

second clause we have “upon it” (the altar) instead of “upon the horns of it,” because the altar itself was expiated in its horns. The use of $\text{בְּ} \text{אֶזְרָא}$ in בְּאֶזְרָא is to be explained on the ground that only a part of the blood of the sin-offering was smeared with the finger upon the horns. (Far further remarks, see at Lev. xvi. 18, 19.) The term “most holy” is not only applied to this altar, in common with the inner division of the tabernacle (chap. xxvi. 33), but also to the altar of burnt-offering (chap. xxix. 37, xl. 10), and all the vessels of the sanctuary (chap. xxx. 29), which were anointed with holy oil; then to the whole of the tabernacle in its holiest aspect (Num. xviii. 10); and lastly, to all the sacrifices, which were given up entirely to Jehovah (see at Lev. ii. 3);—consequently to everything which stood in so intimate a relation to Jehovah as to be altogether removed, not only from use and enjoyment on the part of man, but also from contact on the part of unsanctified men. Whoever touched a most holy thing was sanctified thereby (compare ver. 29 with chap. xxix. 37).

Vers. 11–16. THE ATONEMENT-MONEY, which every Israelite had to pay at the numbering of the people, has the first place among the supplementary instructions concerning the erection and furnishing of the sanctuary, and serves to complete the demand for freewill-offerings for the sanctuary (chap. xxv. 1–9). —Ver. 12. “When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel according to them that are numbered, they shall give every one an expiation for his soul to the Lord at their numbering, that a plague may not strike them (happen to them) at their numbering.” בְּאֶזְרָא , lit. *adsperxit*, then *inspexit explorandi causa*, hence to review, or number an army or a nation, for the purpose of enrolling for military service. לְאֶזְרָאֵיהֶם with reference to the numbered, *qui in censum veniunt*. כִּפָּר (expiation, expiation-money, from כִּפַּר to expiate) is to be traced to the idea that the object for which expiation was made was thereby withdrawn from the view of the person to be won or reconciled. It is applied in two ways: (1) on the supposition that the face of the person to be won was covered by the gift (Gen. xxxii. 21; 1 Sam. xii. 3); and (2) on the supposition that the guilt itself was covered up (Ps. xxxii. 1), or wiped away (Jer. xviii. 23), so far as the eye of God was concerned, as though it had no longer any existence, and that

the sinful man was protected from the punishment of the judge in consequence of this covering. In this way כֶּפֶר has acquired the meaning λύτρον, a payment by which the guilty are redeemed (chap. xxi. 30; Num. xxxv. 31); and this is the meaning which it has in the passage before us, where the soul is said to be protected by the *copher*, so as to be able to come without danger into the presence of the holy God (Num. viii. 19. See *Oehler* in *Herzog's Cycl.*). Such an approach to God took place at the numbering of the people for the purpose of enrolling them in the army of Jehovah (Num. i. 3, cf. Ex. vii. 4, xii. 41). Hence "every one who passed over to those that were numbered," who was enrolled among them, *i.e.* in the army of Jehovah,—that is to say, every male Israelite of 20 years old and upwards (ver. 14),—was to pay half a shekel of the sanctuary as atonement-money; the rich no more, the poor no less (ver. 15), because all were equal in the sight of Jehovah; and this payment was to be a "heave" (*terumah*, see chap. xxv. 2) for Jehovah for the expiation of the souls. The shekel of the sanctuary, which contained 20 gerahs, was no doubt the original shekel of full weight, as distinguished from the lighter shekel which was current in ordinary use. In chap. xxxviii. 26 the half shekel is called שֶׁקֶל, *lit.* the split, *i.e.* half, from שָׁקַץ to split; and we find it mentioned as early as the time of the patriarchs as a weight in common use for valuing gold (Gen. xxiv. 22), so that, no doubt, even at that time there were distinct silver pieces of this weight, which were probably called shekels when employed for purposes of trade, since the word *shekel* itself does not denote any particular weight, as we may perceive at once from a comparison of 1 Kings x. 17 and 2 Chron. ix. 16, at least so far as later times are concerned. The sacred shekel, to judge from the weight of the Maccabean shekels, which are in existence still, and vary from 256 to 272 Parisian grains, weighed 274 grains, and therefore, according to present valuation, would be worth 26 groschen (about 2s. 7d.), so that the half-shekel or bekah would be 13 groschen (1s. 3½d.). —Ver. 16. This atonement-money Moses was to appropriate to the work of the sanctuary (cf. chap. xxxviii. 25-28, where the amount and appropriation are reported). Through this appropriation it became "a memorial to the children of Israel before the Lord to expiate their souls," *i.e.* a permanent reminder of their expiation before the Lord, who would henceforth treat

them as reconciled because of this payment. It was no ordinary tribute, therefore, which Israel was to pay to Jehovah as its King, but an act demanded by the holiness of the theocratic covenant. As an expiation for souls, it pointed to the unholiness of Israel's nature, and reminded the people continually, that by nature it was alienated from God, and could only remain in covenant with the Lord and live in His kingdom on the ground of His grace, which covered its sin. It was not till this sinful nature had been sanctified by a perfect atonement, and servitude under the law had been glorified and fully transformed into that sonship to which Israel was called as the first-born son of Jehovah, that as children of the kingdom they had no longer to pay this atonement-money for their souls (Matt. xvii. 25, 26).—According to Num. i. 1, 18, as compared with Ex. xl. 17, the census of the nation was not taken till a month after the building of the tabernacle was completed, and yet the atonement-money to be paid at the taking of the census was to be appropriated to the purpose of the building, and must therefore have been paid before. This apparent discrepancy may be reconciled by the simple assumption, that immediately after the command of God had been issued respecting the building of the tabernacle and the contributions which the people were to make for that purpose, the numbering of the males was commenced and the atonement-money collected from the different individuals, that the tabernacle was then built and the whole ceremonial instituted, and that, after all this had been done, the whole nation was enrolled according to its tribes, fathers' houses, and families, on the basis of this provisional numbering, and thus the census was completed. For this reason the census gave exactly the same number of males as the numbering (cf. chap. xxxviii. 26 and Num. i. 46), although the one had been carried out nine months before the other.

Vers. 17–21 (cf. chap. xxxviii. 8). The BRAZEN LAVER, and its use.—The making of this vessel is not only mentioned in a supplementary manner, but no description is given of it because of the subordinate position which it occupied, and from the fact that it was not directly connected with the sanctuary, but was only used by the priests to cleanse themselves for the performance of their duties. **קִיֹּון**: a basin, a round, caldron-shaped

vessel. כִּנּוֹ (its support) : by this we are not to understand the pedestal of the caldron, but something separate from the basin, which was no doubt used for drawing off as much water as was required for washing the officiating priests. For although כִּנּוֹ belongs to כִּיֹּר, the fact that it is always specially mentioned in connection with the basin necessarily leads to the conclusion, that it had a certain kind of independence (cf. chap. xxxi. 9, xxxv. 16, xxxix. 39, xl. 11; Lev. viii. 11). These two vessels were to be made of brass or copper, like the other things in the court; and, according to chap. xxxviii. 8, they were made of the brass of the mirrors of the women who served before the door of the tabernacle. מִצְבֵּי אִתּוֹת הַיְצִבֹּת does not mean either "provided with mirrors of the women" (*Bähr*, i. pp. 485-6), or ornamented "with forms, figures of women, as they were accustomed to appear at the sanctuary" (*Knobel*). Both these views are overthrown by the fact, that כִּיֹּר never signifies *with* in the sense of an outward addition, but always denotes the means, "not an independent object, but something accompanying and contributing to the action referred to" (*Ewald*, § 217, f. 3). In this case כִּיֹּר can only apply to the material used, whether we connect it with מַעֲשֵׂה as in chap. xxxi. 4, or, what seems decidedly more correct, with נִשְׁתָּה as a more precise definition; so that כִּיֹּר would denote that particular quality which distinguished the brass of which the basin was made (*Ewald*, § 217 f.),—apart altogether from the fact, that neither the mirrors of women, nor the figures of women, would form a fitting ornament for the basin, as the priests did not require to look at themselves when they washed their hands and feet; and there is still less ground for *Knobel's* fiction, that Levitical women went to the sanctuary at particular times, forming a certain procession, and taking things with them for the purpose of washing, cleaning, and polishing. The true meaning is given by the Septuagint, ἐκ τῶν κατόπτρων. According to 1 Sam. ii. 22, the יְצִבֹּת were women, though not washer-women, but women who dedicated their lives to the service of Jehovah, and spent them in religious exercises, in fasting and in prayer, like Anna, the daughter of Phanuel, mentioned in Luke ii. 37.¹ צְבָא denotes spiritual warfare, and is accordingly

¹ *Knobel's* objection to this explanation, viz. that "at a time when the sanctuary was not yet erected, the author could not speak of women as coming to the door of the sanctuary, or performing religious service there,"

rendered by the LXX. *νηστεύειν*, by *Onkelos*, *orare*, with which the Rabbins agree. The mirrors of the women had been used for the purpose of earthly adorning. But now the pious Israelites renounced this earthly adorning, and offered it to the Lord as a heave-offering to make the purifying laver in front of the sanctuary, in order that "what had hitherto served as a means of procuring applause in the world might henceforth be the means of procuring the approbation of God" (*Hengstenberg*, *Dissert.* vol. ii.).—The laver was to be placed between the tabernacle, *i.e.* the dwelling, and the altar in the court (ver. 18), probably not in a straight line with the door of the dwelling and the altar of burnt-offering, but more sideways, so as to be convenient for the use of the priests, whether they were going into the tabernacle, or going up to the altar for service, to kindle a firing for Jehovah, *i.e.* to offer sacrifice upon the altar. They were to wash their hands, with which they touched the holy things, and their feet, with which they trod the holy ground (see chap. iii. 5), "that they might not die," as is again emphatically stated in vers. 20 and 21. For touching holy things with unclean hands, and treading upon the floor of the sanctuary with dirty feet, would have been a sin against Jehovah, the Holy One of Israel, deserving of death. These directions do not imply "that, notwithstanding all their consecration, they were regarded as still defiled by natural uncleanness" (*Baumgarten*), but rather that consecration did not stamp them with a *character indelebilis*, or protect them from the impurities of the sinful nation in the midst of which they lived, or of their own nature, which was still affected with mortal corruption and sin.

Vers. 22–33. The HOLY ANOINTING OIL.—This was to be prepared from the best perfumes (שִׁמְשִׁימִים רָאִי, where שִׁמְ, *caput*, the principal or chief, is subordinate to אִיִּים), *viz.* of four fragrant spices and olive-oil. The spices were, (1) *liquid myrrh*, as

would contain its own refutation, if there were any ground for it at all. For before the sanctuary was erected, the author could not speak of Levitical women as coming at particular times to the sanctuary, and bringing things with them for the purpose of washing and cleaning. But the participle צִבְּאוֹת does not imply that they had served there before the erection of the sanctuary, but only that from that time forward they did perform service there.

distinguished from the dry gum ;—(2) מִשְׁבַּח־רִיחַ, *cinnamon of fragrance*, the name having been introduced to the Semitic nations along with the thing itself, and then by the Phœnicians to the Greeks and Romans (*κινναμον*, *cinnamum*) : whether it came from Ceylon, the great mart of cinnamon, is very doubtful, as there is no word that can be discovered in the Indian dialects corresponding to *cinnamon*;—(3) *cane of fragrance*, the *κάλαμος ἀρωματικός*, *calamus odoratus*, of the Greeks and Romans, *i.e.* the scented calamus which is imported from India;—and (4) *kiddah*, probably *cassia*, and possibly the species called *κιττώ* in Dioscor. 1, 12, in which case מִיָּצֵץ (Ps. xlv. 9) is either the generic name for cassia, or else refers to a different species. The proportion in which these spices were to be taken was 500 shekels or 14½ lbs. of myrrh, half the quantity, *i.e.* 7 lbs., of cinnamon, and the same of calamus and cassia; in all, therefore, 21 lbs. of dry spices, which were to be mixed with one hin of oil (about 5 quarts) and 14 lbs. of liquid myrrh. These proportions preclude the supposition, that the spices were pulverized and mixed with the oil and myrrh in their natural condition, for the result in that case would have been a thick mess: they rather favour the statement of the Rabbins, that the dry spices were softened in water and boiled, to extract their essence, which was then mixed with oil and myrrh, and boiled again until all the watery part had evaporated. An artificial production of this kind is also indicated by the expressions מִקְצֵה מִרְחֵת “*spice-work of spice-mixture*,” and מִעֲשֵׂה רִיחַ “*labour (work) of the perfumer or ointment-maker*.”—Vers. 26 sqq. With this holy anointing oil the tabernacle and all its furniture were to be anointed and sanctified, that they might be most holy; also Aaron and his sons, that they might serve the Lord as priests (see at Lev. viii. 10 sqq.). This anointing oil was holy, either because it was made from the four fragrant substances according to the proportions commanded by Jehovah, or because God declared this kind of mixture and preparation holy (cf. ver. 32), and forbade for all time, on pain of death (ver. 31), not only the use of ointment so prepared for any ordinary anointings, but even an imitation of it. “*Upon man’s flesh shall it not be poured*,” *i.e.* it is not to be used for the ordinary practice of anointing the human body (ver. 32). “*Man*,” *i.e.* the ordinary man in distinction from the priests. מִמֶּנֶם according to its measure, *i.e.* according to

the proportions prescribed for its manufacture. ׀ (ver. 33), a stranger, is not only the non-Israelite, but laymen or non-priests in general. On the expression, "cut off from his people," see at Gen. xvii. 14.

Vers. 34–38. The HOLY INCENSE was also to be made of four ingredients, viz. (1) *nataph* (στανρή, *stacte*), i.e. not the resinous myrrh, or sap obtained from the fragrant myrrh and dried, but a kind of *storax* gum resembling myrrh, which was baked, and then used, like incense, for fumigating;—(2) *shecheleth* (δvvξ, *unguis odoratus*), the shell of a shell-fish resembling the *purpura*, of an agreeable odour;—(3) *chelbenah* (χαλβάνη), a resin of a pungent, bitter flavour, obtained, by means of an incision in the bark, from the *ferula*, a shrub which grows in Syria, Arabia, and Abyssinia, and then mixed with fragrant substances to give greater pungency to their odour;—and (4) *lebonah* (λίβανος or λιβανωτός), frankincense, a resin of a pleasant smell, obtained from a tree in Arabia Felix or India, but what tree has not been discovered. זָה pure, i.e. unadulterated. The words בַּרְבַּר יְהִיָּה "part for part shall it be," are explained by the LXX. as meaning ἴσον ἴσῳ ἔσται, *Vulg.* *æqualis ponderis erunt omnia*, i.e. with equal parts of all the different substances. But this is hardly correct, as זָה literally means separation, and the use of זָ in this sense would be very striking. The explanation given by *Aben Ezra* is more correct, viz. "every part shall be for itself;" that is to say, each part was to be first of all prepared by itself, and then all the four to be mixed together afterwards.—Ver. 35. Of this Moses was to make incense, spicework, etc. (as in ver. 25), salted, seasoned with salt (חֶמֶץ, a *denom.* from מֶלַח salt), like the meat-offering in Lev. ii. 13. The word does not mean *μειγμένον*, *mixtum* (LXX.; *Vulg.*), or rubbed to powder, for the rubbing or pulverizing is expressed by שָׁחַתָּהּ הָרֶקֶת in the following verse.—Ver. 36. Of this incense (a portion) was to be placed "before the testimony in the tabernacle," i.e. not in the most holy place, but where the altar of incense stood (cf. xxx. 6 and Lev. xvi. 12). The remainder was of course to be kept elsewhere.—Vers. 37, 38. There is the same prohibition against imitating or applying it to a strange use as in the case of the anointing oil (vers. 32, 33). "To smell thereto," i.e. to enjoy the perfume of it.

Chap. xxxi. 1-11. The BUILDERS (cf. chap. xxxv. 30-xxxvi. 1).—After ~~having given~~ directions for the construction of the sanctuary, and all the things required for the worship, Jehovah pointed out the builders, whom He had called to carry out the work, and had filled with His Spirit for that purpose. To “*call by name*” is to choose or appoint by name for a particular work (cf. Isa. xlv. 3, 4). *Bezaleel* was a grandson of *Hur*, of the tribe of Judah, who is mentioned in chap. xvii. 10, xxiv. 14, and was called to be the master-builder, to superintend the whole of the building and carry out the artistic work; consequently he is not only invariably mentioned first (chap. xxxv. 30, xxxvi. 1, 2), but in the accounts of the execution of the separate portions he is mentioned alone (chap. xxxvii. 1, xxxviii. 22). Filling with the Spirit of God signifies the communication of an extraordinary and supernatural endowment and qualification, “in wisdom,” etc., *i.e.* consisting of wisdom, understanding, knowledge, and every kind of workmanship, that is to say, for the performance of every kind of work. This did not preclude either natural capacity or acquired skill, but rather presupposed them; for in ver. 6 it is expressly stated in relation to his assistants, that God had put wisdom into all that were wise-hearted (see at chap. xxviii. 3). Being thus endowed with a supernaturally exalted gift, *Bezaleel* was qualified “to think out inventions,” *i.e.* ideas or artistic designs. Although everything had been minutely described by Jehovah, designs and plans were still needed in carrying out the work, so that the result should correspond to the divine instructions.—Ver. 6. There were associated with *Bezaleel* as assistants, *Oholiab*, the son of *Achisamach*, of the tribe of Dan, and other men endowed with understanding, whom God had filled with wisdom for the execution of His work. According to chap. xxxviii. 23, *Oholiab* was both *faber*, a master in metal, stone, and wood work, and also an artistic weaver of colours. In vers. 7-11, the works to be executed, which have been minutely described in chap. xxv.—xxx., are mentioned singly once more; and, in addition to these, we find in ver. 10 בְּנֵי הַשָּׂרָד mentioned, along with, or rather before, the holy dress of Aaron. This is the case also in chap. xxxv. 19 and xxxix. 41, where there is also the additional clause, “to serve (שָׁרַת *ministrare*) in the sanctuary.” They were composed, according to chap. xxxix. 1, of blue and red purple, and crimson. The meaning of the word

serad, which only occurs in these passages, is quite uncertain. The Rabbins understand by the *bigde hasserad* the wrappers in which the vessels of the sanctuary were enclosed when the camp was broken up, as these are called *begadim* of blue and red purple, and crimson, in Num. iv. 6 sqq. But this rendering is opposed to the words which follow, and which indicate their use in the holy service, *i.e.* in the performance of worship, and therefore are quite inapplicable to the wrappers referred to. There is even less ground for referring them, as *Gesenius* and others do, to the inner curtains of the tabernacle, or the inner hangings of the dwelling-place. For, apart from the uncertainty of the rendering given to *serad*, *viz.* netted cloth, *filet*, it is overthrown by the fact that these curtains of the dwelling-place were not of net-work; and still more decisively by the order in which the *bigde hasserad* occur in chap. xxxix. 41, *viz.* not till the dwelling-place and tent, and everything belonging to them, have been mentioned, even down to the hangings of the court and the pegs of the tent, and all that remains to be noticed is the clothing of the priests. From the definition "to serve in the sanctuary," it is obvious that the *bigde serad* were clothes used in the worship, *στολαὶ λειτουργικαί*, as the LXX. have rendered it in agreement with the rest of the ancient versions,—that they were, in fact, the rich robes which constituted the official dress of the high priest, whilst "the holy garments for Aaron" were the holy clothes which were worn by him in common with the priests.

Vers. 12–17 (cf. chap. xxxv. 2, 3). God concludes by enforcing the observance of His Sabbaths in the most solemn manner, repeating the threat of death and extermination in the case of every transgressor. The repetition and further development of this command, which was included already in the decalogue, is quite in its proper place here, inasmuch as the thought might easily have occurred, that it was allowable to omit the keeping of the Sabbath, when the execution of so great a work in honour of Jehovah had been commanded. "*My Sabbaths:*" by these we are to understand the weekly Sabbaths, not the other sabbatical festivals, since the words which follow apply to the weekly Sabbath alone. This was "*a sign between Jehovah and Israel for all generations, to know (i.e. by which Israel might learn) that it was Jehovah who sanctified them,*" *viz.* by the sabbatical rest (see at chap. xx. 11). It was therefore a holy thing

for Israel (ver. 14), the desecration of which would be followed by the punishment of death, as a breach of the covenant. The kernel of the Sabbath commandment is repeated in ver. 15; the seventh day of the week, however, is not simply designated a "Sabbath," but שַׁבָּת שְׁבִיבָה "a high Sabbath" (the repetition of the same word, or of an abstract form of the concrete noun, denoting the superlative; see *Ges.* § 113, 2), and "holy to Jehovah" (see at chap. xvi. 23). For this reason Israel was to keep it in all future generations, *i.e.* to observe it as an eternal covenant (ver. 16), as in the case of circumcision, since it was to be a sign for ever between Jehovah and the children of Israel (ver. 20). The eternal duration of this sign was involved in the signification of the sabbatical rest, which is pointed out in chap. xx. 11, and reaches forward into eternity.

Ver. 18. When Moses had received all the instructions respecting the sanctuary to be erected, Jehovah gave him the two tables of testimony,—tables of stone, upon which the decalogue was written with the finger of God. It was to receive these tables that he had been called up the mountain (chap. xxiv. 12). According to chap. xxxii. 16, the tables themselves, as well as the writing, were the work of God; and the writing was engraved upon them (קָרַת from קָרַת = *χαράττειν*), and the tables were written on both their sides (chap. xxxii. 15). Both the choice of stone as the material for the tables, and the fact that the writing was engraved, were intended to indicate the imperishable duration of these words of God. The divine origin of the tables, as well as of the writing, corresponded to the direct proclamation of the ten words to the people from the summit of the mountain by the mouth of God. As this divine promulgation was a sufficient proof that they were the immediate word of God, unchanged by the mouth and speech of man, so the writing of God was intended to secure their preservation in Israel as a holy and inviolable thing. The writing itself was not a greater miracle than others, by which God has proved Himself to be the Lord of nature, to whom all things that He has created are subservient for the establishment and completion of His kingdom upon earth; and it can easily be conceived of without the anthropomorphic supposition of a material finger being possessed by God. Nothing is said about the dimensions of the tables: at the same time, we can hardly imagine them to have been as large as the

inside of the ark ; for stone slabs $2\frac{1}{2}$ cubits long and $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubit broad, which must necessarily have been some inches in thickness to prevent their breaking in the hand, would have required the strength of Samson to enable Moses to carry them down the mountain "in his hand" (chap. xxxii. 15), or even "in his two hands" (Deut. ix. 15, 17). But if we suppose them to have been smaller than this, say at the most a cubit and a half long and one cubit broad, there would have been plenty of room on the four sides for the 172 words contained in the decalogue, with its threats and promises (chap. xx. 2-17), without the writing being excessively small.

THE COVENANT BROKEN AND RENEWED.—CHAP. XXXII.—XXXIV.

Chap. xxxii. 1-6. The long stay that Moses made upon the mountain rendered the people so impatient, that they desired another leader, and asked Aaron, to whom Moses had directed the people to go in all their difficulties during his absence (chap. xxiv. 14), to make them a god to go before them. The protecting and helping presence of God had vanished with Moses, of whom they said, "We know not what has become of him," and whom they probably supposed to have perished on the mountain in the fire that was burning there. They came to Aaron, therefore, and asked him, not for a leader, but for a god to go before them ; no doubt with the intention of trusting the man as their leader who was able to make them a god. They were unwilling to continue longer without a God to go before them ; but the faith upon which their desire was founded was a very perverted one, not only as clinging to what was apparent to the eye, but as corrupted by the impatience and unbelief of a natural heart, which has not been pervaded by the power of the living God, and imagines itself forsaken by Him, whenever His help is not visibly and outwardly at hand. The delay (בַּיָּשׁוּב , from בָּשׂוּב to act bashfully, or with reserve, then to hesitate, or delay) of Moses' return was a test for Israel, in which it was to prove its faith and confidence in Jehovah and His servant Moses (xix. 9), but in which it gave way to the temptation of flesh and blood.—Ver. 2. Aaron also succumbed to the temptation along with the people. Instead of courageously and decidedly opposing their proposal, and raising the

despondency of the people into the strength of living faith, by pointing them to the great deeds through which Jehovah had proved Himself to be the faithful covenant God, he hoped to be able to divert them from their design by means of human craftiness. "*Tear off the golden ornaments in the ears of your wives, your sons, and your daughters, and bring them to me:*" this he said in the hope that, by a demand which pressed so heavily upon the vanity of the female sex and its love of display, he might arouse such opposition as would lead the people to desist from their desire. But his cleverness was put to shame. "All the people" tore off their golden ornaments and brought them to him (ver. 3); for their object was not merely "to accomplish an act of pure self-will, in which case there is no sacrifice that the human heart is not ready to make," but to secure a pledge of the protection of God through a visible image of the Deity. The weak-minded Aaron had no other course left than to make (*i.e.* to cause to be made) an image of God for the people.

Ver. 4. *He took* (the golden ear-rings) *from their hands, and formed it* (the gold) *with the graving-tool, or chisel, and made it a molten calf.*" Out of the many attempts that have been made at interpreting the words *וַיִּצַר אֹתוֹ בַּחֶרֶט*, there are only two that deserve any notice, viz. the one adopted by *Bochart* and *Schroeder*, "he bound it up in a bag," and the one given by the earlier translators, "he fashioned (*יצר*), as in 1 Kings vii. 15) the gold with the chisel." No doubt *וַיִּצַר* (from *ציר* = *ציר*) does occur in the sense of binding in 2 Kings v. 23, and *חָרַט* may certainly be used for *חָרַט* a bag; but why should Aaron first tie up the golden ear-rings in a bag? And if he did so, why this superfluous and incongruous allusion to the fact? We give in our adhesion to the second, which is adopted by the LXX., *Onkelos*, the *Syriac*, and even *Jonathan*, though the other rendering is also interpolated into the text. Such objections, as that the calf is expressly spoken of as molten work, or that files are used, and not chisels, for giving a finer finish to casts, have no force whatever. The latter is not even correct. A graving-knife is quite as necessary as a file for chiselling, and giving a finer finish to things cast in a mould; and *cheret* does not necessarily mean a chisel, but may signify any tool employed for carving, engraving, and shaping hard metals. The other objec-

tion rests upon the supposition that *massecah* means an image made entirely of metal (e.g. gold). But this cannot be sustained. Apart from the fact, that most of the larger idols worshipped by the ancients had a wooden centre, and were merely covered with gold plate, such passages as Isa. xl. 19 and xxx. 22 prove, not only that the casting of gold for idols consisted merely in casting the metal into a flat sheet, which the goldsmith hammered out and spread into a coating of gold plate, but also that a wooden image, when covered in this way with a coating of gold, was actually called *massecah*. And Aaron's molten calf was also made in this way: it was first of all formed of wood, and then covered with gold plate. This is evident from the way in which it was destroyed: the image was first of all burnt, and then beaten or crushed to pieces, and pounded or ground to powder (Deut. ix. 21); i.e. the wooden centre was first burnt into charcoal, and then the golden covering beaten or rubbed to pieces (ver. 20 compared with Deut. ix. 21).

The "golden calf" (בַּיִט, a young bull) was copied from the Egyptian *Apis* (vid. Hengstenberg, Dissertations); but for all that, it was not the image of an Egyptian deity,—it was no symbol of the generative or bearing power of nature, but an image of Jehovah. For when it was finished, those who had made the image, and handed it over to the people, said, "This is thy God (*pluralis majest.*), O Israel, who brought thee out of Egypt." This is the explanation adopted in Ps. cvi. 19, 20.—Vers. 5, 6. When Aaron saw it, he built an altar in front of the image, and called aloud to the people, "*To-morrow is a feast of Jehovah;*" and the people celebrated this feast with burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, with eating and drinking, i.e. with sacrificial meals and sports (פָּנֵץ), or with loud rejoicing, shouting, antiphonal songs, and dances (cf. vers. 17–19), in the same manner in which the Egyptians celebrated their feast of *Apis* (*Herod.* 2, 60, and 3, 27). But this intimation of an Egyptian custom is no proof that the feast was not intended for Jehovah; for joyous sacrificial meals, and even sports and dances, are met with in connection with the legitimate worship of Jehovah (cf. chap. xv. 20, 21). Nevertheless the making of the calf, and the sacrificial meals and other ceremonies performed before it, were a shameful apostasy from Jehovah, a practical denial of the inimitable glory of the true God, and a culpable breach of the

second commandment of the covenant words (chap. xx. 4), whereby Israel had broken the covenant with the Lord, and fallen back to the heathen customs of Egypt. Aaron also shared the guilt of this transgression, although it was merely out of sinful weakness that he had assented to the proposals of the people and gratified their wishes (cf. Deut. ix. 20). He also fell with the people, and denied the God who had chosen him, though he himself was unconscious of it, to be His priest, to bear the sins of the people, and to expiate them before Jehovah. The apostasy of the nation became a temptation to him, in which the unfitness of his nature for the office was to be made manifest, in order that he might ever remember this, and not excuse himself from the office, to which the Lord had not called him because of his own worthiness, but purely as an act of unmerited grace.

Vers. 7-14. Before Moses left the mountain, God told him of the apostasy of the people (vers. 7, 8). "*Thy people, which thou hast brought out of Egypt:*" God says this not in the sense of an "*obliqua exprobratio,*" or "*Mosen quodammodo vocare in partem criminis quo examinetur ejus tolerantia et plus etiam mœroris ex rei indignitate concipiat*" (Calvin), or even because the Israelites, who had broken the covenant, were no longer the people of Jehovah; but the transgression of the people concerned Moses as the mediator of the covenant.—Ver. 8. "*They have turned aside quickly (lit. hurriedly):*" this had increased their guilt, and made their ingratitude to Jehovah, their Redeemer, all the more glaring.—Vers. 9, 10. "*Behold, it is a stiff-necked people (a people with a hard neck, that will not bend to the commandment of God; cf. chap. xxxiii. 3, 5, xxxiv. 9; Deut. ix. 6, etc.): now therefore suffer Me, that My wrath may burn against them, and I may consume them, and I will make of thee a great nation.*" Jehovah, as the unchangeably true and faithful God, would not, and could not, retract the promises which He had given to the patriarchs, or leave them unfulfilled; and therefore if in His wrath He should destroy the nation, which had shown the obduracy of its nature in its speedy apostasy, He would still fulfil His promise in the person of Moses, and make of him a great nation, as He had promised Abraham in Gen. xii. 2. When God says to Moses, "*Leave Me, allow Me, that My wrath may burn,*" this is only done, as Gregory the Great expresses it,

deprecandi ansam præbere. God puts the fate of the nation into the hand of Moses, that he may remember his mediatorial office, and show himself worthy of his calling. This condescension on the part of God, which placed the preservation or destruction of Israel in the hands of Moses, coupled with a promise, which left the fullest freedom to his decision, viz. that after the destruction of the people he should himself be made a great nation, constituted a great test for Moses, whether he would be willing to give up his own people, laden as they were with guilt, as the price of his own exaltation. And Moses stood the test. The preservation of Israel was dearer to him than the honour of becoming the head and founder of a new kingdom of God. True to his calling as mediator, he entered the breach before God, to turn away His wrath, that He might not destroy the sinful nation (Ps. cvi. 23).—But what if Moses had not stood the test, had not offered his soul for the preservation of his people, as he is said to have done in ver. 32? Would God in that case have thought him fit to make into a great nation? Unquestionably, if this had occurred, he would not have proved himself fit or worthy of such a call; but as God does not call those who are fit and worthy in themselves, for the accomplishment of His purposes of salvation, but chooses rather the unworthy, and makes them fit for His purposes (2 Cor. iii. 5, 6), He might have made even Moses into a great nation. The possibility of such a thing, however, is altogether an abstract thought: the case supposed could not possibly have occurred, since God knows the hearts of His servants, and foresees what they will do, though, notwithstanding His omniscience, He gives to human freedom room enough for self-determination, that He may test the fidelity of His servants. No human speculation, however, can fully explain the conflict between divine providence and human freedom. This promise is referred to by Moses in Deut. ix. 14, when he adds the words which God made use of on a subsequent occasion of a similar kind (Num. xiv. 12), “I will make of thee a nation stronger and more numerous than this.”—Ver. 11. “*And Moses besought the Lord his God.*” חָקָה אֶת־פָּנָי, *lit.* to stroke the face of Jehovah, for the purpose of appeasing His anger, *i.e.* to entreat His mercy, either by means of sacrifices (1 Sam. xiii. 12) or by intercession. He pleaded His acts towards Israel (ver. 11), His honour in the sight of the Egyptians (ver. 12), and the promises He had made

to the patriarchs (ver. 13), and prayed that for His own sake, and the sake of His honour among the heathen, He would show mercy instead of justice. *בְּרָעָה* (ver. 12) does not mean *μετὰ πονηρίας* (LXX.), or *callide* (*Vulg.*), but “for their hurt,”—the preposition denoting the manner in which, or according to which, anything took place.—Ver. 14. “*And Jehovah repented of the evil, etc.*”—On the repentance of God, see at Gen. vi. 6. *Augustine* is substantially correct in saying that “an unexpected change in the things which God has put in His own power is called repentance” (*contra adv. leg. 1, 20*), but he has failed to grasp the deep spiritual idea of the repentance of God, as an anthropopathic description of the pain which is caused to the love of God by the destruction of His creatures.—Ver. 14 contains a remark which anticipates the development of the history, and in which the historian mentions the result of the intercession of Moses, even before Moses had received the assurance of forgiveness, for the purpose of bringing the account of his first negotiations with Jehovah to a close. God let Moses depart without any such assurance, that He might display before the people the full severity of the divine wrath.

Vers. 15-24. When Moses departed from God with the two tables of the law in his hand (see at chap. xxxi. 18), and came to Joshua on the mountain (see at chap. xxiv. 13), the latter heard the shouting of the people (*lit.* the voice of the people in its noise, *רָעָה* for *רָעָה*, from *רָעָה* noise, tumult), and took it to be the noise of war; but Moses said (ver. 18), “*It is not the sound of the answering of power, nor the sound of the answering of weakness,*” *i.e.* they are not such sounds as you hear in the heat of battle from the strong (the conquerors) and the weak (the conquered); “*the sound of antiphonal songs I hear.*” (*עֲנִיתִי* is to be understood, both here and in Ps. lxxxviii. 1, in the same sense as in chap. xv. 21.)—Ver. 19. But when he came nearer to the camp, and saw the calf and the dancing, his anger burned, and he threw down the tables of the covenant and broke them at the foot of the mountain, as a sign that Israel had broken the covenant.—Ver. 20. He then proceeded to the destruction of the idol. “*He burned it in (with) fire,*” by which process the wooden centre was calcined, and the golden coating either entirely or partially melted; and what was left by the fire he ground till it was fine, or, as it is expressed in Deut. ix. 21, he beat it to pieces, grind-

ing it well (*i.e.* crushing it with and between stones), till it was as fine as dust.¹ The dust, which consisted of particles of charcoal and gold, he then “*strewed upon the water,*” or, according to Deuteronomy, “*threw it into the brook which flowed down from the mountain, and made the children of Israel drink,*” *i.e.* compelled them to drink the dust that had been thrown in along with the water of the brook. The object of this was certainly not to make them ashamed, by showing them the worthlessness of their god, and humiliating them by such treatment as compelling them to swallow their own god (as *Knobel* supposes). It was intended rather to set forth in a visible manner both the sin and its consequences. The sin was poured as it were into their bowels along with the water, as a symbolical sign that they would have to bear it and atone for it, just as a woman who was suspected of adultery was obliged to drink the curse-water (Num. v. 24).—Ver. 21. After the calf had been destroyed, Moses called Aaron to account. “*What has this people done to thee* (“*done*” in a bad sense, as in Gen. xxvii. 45; Ex. xiv. 11), *that thou hast brought a great sin upon it?*” Even if Aaron had merely acted from weakness in carrying out the will of the people, he was the most to blame, for not having resisted the urgent entreaty of the people firmly and with strong faith, and even at the cost of his life. Consequently he could think of nothing better than the pitiful subterfuge, “*Be not angry, my lord* (he addresses Moses in this way on account of his office, and because of his anger, cf. Num. xii. 11): *thou knowest the people, that it is in wickedness*” (cf. 1 John v. 19), and the admission that he had been overcome by the urgency of the people, and had thrown the gold they handed him into the fire, and that this calf had come out (vers. 22–24), as if the image had come out of its own accord, without his intention or will. This excuse was so contemptible that Moses did not think it worthy of a reply, at the same time, as he told the people afterwards (Deut. ix. 20), he averted the great wrath of the Lord from him through his intercession.

Vers. 25–29. Moses then turned to the unbridled nation,

¹ There is no necessity to refer to the process of calcining gold, either here or in connection with the destruction of the *Asherah* by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 4, 12; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 4, 7), apart altogether from the question, whether this chemical mode of reducing the precious metals was known at all to Moses and the Israelites.

whom Aaron had set free from all restraint, "for a reproach among their foes," inasmuch as they would necessarily become an object of scorn and derision among the heathen on account of the punishment which their conduct would bring down upon them from God (compare ver. 12 and Deut. xxviii. 37), and sought to restrain their licentiousness and ward off the threatened destruction of the nation through the infliction of a terrible punishment. If the effect of this punishment should show that there were still some remains of obedience and faithfulness towards God left in the nation, Moses might then hope, that in accordance with the pleading of Abraham in Gen. xviii. 23 sqq., he should obtain mercy from God for the whole nation for the sake of those who were righteous. He therefore went into the gate of the camp (the entrance to the camp) and cried out: "Whoever (belongs) to the Lord, (come) to me!" and his hope was not disappointed. "All the Levites gathered together to him." Why the Levites? Certainly not merely, nor chiefly, "because the Levites for the most part had not assented to the people's sin and the worship of the calf, but had been displeased on account of it" (*C. a Lapide*); but partly because the Levites were more prompt in their determination to confess their crime, and return with penitence, and partly out of regard to Moses, who belonged to their tribe, in connection with which it must be borne in mind that the resolution and example of a few distinguished men was sure to be followed by all the rest of their tribe. The reason why no one came over to the side of Moses from any of the other tribes, must also be attributed, to some extent, to the bond that existed among members of the same tribe, and is not sufficiently explained by *Calvin's* hypothesis, that "they were held back, not by contempt or obstinacy, so much as by shame, and that they were all so paralyzed by their alarm, that they waited to see what Moses was about to do and to what length he would proceed."—Ver. 27. The Levites had to allow their obedience to God to be subjected to a severe test. Moses issued this command to them in the name of Jehovah the God of Israel: "Let every one gird on his sword, and go to and fro through the camp from one gate (end) to the other, and put to death brothers, friends, and neighbours," i.e. all whom they met, without regard to relationship, friendship, or acquaintance. And they stood the test. About 3000 men fell by their sword

on that day. There are several difficulties connected with this account, which have furnished occasion for doubts as to its historical credibility. The one of least importance is that which arises from the supposed severity and recklessness of Moses' proceedings. The severity of the punishment corresponded to the magnitude of the crime. The worship of an image, being a manifest transgression of one of the fundamental laws of the covenant, was a breach of the covenant, and as such a capital crime, bringing the punishment of death or extermination in its train. Now, although the whole nation had been guilty of this crime, yet in this, as in every other rebellion, the guilt of all would not be the same, but many would simply follow the example of others; so that, instead of punishing all alike, it was necessary that a separation should be made, if not between the innocent and guilty, yet between the penitent and the stiff-necked transgressors. To effect this separation, Moses called out into the camp: "Over to me, whoever is for the Lord!" All the Levites responded to his call, but not the other tribes; and it was necessary that the refractory should be punished. Even these, however, had not all sinned to the same extent, but might be divided into tempters and tempted; and as they were all mixed up together, nothing remained but to adopt that kind of punishment, which has been resorted to in all ages in such circumstances as these. "If at any time," as *Calvin* says, "mutiny has broken out in an army, and has led to violence, and even to bloodshed, by *universal law* a commander proceeds to *decimate* the guilty." He then adds, "How much milder, however, was the punishment here, when out of six hundred thousand only three thousand were put to death!" This decimation Moses committed to the Levites; and just as in every other decimation the selection must be determined by lot or accidental choice, so here Moses left it to be determined by chance, upon whom the sword of the Levites would fall, knowing very well that even the so-called chance would be under the direction of God.

There is apparently a greater difficulty in the fact, that not only did the Levites execute the command of Moses without reserve, but the people let them pass through the camp, and kill every one who came within reach of their sword, without offering the slightest resistance. To remove this difficulty, there is no necessity that we should either assume that the Levites knew

who were the originators and ringleaders of the worship of the calf, and only used their swords against them, as *Calvin* does, or that we should follow *Kurtz*, and introduce into the text a "formal conflict between the two parties, in which some of Moses' party were also slain," since the history says nothing about "the men who sided with Moses gaining a complete victory," and merely states that in obedience to the word of Jehovah the God of Israel, as declared by Moses, they put 3000 men of the people to death with the sword. The obedience of the Levites was an act of faith, which knows neither the fear of man nor regard to person. The unresisting attitude of the people generally may be explained, partly from their reverence for Moses, whom God had so mightily and marvellously accredited as His servant in the sight of all the nation, and partly from the despondency and fear so natural to a guilty conscience, which took away all capacity for opposing the bold and determined course that was adopted by the divinely appointed rulers and their servants in obedience to the command of God. It must also be borne in mind, that in the present instance the sin of the people was not connected with any rebellion against Moses.

Very different explanations have been given of the words which were spoken by Moses to the Levites (ver. 29): "*Fill your hand to-day for Jehovah; for every one against his son and against his brother, and to bring a blessing upon you to-day.*" "To fill the hand for Jehovah" does not mean to offer a sacrifice to the Lord, but to provide something to offer to God (1 Chron. xxix. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 31). Thus *Jonathan's* explanation, which *Kurtz* has revived in a modified form, viz. that Moses commanded the Levites to offer sacrifices as an expiation for the blood that they had shed, or for the rent made in the congregation by their reckless slaughter of their blood-relations, falls to the ground; though we cannot understand how the fulfilment of a divine command, or an act of obedience to the declared will of God, could be regarded as blood-guiltiness, or as a crime that needed expiation. As far as the clause which follows is concerned, so much is clear, viz. that the words can neither be rendered, "for every one is *in* his son," etc., nor "for every one *was* against his son," etc. To the former it is impossible to attach any sense; and the latter cannot be correct, because the preterite וְהָיָה could not be omitted after an imperative,

if the explanatory clause referred to what was past. If וְ were a causal particle in this case, the meaning could only be, "for every one shall be against his son," etc. But it is much better to understand it as indicating the object, "that every one may be against his son and against his brother;" *i.e.* that in the cause of the Lord every one may not spare even his nearest relative, but deny either son or brother for the Lord's sake (Deut. xxxiii. 9). "*And to give*" (or bring), *i.e.* so that ye may bring, "*a blessing upon yourselves to-day.*" The following, then, is the thought contained in the verse: Provide yourselves to-day with a gift for the Lord, consecrate yourselves to-day for the service of the Lord, by preserving the obedience you have just shown towards Him, by not knowing either son or brother in His service, and thus gain for yourselves a blessing. In the fulfilment of the command of God, with the denial of their own flesh and blood, Moses discerns such a disposition and act as would fit them for the service of the Lord. He therefore points to the blessing which it would bring them, and exhorts them by their election as the peculiar possession of Jehovah (Num. iii. iv.), which would be secured to them from this time forward, to persevere in this fidelity to the Lord. "The zeal of the tribe-father burned still in the Levites; but this time it was for the glory of God, and not for their own. Their ancestor had violated both truth and justice by his vengeance upon the Shechemites, from a false regard to blood-relationship, but now his descendants had saved truth, justice, and the covenant by avenging Jehovah upon their own relations" (*Kurtz, and Oehler in Herzog's Cycl.*), so that the curse which rested upon them (Gen. xlix. 7) could now be turned into a blessing (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 9).

Vers. 30-35. After Moses had thus avenged the honour of the Lord upon the sinful nation, he returned the next day to Jehovah as a mediator, who is not a mediator of one (Gal. iii. 20), that by the force of his intercession he might turn the divine wrath, which threatened destruction, into sparing grace and compassion, and that he might expiate the sin of the nation. He had received no assurance of mercy in reply to his first entreaty (vers. 11-13). He therefore announced his intention to the people in these words: "*Peradventure I can make an atonement for your sin.*" But to the Lord he said (vers. 31, 32),

“*The sin of this people is a great sin ; they have made themselves a god of gold,*” in opposition to the clear commandment in chap. xx. 23 : “*and now, if Thou wilt forgive their sin, and if not, blot me out of the book that Thou hast written.*” The book which Jehovah has written is the book of life, or of the living (Ps. lxix. 29 ; Dan. xii. 1). This expression is founded upon the custom of writing the names of the burgesses of a town or country in a burgess-list, whereby they are recognised as natives of the country, or citizens of the city, and all the privileges of citizenship are secured to them. The book of life contains the list of the righteous (Ps. lxix. 29), and ensures to those whose names are written there, life before God, first in the earthly kingdom of God, and then eternal life also, according to the knowledge of salvation, which keeps pace with the progress of divine revelation, *e.g.* in the New Testament, where the heirs of eternal life are found written in the book of life (Phil. iv. 3 ; Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8, etc.),—an advance for which the way was already prepared by Isa. iv. 3 and Dan. xii. 1. To blot out of Jehovah’s book, therefore, is to cut off from fellowship with the living God, or from the kingdom of those who live before God, and to deliver over to death. As a true mediator of his people, Moses was ready to stake his own life for the deliverance of the nation, and not to live before God himself, if Jehovah did not forgive the people their sin. These words of Moses were the strongest expression of devoted, self-sacrificing love. And they were just as deep and true as the wish expressed by the Apostle Paul in Rom. ix. 3, that he might be accursed from Christ for the sake of his brethren according to the flesh. *Bengel* compares this wish of the apostle to the prayer of Moses, and says with regard to this unbounded fulness of love, “It is not easy to estimate the measure of love in a Moses and a Paul ; for the narrow boundary of our reasoning powers does not comprehend it, as the little child is unable to comprehend the courage of warlike heroes” (Eng. Tr.). The infinite love of God is unable to withstand the importunity of such love. God, who is holy love, cannot sacrifice the righteous and good for the unrighteous and guilty, nor can He refuse the mediatorial intercession of His faithful servant, so long as the sinful nation has not filled up the measure of its guilt, in which case even the intercession of a Moses and a Samuel would not be able to avert the judgment

(Jer. xv. 1, cf. Ezek. xiv. 16). Hence, although Jehovah puts back the wish and prayer of Moses with the words, "*Whoever* (כִּי אֲשֶׁר, both here and in 2 Sam. xx. 11, is more emphatic than either one or the other alone) *has sinned, him will I blot out of My book,*" He yields to the entreaty that He will ensure to Moses the continuance of the nation under His guidance, and under the protection of His angel, which shall go before it (see at chap. xxxiii. 2, 3), and defer the punishment of their sin until the day of His visitation.—Ver. 35. "*Thus Jehovah smote the people because they had made the calf.*" With these words the historian closes the first act of Moses' negotiations with the Lord on account of this sin, from which it was apparent how God had repented of the evil with which He had threatened the nation (ver. 14). Moses had obtained the preservation of the people and their entrance into the promised land, under the protection of God, through his intercession, and averted from the nation the abrogation of the covenant; but the covenant relation which had existed before was not restored in its integrity. Though grace may modify and soften wrath, it cannot mar the justice of the holy God. No doubt an atonement had been made to justice, through the punishment which the Levites had inflicted upon the nation, but only a passing and imperfect one. Only a small portion of the guilty nation had been punished, and that without the others showing themselves worthy of forgiving grace through sorrow and repentance. The punishment, therefore, was not remitted, but only postponed in the long-suffering of God, "until the day of retribution" or visitation. The day of visitation came at length, when the stiff-necked people had filled up the measure of their sin through repeated rebellion against Jehovah and His servant Moses, and were sentenced at Kadesh to die out in the wilderness (Num. xiv. 26 sqq.). The sorrow manifested by the people (chap. xxxiii. 4), when the answer of God was made known to them, was a proof that the measure was not yet full.

Chap. xxxiii. 1-6. Moses' negotiations with the people, for the purpose of bringing them to sorrow and repentance, commenced with the announcement of what Jehovah had said. The words of Jehovah in vers. 1-3, which are only a still further expansion of the assurance contained in chap. xxxii. 34, commence in a similar manner to the covenant promise in chap.

xxiii. 20, 23 ; but there is this great difference, that whereas the name, *i.e.* the presence of Jehovah Himself, was to have gone before the Israelites in the angel promised to the people as a leader in chap. xxiii. 20, now, though Jehovah would still send an angel before Moses and Israel, He Himself would not go up to Canaan (a land flowing, etc., see at iii. 8) in the midst of Israel, lest He should destroy the people by the way, because they were stiff-necked (קָשָׁיִם for קָשָׁיִם, see *Ges.* § 27, 3, *Anm.* 2).—Ver. 4. The people were so overwhelmed with sorrow by this evil word, that they all put off their ornaments, and showed by this outward sign the trouble of their heart.—Ver. 5. That this good beginning of repentance might lead to a true and permanent change of heart, Jehovah repeated His threat in a most emphatic manner : “ *Thou art a stiff-necked people ; if I go a moment in the midst of thee, I destroy thee :*” *i.e.* if I were to go up in the midst of thee for only a single moment, I should be compelled to destroy thee because of thine obduracy. He then issued this command : “ *Throw thine ornament away from thee, and I shall know (by that) what to do to thee.*”—Ver. 6. And the people obeyed this commandment, renouncing all that pleased the eye. “ *The children of Israel spoiled themselves (see at chap. xii. 36) of their ornament from Mount Horeb onwards.*” Thus they entered formally into a penitential condition. The expression, “ *from Mount Horeb onwards,*” can hardly be paraphrased as it is by *Seb. Schmidt*, *viz.* “ *going from Mount Horeb into the camp,*” but in all probability expresses this idea, that from that time forward, *i.e.* after the occurrence of this event at Horeb, they laid aside the ornaments which they had hitherto worn, and assumed the outward appearance of perpetual penitence.

Vers. 7-11. Moses then took a tent, and pitched it outside the camp, at some distance off, and called it “ *tent of meeting.*” The “ *tent*” is neither the sanctuary of the tabernacle described in chap. xxv. sqq., which was not made till after the perfect restoration of the covenant (chap. xxxv. sqq.), nor another sanctuary that had come down from their forefathers and was used before the tabernacle was built, as *Clericus*, *J. D. Michaelis*, *Rosenmüller*, and others suppose ; but a tent belonging to Moses, which was made into a temporary sanctuary by the fact that the pillar of cloud came down upon it, and Jehovah

talked with Moses there, and which was called by the same name as the tabernacle, viz. אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד (see at chap. xxvii. 21), because Jehovah revealed Himself there, and every one who sought Him had to go to this tent outside the camp. There were two reasons for this: in the first place, Moses desired thereby to lead the people to a fuller recognition of their separation from their God, that their penitence might be deepened in consequence; and in the second place, he wished to provide such means of intercourse with Jehovah as would not only awaken in the minds of the people a longing for the renewal of the covenant, but render the restoration of the covenant possible. And this end was answered. Not only did every one who sought Jehovah go out to the tent, but the whole nation looked with the deepest reverence when Moses went out to the tent, and bowed in adoration before the Lord, every one in front of his tent, when they saw the pillar of cloud come down upon the tent and stand before the door. Out of this cloud Jehovah talked with Moses (vers. 7-10) "*face to face, as a man talks with his friend*" (ver. 11); that is to say, not from the distance of heaven, through any kind of medium whatever, but "*mouth to mouth,*" as it is called in Num. xii. 8, as closely and directly as friends talk to one another. "These words indicate, therefore, a familiar conversation, just as much as if it had been said, that God appeared to Moses in some peculiar form of manifestation. If any one objects to this, that it is at variance with the assertion which we shall come to presently, 'Thou canst not see My face,' the answer is a very simple one. Although Jehovah showed Himself to Moses in some peculiar form of manifestation, He never appeared in His own essential glory, but only in such a mode as human weakness could bear. This solution contains a tacit comparison, viz. that there never was any one equal to Moses, or who had attained to the same dignity as he" (*Calvin*). When Moses returned to the tent, his servant Joshua remained behind as guard.—This condescension on the part of Jehovah towards Moses could not fail to strengthen the people in their reliance upon their leader, as the confidant of Jehovah. And Moses himself was encouraged thereby to endeavour to effect a perfect restoration of the covenant bond that had been destroyed.

Vers. 12-23. Jehovah had commanded Moses to lead the

people to Canaan, and promised him the guidance of an angel; but He had expressly distinguished this angel from His own personal presence (vers. 1-3). Moreover, though it has not been mentioned before, Jehovah had said to Moses, "*I have known thee by name,*"—*i.e.* I have recognised thee as Mine, and chosen and called thee to execute My will (cf. Isa. xliii. 1, xlix. 1), or put thee into "a specifically personal relation to God, which was peculiar to Moses, and therefore was associated with his name" (*Oehler*);—"and thou hast also found grace in My eyes," inasmuch as God had granted a hearing to his former intercession. Moses now reminded the Lord of this divine assurance with such courage as can only be produced by faith, which wrestles with God and will not let Him go without a blessing (Gen. xxxii. 27); and upon the strength of this he presented the petition (ver. 13), "*Let me know Thy way* (the way which Thou wilt take with me and with this people), *that I may know Thee, in order that I may find grace in Thine eyes, and see that this people is Thy people.*" The meaning is this: If I have found grace in Thy sight, and Thou hast recognised me as Thy servant, and called me to be the leader of this people, do not leave me in uncertainty as to Thine intentions concerning the people, or as to the angel whom Thou wilt give as a guide to me and the nation, that I may know Thee, that is to say, that my finding grace in Thine eyes may become a reality;¹ and if Thou wilt lead the people up to Canaan, consider that it is Thine own people, to whom Thou must acknowledge Thyself as its God. Such boldness of undoubting faith presses to the heart of God, and brings away the blessing. Jehovah replied (ver. 14), "*My face will go, and I shall give thee rest,*"—that is to say, shall bring thee and all this people into the land, where ye will find rest (Deut. iii. 20). The "face" of Jehovah is Jehovah in His own personal presence, and is identical with the "angel" in whom the name of Jehovah was (chap. xxiii. 20, 21), and who is therefore called in Isa. lxiii. 9 "the angel of His face."

With this assurance on the part of God, the covenant bond was completely restored. But to make more sure of it, Moses replied (vers. 15, 16), "*If Thy face is not going* (with us), *lead us not up hence And whereby shall it be known that I have found grace in thine eyes, I and Thy people, if not* (*lit.* is it not known)

¹ *Domine fac ut verbis tuis respondeat eventus* (*Calvin*).

in Thy going with us, that we, I and Thy people, are distinguished (see at chap. viii. 18) before every nation upon the face of the earth?" These words do not express any doubt as to the truth of the divine assurance, "but a certain feeling of the insufficiency of the assurance," inasmuch as even with the restoration of the former condition of things there still remained "the fear lest the evil root of the people's rebellion, which had once manifested itself, should break forth again at any moment" (*Baumgarten*). For this reason Jehovah assured him that this request also should be granted (ver. 17). "There was nothing extraordinary in the fact that Moses desired for himself and his people that they might be distinguished before every nation upon the face of the earth; this was merely the firm hold of faith upon the calling and election of God (chap. xix. 5, 6)."—Ver. 18. Moses was emboldened by this, and now prayed to the Lord, "*Let me see Thy glory.*" What Moses desired to see, as the answer of God clearly shows, must have been something surpassing all former revelations of the glory of Jehovah (chap. xvi. 7, 10, xxiv. 16, 17), and even going beyond Jehovah's talking with him face to face (ver. 11). When God talked with him face to face, or mouth to mouth, he merely saw a "similitude of Jehovah" (Num. xii. 8), a form which rendered the invisible being of God visible to the human eye, *i.e.* a manifestation of the divine glory in a certain form, and not the direct or essential glory of Jehovah, whilst the people saw this glory under the veil of a dark cloud, rendered luminous by fire, that is to say, they only saw its splendour as it shone through the cloud; and even the elders, at the time when the covenant was made, only saw the God of Israel in a certain form which hid from their eyes the essential being of God (xxiv. 10, 11). What Moses desired, therefore, was a sight of the glory or essential being of God, without any figure, and without a veil.

Moses was urged to offer this prayer, as *Calvin* truly says, not by "*stulta curiositas, quæ ut plurimum titillat hominum mentes, ut audacter penetrare tentent usque ad ultima cælorum arcana,*" but by "a desire to cross the chasm which had been made by the apostasy of the nation, that for the future he might have a firmer footing than the previous history had given him. As so great a stress had been laid upon his own person in his present task of mediation between the offended Jehovah and the apostate nation, he felt that the separation, which existed between himself

and Jehovah, introduced a disturbing element into his office. For if his own personal fellowship with Jehovah was not fully established, and raised above all possibility of disturbance, there could be no eternal foundation for the perpetuity of his mediation" (*Baumgarten*). As a man called by God to be His servant, he was not yet the perfect mediator; but although he was faithful in all his house, it was only as a servant, called εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων (Heb. iii. 5), i.e. as a herald of the saving revelations of God, preparing the way for the coming of the perfect Mediator. Jehovah therefore granted his request, but only so far as the limit existing between the infinite and holy God and finite and sinful man allowed. "I will make all My goodness pass before thy face, and proclaim the name of Jehovah before thee (עֲשֵׂה אֶפְרָיִם see at Gen iv. 26), and will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and will show mercy on whom I will show mercy. Thou canst not see My face, for man cannot see Me and live." The words וְנֹרָאִי וְנֹרָאִי, although only connected with the previous clause by the cop. ו, are to be understood in a causative sense, as expressing the reason why Moses' request was granted, viz. that it was an act of unconditional grace and compassion on the part of God, to which no man, not even Moses, could lay any just claim. The Apostle Paul uses the words in the same sense in Rom. ix. 15, for the purpose of overthrowing the claims of self-righteous Jews to participate in the Messianic salvation.—No mortal man can see the face of God and remain alive; for not only is the holy God a consuming fire to unholy man, but a limit has been set, in and with the σῶμα χοϊκόν and ψυχικόν (the earthly and psychical body) of man, between the infinite God, the absolute Spirit, and the human spirit clothed in an earthly body, which will only be removed by the "redemption of our body," and our being clothed in a "spiritual body," and which, so long as it lasts, renders a direct sight of the glory of God impossible. As our bodily eye is dazzled, and its power of vision destroyed, by looking directly at the brightness of the sun, so would our whole nature be destroyed by an unveiled sight of the brilliancy of the glory of God. So long as we are clothed with this body, which was destined, indeed, from the very first to be transformed into the glorified state of the immortality of the spirit, but has become through the fall a prey to the corruption of death, we can only walk in faith, and only see God with the eye of faith,

so far as He has revealed His glory to us in His works and His word. When we have become like God, and have been transformed into the "divine nature" (2 Pet. i. 4), then, and not till then, shall we see Him as He is; then we shall see His glory without a veil, and live before Him for ever. For this reason Moses had to content himself with the passing by of the glory of God before his face, and with the revelation of the name of Jehovah through the medium of the word, in which God discloses His inmost being, and, so to speak, His whole heart to faith. In ver. 22 "My glory" is used for "all My goodness," and in chap. xxxiv. 6 it is stated that *Jehovah* passed by before the face of Moses. כבוד is not to be understood in the sense of beautiful, or beauty, but signifies goodness; not the brilliancy which strikes the senses, but the spiritual and ethical nature of the Divine Being. For the manifestation of Jehovah, which passed before Moses, was intended unquestionably to reveal nothing else than what Jehovah expressed in the proclamation of His name.

The manifested glory of the Lord would so surely be followed by the destruction of man, that even Moses needed to be protected before it (vers. 21, 22). Whilst Jehovah, therefore, allowed him to come to a place upon the rock near Him, *i.e.* upon the summit of Sinai (chap. xxxiv. 2), He said that He would put him in a cleft of the rock whilst He was passing by, and cover him with His hand, *i.e.* with His protecting power, and only take away His hand when He had gone by, that he might see His back, because His face could not be seen. The back, as contrasted with the face, signifies the reflection of the glory of God that had just passed by. The words are transferred anthropomorphically from man to God, because human language and human thought can only conceive of the nature of the absolute Spirit according to the analogy of the human form. As the inward nature of man manifests itself in his face, and the sight of his back gives only an imperfect and outward view of him, so Moses saw only the back and not the face of Jehovah. It is impossible to put more into human words concerning this unparalleled vision, which far surpasses all human thought and comprehension. According to chap. xxxiv. 2, the place where Moses stood by the Lord was at the top (the head) of Sinai, and no more can be determined with certainty concerning it. The cleft

in the rock (ver. 22) has been supposed by some to be the same place as the "cave" in which Elijah lodged at Horeb, and where the Lord appeared to him in the still small voice (1 Kings xix. 9 sqq.). The real summit of the Jebel Musa consists of "a small area of huge rocks, about 80 feet in diameter," upon which there is now a chapel that has almost fallen down, and about 40 feet to the south-west a dilapidated mosque (*Robinson, Palestine*, vol. i. p. 153). Below this mosque, according to *Seetzen (Reise* iii. pp. 83, 84), there is a very small grotto, into which you descend by several steps, and to which a large block of granite, about a fathom and a half long and six spans in height, serves as a roof. According to the Mussulman tradition, which the Greek monks also accept, it was in this small grotto that Moses received the law; though other monks point out a "hole, just large enough for a man," near the altar of the Elijah chapel, on the small plain upon the ridge of Sinai, above which the loftier peak rises about 700 feet, as the cave in which Elijah lodged on Horeb (*Robinson, Pal. ut supra*).

Chap. xxxiv. 1-10. When Moses had restored the covenant bond through his intercession (chap. xxxiii. 14), he was directed by Jehovah to hew out two stones, like the former ones which he had broken, and to come with them the next morning up the mountain, and Jehovah would write upon them the same words as upon the first,¹ and thus restore the covenant record. It was also commanded, as in the former case (chap. xix. 12, 13), that no one should go up the mountain with him, or be seen upon it, and that not even cattle should feed against the mountain, *i.e.* in the immediate neighbourhood (ver. 3). The first tables of the covenant were called "tables of stone" (chap. xxiv. 12, xxxi. 18); the second, on the other hand, which were hewn by Moses, are called "tables of stones" (vers. 1 and 4); and the latter expression is applied indiscriminately to both of them in Deut. iv. 13, v. 19, ix. 9-11, x. 1-4. This difference does not indicate a diversity in the records, but may be explained very simply from the fact, that the tables prepared by Moses were hewn from two stones, and not both from the same block; whereas all that could be said of the former, which had been

¹ Namely, the ten words in chap. xx. 2-17, not the laws contained in vers. 12-26 of this chapter, as *Göthe* and *Hitzig* suppose. See *Hengstenberg, Dissertations* ii. p. 319, and *Kurtz* on the Old Covenant iii. 182 sqq.

made by God Himself, was that they were of stone, since no one knew whether God had used one stone or two for the purpose. There is apparently far more importance in the following distinction, that the second tables were delivered by Moses and only written upon by God, whereas in the case of the former both the writing and the materials came from God. This cannot have been intended either as a punishment for the nation (*Hengstenberg*), or as "the sign of a higher stage of the covenant, inasmuch as the further the reciprocity extended, the firmer was the covenant" (*Baumgarten*). It is much more natural to seek for the cause, as *Rashi* does, in the fact, that Moses had broken the first in pieces; only we must not regard it as a sign that God disapproved of the manifestation of anger on the part of Moses, but rather as a recognition of his zealous exertions for the restoration of the covenant which had been broken by the sin of the nation. As Moses had restored the covenant through his energetic intercession, he should also provide the materials for the renewal of the covenant record, and bring them to God, for Him to complete and confirm the record by writing the covenant words upon the tables.

On the following morning, when Moses ascended the mountain, Jehovah granted him the promised manifestation of His glory (vers. 5 sqq.). The description of this unparalleled occurrence is in perfect harmony with the mysterious and majestic character of the revelation. "*Jehovah descended (from heaven) in the cloud, and stood by him there, and proclaimed the name of Jehovah; and Jehovah passed by in his sight, and proclaimed Jehovah, Jehovah God, merciful and gracious,*" etc. What Moses saw we are not told, but simply the words in which Jehovah proclaimed all the glory of His being; whilst it is recorded of Moses, that he bowed his head toward the earth and worshipped. This "sermon on the name of the Lord," as *Luther* calls it, disclosed to Moses the most hidden nature of Jehovah. It proclaimed that God is love, but that kind of love in which mercy, grace, long-suffering, goodness, and truth are united with holiness and justice. As the merciful One, who is great in goodness and truth, Jehovah shows mercy to the thousandth, forgiving sin and iniquity in long-suffering and grace; but He does not leave sin altogether unpunished, and in His justice visits the sin of the fathers upon the children and the children's children even unto

the fourth generation. The Lord had already revealed Himself to the whole nation from Mount Sinai as visiting sin and showing mercy (chap. xx. 5 sqq.). But whereas on that occasion the burning zeal of Jehovah which visits sin stood in the foreground, and mercy only followed afterwards, here grace, mercy, and goodness are placed in the front. And accordingly all the words which the language contained to express the idea of grace in its varied manifestations to the sinner, are crowded together here, to reveal the fact that in His inmost being God is love. But in order that grace may not be perverted by sinners into a ground of wantonness, justice is not wanting even here with its solemn threatenings, although it only follows mercy, to show that mercy is mightier than wrath, and that holy love does not punish till sinners despise the riches of the goodness, patience, and long-suffering of God. As Jehovah here proclaimed His name, so did He continue to bear witness of it to the Israelites, from their departure from Sinai till their entrance into Canaan, and from that time forward till their dispersion among the heathen, and even now in their exile showing mercy to the thousandth, when they turn to the Redeemer who has come out of Zion.—Ver. 9. On this manifestation of mercy, Moses repeated the prayer that Jehovah would go in the midst of Israel. It is true the Lord had already promised that His face should go with them (chap. xxxiii. 14); but as Moses had asked for a sight of the glory of the Lord as a seal to the promise, it was perfectly natural that, when this petition was granted, he should lay hold of the grace that had been revealed to him as it never had been before, and endeavour to give even greater stability to the covenant. To this end he repeated his former intercession on behalf of the nation, at the same time making this confession, “For it is a stiff-necked people; therefore forgive our iniquity and our sin, and make us the inheritance.” Moses spoke collectively, including himself in the nation in the presence of God. The reason which he assigned pointed to the deep root of corruption that had broken out in the worship of the golden calf, and was appropriately pleaded as a motive for asking forgiveness, inasmuch as God Himself had assigned the natural corruption of the human race as a reason why He would not destroy it again with a flood (Gen. viii. 21). Wrath was mitigated by a regard to the natural condition.—*לָקַח* in the *Kal*, with an accusative of the person, does not mean to lead a person

into the inheritance, but to make a person into an inheritance; here, therefore, to make Israel the possession of Jehovah (Deut. iv. 20, ix. 26, cf. Zech. ii. 16). Jehovah at once declared (ver. 10) that He would conclude a covenant, *i.e.* restore the broken covenant, and do marvels before the whole nation, such as had not been done in all the earth or in any nation, and thus by these His works distinguish Israel before all nations as His own property (chap. xxxiii. 16). The nation was to see this, because it would be terrible; terrible, namely, through the overthrow of the powers that resisted the kingdom of God, every one of whom would be laid prostrate and destroyed by the majesty of the Almighty.

Vers. 11-26. To recall the duties of the covenant once more to the minds of the people, the Lord repeats from among the rights of Israel, upon the basis of which the covenant had been established (chap. xxi.-xxiii.), two of the leading points which determined the attitude of the nation towards Him, and which constituted, as it were, the main pillars that were to support the covenant about to be renewed. These were, *first*, the warning against every kind of league with the Canaanites, who were to be driven out before the Israelites (vers. 11-16); and, *secondly*, the instructions concerning the true worship of Jehovah (vers. 17-26). The warning against friendship with the idolatrous Canaanites (vers. 11-16) is more fully developed and more strongly enforced than in chap. xxiii. 23 sqq. The Israelites, when received into the covenant with Jehovah, were not only to beware of forming any covenant with the inhabitants of Canaan (cf. xxiii. 32, 33), but were to destroy all the signs of their idolatrous worship, such as altars, monuments (see chap. xxiii. 24), and *asherim*, the idols of Astarte, the Canaanitish goddess of nature, which consisted for the most part of wooden pillars (see my Comm. on 1 Kings xiv. 23), and to worship no other god, because Jehovah was called jealous, *i.e.* had revealed Himself as jealous (see at chap. xx. 5), and was a jealous God. This was commanded, that the Israelites might not suffer themselves to be led astray by such an alliance; to go a whoring after their gods, and sacrifice to them, to take part in their sacrificial festivals, or to marry their sons to the daughters of the Canaanites, by whom they would be persuaded to join in the worship of idols. The use of the expression "go a whoring" in a spiritual sense, in re-

lation to idolatry, is to be accounted for on the ground, that the religious fellowship of Israel with Jehovah was a covenant resembling the marriage tie; and we meet with it for the first time here, immediately after the formation of this covenant between Israel and Jehovah. The phrase is all the more expressive on account of the literal prostitution that was frequently associated with the worship of Baal and Astarte (cf. Lev. xvii. 7, xx. 5, 6; Num. xiv. 33, etc.). We may see from Num. xxv. 1 sqq. how Israel was led astray by this temptation in the wilderness.—Vers. 17-26. The true way to worship Jehovah is then pointed out, first of all negatively, in the prohibition against making molten images, with an allusion to the worship of the golden calf, as evinced by the use of the expression אֱלֹהֵי מַסֵּכָה, which only occurs again in Lev. xix. 4, instead of the phrase “gods of silver and gold” (chap. xx. 23); and then positively, by a command to observe the feast of *Mazzoth* and the consecration of the first-born connected with the Passover (see at chap. xiii. 2, 11, and 12), also the Sabbath (ver. 21), the feasts of Weeks and Ingathering, the appearance of the male members of the nation three times a year before the Lord (ver. 22, see at chap. xxiii. 14-17), together with all the other instructions connected with them (vers. 25, 26). Before the last, however, the promise is introduced, that after the expulsion of the Canaanites, Jehovah would enlarge the borders of Israel (cf. xxiii. 31), and make their land so secure, that when they went up to the Lord three times in the year, no one should desire their land, *sc.* because of the universal dread of the might of their God (chap. xxiii. 27).

Vers. 27-35. Moses was to write down these words, like the covenant rights and laws that had been given before (chap. xxiv. 4, 7), because Jehovah had concluded the covenant with Moses and Israel according to the tenor of them. By the renewed adoption of the nation, the covenant in chap. xxiv. was *eo ipso* restored; so that no fresh conclusion of this covenant was necessary, and the writing down of the fundamental conditions of the covenant was merely intended as a proof of its restoration. It does not appear in the least degree “irreconcilable,” therefore, with the writing down of the covenant rights before (*Knobel*).—Ver. 28. Moses remained upon the mountain forty days, just as on the former occasion (cf. xxiv. 18). “*And He (Jehovah) wrote upon the tables the ten covenant words*” (see at ver. 1).—

Vers. 29 sqq. The sight of the glory of Jehovah, though only of the back or reflection of it, produced such an effect upon Moses' face, that the skin of it shone, though without Moses observing it. When he came down from the mountain with the tables of the law in his hand, and the skin of his face shone *בְּרָצְרָא אִתּוֹ*, *i.e.* on account of his talking with God, Aaron and the people were afraid to go near him when they saw the brightness of his face. But Moses called them to him,—viz. first of all Aaron and the princes of the congregation to speak to them, and then all the people to give them the commandments of Jehovah; but on doing this (ver. 33), he put a veil upon (before) his face, and only took it away when he went in before Jehovah to speak with Him, and then, when he came out (from the Lord out of the tabernacle, of course after the erection of the tabernacle), he made known His commands to the people. But while doing this, he put the veil upon his face again, and always wore it in his ordinary intercourse with the people (vers. 34, 35). This reflection of the splendour thrown back by the glory of God was henceforth to serve as the most striking proof of the confidential relation in which Moses stood to Jehovah, and to set forth the glory of the office which Moses filled. The Apostle Paul embraces this view in 2 Cor. iii. 7 sqq., and lays stress upon the fact that the glory was to be done away, which he was quite justified in doing, although nothing is said in the Old Testament about the glory being transient, from the simple fact that Moses died. The apostle refers to it for the purpose of contrasting the perishable glory of the law with the far higher and imperishable glory of the Gospel. At the same time he regards the veil which covered Moses' face as a symbol of the obscuring of the truth revealed in the Old Testament. But this does not exhaust the significance of this splendour. The office could only confer such glory upon the possessor by virtue of the glory of the blessings which it contained, and conveyed to those for whom it was established. Consequently, the brilliant light on Moses' face also set forth the glory of the Old Covenant, and was intended both for Moses and the people as a foresight and pledge of the glory to which Jehovah had called, and would eventually exalt, the people of His possession.

ERECTION OF THE TABERNACLE, AND PREPARATION OF THE APPARATUS OF WORSHIP.—CHAP. XXXV.—XXXIX.

Chap. xxxv. 1-xxxvi. 7. PRELIMINARIES TO THE WORK.—
 Chap. xxxv. 1-29. After the restoration of the covenant, Moses announced to the people the divine commands with reference to the holy place of the tabernacle which was to be built. He repeated first of all (vers. 1-3) the law of the Sabbath according to chap. xxxi. 13-17, and strengthened it by the announcement, that on the Sabbath no fire was to be kindled in their dwelling, because this rule was to be observed even in connection with the work to be done for the tabernacle. (For a fuller comment, see at chap. xx. 9 sqq.) Then, in accordance with the command of Jehovah, he first of all summoned the whole nation to present freewill-offerings for the holy things to be prepared (vers. 4, 5), mentioning one by one all the materials that would be required (vers. 5-9, as in chap. xxv. 3-7); and after that he called upon those who were endowed with understanding to prepare the different articles, as prescribed in chap. xxv.-xxx., mentioning these also one by one (vers. 11-19), even down to the pegs of the dwelling and court (xxvii. 19), and "their cords," *i.e.* the cords required to fasten the tent and the hangings round the court to the pegs that were driven into the ground, which had not been mentioned before, being altogether subordinate things. (On the "cloths of service," ver. 19, see at chap. xxxi. 10.) In vers. 20-29 we have an account of the fulfilment of this command. The people went from Moses, *i.e.* from the place where they were assembled round Moses, away to their tents, and willingly offered the things required as a heave-offering for Jehovah; every one "whom his heart lifted up," *i.e.* who felt himself inclined and stirred up in his heart to do this. The men along with (וְאִשְׁרָאֵלִים as in Gen. xxxii. 12; see *Ewald*, § 217) the women brought with a willing heart all kinds of golden rings and jewellery: *chak*, *lit.* hook, here a clasp or ring; *nezem*, an ear or nose-ring (Gen. xxxv. 4, xxiv. 47); *tabbaath*, a finger-ring; *cumaz*, *globulus aureus*, probably little golden balls strung together like beads, which were worn by the Israelites and Midianites (Num. xxxi. 50) as an ornament round the wrist and neck, as *Diod. Sic.* relates that they were by the Arabians (3, 44). "All kinds of golden jewellery,

and every one who had waved (dedicated) a wave (offering) of gold to Jehovah," sc. offered it for the work of the tabernacle. The meaning is, that in addition to the many varieties of golden ornaments, which were willingly offered for the work to be performed, every one brought whatever gold he had set apart as a wave-offering (a sacrificial gift) for Jehovah. *תניף* to wave, lit. to swing or move to and fro, is used in connection with the sacrificial ritual to denote a peculiar ceremony, through which certain portions of a sacrifice, which were not intended for burning upon the altar, but for the maintenance of the priests (Num. xviii. 11); were consecrated to the Lord, or given up to Him in a symbolical manner (see at Lev. vii. 30). *Tenuphah*, the wave-offering, accordingly denoted primarily those portions of the sacrificial animal which were allotted to the priests as their share of the sacrifices; and then, in a more general sense, every gift or offering that was consecrated to the Lord for the establishment and maintenance of the sanctuary and its worship. In this wider sense the term *tenuphah* (wave-offering) is applied both here and in chap. xxxviii. 24, 29 to the gold and copper presented by the congregation for the building of the tabernacle. So that it does not really differ from *terumah*, a lift or heave-offering, as every gift intended for the erection and maintenance of the sanctuary was called, inasmuch as the offerer lifted it off from his own property, to dedicate it to the Lord for the purposes of His worship. Accordingly, in ver. 24 the freewill-offerings of the people in silver and gold for the erection of the tabernacle are called *terumah*; and in chap. xxxvi. 6, all the gifts of metal, wood, leather, and woven materials, presented by the people for the erection of the tabernacle, are called *תְּרומַת קֹדֶשׁ* (On heaving and the heave-offering, see at chap. xxv. 2 and Lev. ii. 9.)—Vers. 25, 26. All the women who understood it (were wise-hearted, as in chap. xxviii. 3) spun with their hands, and presented what they spun, viz. the yarn required for the blue and red purple cloth, the crimson and the byssus; from which it is evident that the coloured cloths were dyed in the yarn or in the wool, as was the case in Egypt according to different specimens of old Egyptian cloths (see *Hengstenberg*, *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 144). Other women spun goats' hair for the upper or outer covering of the tent (xxvi. 7 sqq.). Spinning was done by the women in very

early times (*Plin. hist. n. 8, 48*), particularly in Egypt, where women are represented on the monuments as busily engaged with the spindle (see *Wilkinson, Manners ii. p. 60; iii. p. 133, 136*), and at a later period among the Hebrews (*Prov. xxxi. 19*). At the present day the women in the peninsula of Sinai spin the materials for their tents from camels' and goats' hair, and prepare sheep's wool for their clothing (*Rüppell, Nubien, p. 202*); and at Neswa, in the province of *Omân*, the preparation of cotton yarn is the principal employment of the women (*Wellstedt, i. p. 90*). Weaving also was, and still is to a great extent, a woman's work (cf. *2 Kings xxiii. 7*); it is so among the Arab tribes in the Wady Gharandel, for example (*Russegger, iii. 24*), and in Nubia (*Burckhardt, Nub. p. 211*); but at Neswa the weaving is done by the men (*Wellstedt*). The woven cloths for the tabernacle were prepared by men, partly perhaps because the weaving in Egypt was mostly done by the men (*Herod. 2, 35; cf. Hengstenberg, p. 143*), but chiefly for this reason, that the cloths for the hangings and curtains were artistic works, which the women did not understand, but which the men had learned in Egypt, where artistic weaving was carried out to a great extent (*Wilkinson, iii. pp. 113 sqq.*)¹—Vers. 27, 28. The precious stones for the robes of the high priest, and the spices for the incense and anointing oil, were presented by the princes of the congregation, who had such costly things in their possession.

Ver. 30—chap. xxxvi. 7. Moses then informed the people that God had called *Bezaleel* and *Aholiab* as master-builders, to complete the building and all the work connected with it, and had not only endowed them with His Spirit, that they might draw the plans for the different works and carry them out, but “had put it into his (*Bezaleel's*) heart to teach” (ver. 34), that is to say, had qualified him to instruct labourers to prepare the different articles under his supervision and guidance. “*He and Aholiab*” (ver 34) are in apposition to “*his heart:*” into his and *Aholiab's* heart (see *Ges. § 121, 3; Ewald, § 311 a*). The concluding words in ver. 35 are in apposition to *אֲנִי־בָנֵיהֶם* (*them*): “*them* hath He filled with wisdom . . . as performers of every kind of work and inventors of designs,” *i.e.* that they may make

¹ For drawings of the Egyptian weaving-stool, see *Wilkinson, iii. p. 135*; also *Hartmann, die Hebräerin am Putztisch i. Taf. 1*.

every kind of work and may invent designs. In chap. xxxvi. 1, וַיִּצְוֶה with *vav consec.* is dependent upon what precedes, and signifies either, "and so will make," or, so that he will make (see *Ewald*, § 342 b). The idea is this, "Bezaleel, Aholiab, and the other men who understand, into whom Jehovah has infused (אֶת־חָכְמָתוֹ) wisdom and understanding, that they may know how to do, shall do every work for the holy service (worship) with regard to (לְ as in chap. xxviii. 38, etc.) all that Jehovah has commanded."—Vers. 2-7. Moses then summoned the master-builders named, and all who were skilled in art, "*every one whom his heart lifted up to come near to the work to do it*" (i.e. who felt himself stirred up in heart to take part in the work), and handed over to them the heave-offering presented by the people for that purpose, whilst the children of Israel still continued bringing freewill-offerings every morning.—Ver. 4. Then the wise workmen came, every one from his work that they were making, and said to Moses, "*Much make the people to bring, more than suffices for the labour* (the finishing, as in chap. xxvii. 19) *of the work,*" i.e. they are bringing more than will be wanted for carrying out the work (the כִּי in כִּי־יָבִיאוּ is comparative); whereupon Moses let the cry go through the camp, i.e. had proclamation made, "No one is to make any more property (מִלְאָכָה) as in chap. xxii. 7, 10, cf. Gen. xxxiii. 14) for a holy heave-offering," i.e. to prepare anything more from his own property to offer for the building of the sanctuary; and with this he put a stop to any further offerings.—Ver. 7. "*And there was enough* (וְיָבִיאוּ their sufficiency, i.e. the requisite supply for the different things to be made) *of the property for every work to make it, and over*" (lit. and to leave some over). By this liberal contribution of freewill gifts, for the work commanded by the Lord, the people proved their willingness to uphold their covenant relationship with Jehovah their God.

Chap. xxxvi. 8-xxxviii. 20. EXECUTION OF THE WORK.—Preparation of the *dwelling-place*: viz. the hangings and coverings (chap. xxxvi. 8-19, as in chap. xxvi. 1-14); the wooden boards and bolts (vers. 20-34, as in chap. xxvi. 15-30); the two curtains, with the pillars, hooks, and rods that supported them (vers. 35-38, as in chap. xxvi. 31-37). As these have all been already explained, the only thing remaining to be noticed here is, that

the verbs עָשָׂה in ver. 8, יַחֲבִיר in ver. 10, etc., are in the third person singular with an indefinite subject, corresponding to the German *man* (the French *on*).—Preparation of the *vessels of the dwelling*: viz. the ark of the covenant (chap. xxxvii. 1-9, as in chap. xxv. 10-22); the table of shew-bread and its vessels (vers. 10-16, as in chap. xxv. 23-30); the candlestick (vers. 17-24, as in chap. xxv. 31-40); the altar of incense (vers. 25-28, as in chap. xxx. 1-10); the anointing oil and incense (ver. 29), directions for the preparation of which are given in chap. xxx. 22-38; the altar of burnt-offering (chap. xxxviii. 1-7, as in chap. xxvii. 1-8); the laver (ver. 8, as in chap. xxx. 17-21); and the court (vers. 9-20, as in chap. xxvii. 9-19). The order corresponds on the whole to the list of the separate articles in chap. xxxv. 11-19, and to the construction of the entire sanctuary; but the holy chest (the ark), as being the most holy thing of all, is distinguished above all the rest, by being expressly mentioned as the work of Bezaleel, the chief architect of the whole.

Chap. xxxviii. 21-31. ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNT OF METAL USED.—Ver. 21. “*These are the numbered things of the dwelling, of the dwelling of the testimony, that were numbered at the command of Moses, through the service of the Levites, by the hand of Ithamar, the son of Aaron the priest.*” מִסְפָּרֵיהֶם does not mean the numbering (equivalent to מִסְפָּר 2 Sam. iv. 9, or מִסְפָּר 2 Chron. xvii. 14, xxvi. 11), as *Knobel* supposes, but here as elsewhere, even in Num. xxvi. 63, 64, it signifies “the numbered;” the only difference being, that in most cases it refers to persons, here to things, and that the reckoning consisted not merely in the counting and entering of the different things, but in ascertaining their weight and estimating their worth. *Lyra* has given the following correct rendering of this heading: “*hæc est summa numeri ponderis eorum, quæ facta sunt in tabernaculo ex auro, argento et ære.*” It was apparently superfluous to enumerate the different articles again, as this had been repeatedly done before. The weight of the different metals, therefore, is all that is given. The “dwelling” is still further described as “the dwelling of the testimony,” because the testimony, *i.e.* the decalogue written with the finger of God upon the tables of stone, was kept in the dwelling, and this testimony formed the base of

the throne of Jehovah, and was the material pledge that Jehovah would cause His name, His manifested presence, to dwell there, and would thus show Himself to His people in grace and righteousness. "That which was numbered" is an explanatory apposition to the previous clause, "the numbering of the dwelling;" and the words עֲבַרְתָּ הַלְוִיִּים, which follow, are an *accusative* construed freely to indicate more particularly the mode of numbering (*Ewald*, § 204 a), viz. "through the service," or "by means of the service of the Levites," not *for* their service. "By the hand of Ithamar:" who presided over the calculations which the Levites carried out under his superintendence.—Vers. 22, 23. The allusion to the service of the Levites under Ithamar leads the historian to mention once more the architects of the whole building, and the different works connected with it (cf. chap. xxxi. 2 sqq.).—Ver. 24. "(As for) *all the gold that was used (הַעֲשׂוֹי) for the work in every kind of holy work, the gold of the wave-offering (the gold that was offered as a wave-offering, see at chap. xxxv. 22) was (amounted to) 29 talents and 730 shekels in holy shekel,*" that is to say, 87,370 shekels or 877,300 thalers (L.131,595), if we accept *Thenius'* estimate, that the gold shekel was worth 10 thalers (L.1, 10s.), which is probably very near the truth.—Vers. 25 sqq. Of the silver, all that is mentioned is the amount of atonement-money raised from those who were numbered (see at chap. xxx. 12 sqq.) at the rate of half a shekel for every male, without including the freewill-offerings of silver (chap. xxxv. 24, cf. chap. xxv. 3), whether it was that they were too insignificant, or that they were not used for the work, but were placed with the excess mentioned in chap. xxxvi. 7. The result of the numbering gave 603,550 men, every one of whom paid half a shekel. This would yield 301,775 shekels, or 100 talents and 1775 shekels, which proves by the way that a talent contained 3000 shekels. A hundred talents of this were used for casting 96 sockets for the 48 boards, and 4 sockets for the 4 pillars of the inner court,—one talent therefore for each socket,—and the 1775 shekels for the hooks of the pillars that sustained the curtains, for silvering their capitals, and "for binding the pillars," *i.e.* for making the silver connecting rods for the pillars of the court (chap. xxvii. 10, 11, xxxviii. 10 sqq.).—Vers. 29 sqq. The copper of the wave-offering amounted to 70 talents and 2400 shekels; and of this the

L1 10 s.
494 + 240 =
734

sockets of the pillars at the entrance of the tabernacle (chap. xxvi. 37), the altar of burnt-offering with its network and vessels, the supports of the pillars of the court, all the pegs of the dwelling and court, and, what is not expressly mentioned here, the laver with its support (xxx. 18), were made. אֶתְכֶם to work in (with) copper, *i.e.* to make of copper.

If this quantity of the precious metals may possibly strike some readers as very large, and was in fact brought forward years ago as a reason for questioning the historical credibility of our account of the building of the tabernacle, it has been frequently urged, on the other hand, that it looks quite small, in comparison with the quantities of gold and silver that have been found accumulated in the East, in both ancient and modern times. According to the account before us, the requisite amount of silver was raised by the comparatively small payment of half a shekel, about fifteen pence, for every male Israelite of 20 years old and upwards. Now no tenable objection can be raised against the payment of such a tribute, since we have no reason whatever for supposing the Israelites to have been paupers, notwithstanding the oppression which they endured during the closing period of their stay in Egypt. They were settled in the most fertile part of Egypt; and coined silver was current in western Asia even in the time of the patriarchs (Gen. xxiii. 16). But with reference to the quantities of gold and copper that were delivered, we need not point to the immense stores of gold and other metals that were kept in the capitals of the Asiatic kingdoms of antiquity,¹ but will merely call to mind the fact, that the kings of Egypt possessed many large gold mines on the frontiers of the country, and in the neighbouring lands of Arabia and Ethiopia, which were worked by criminals, prisoners of war, and others, under the harshest pressure, and the very earliest times copper mines were discovered on the

¹ Thus, to mention only one or two examples, the images in the temple of Belus, at Babylon, consisted of several thousand talents of gold, to say nothing of the golden tables, the bedsteads, and other articles of gold and silver (*Diod. Sic.* 2, 9; *Herod.* 1, 181, 183). In the siege of Nineveh, Sardanapalus erected a funeral pile, upon which he collected all his wealth, including 150 golden bedsteads, 150 golden tables, a million talents of gold, and ten times as much silver and other valuables, to prevent their falling into the hands of the foe (*Ctesias in Athen.* 12, 38, p. 529). According to a

Arabian peninsula, which were worked by a colony of labourers (*Lepsius*, Letters from Egypt, p. 336). Moreover, the love of the ancient Egyptians for valuable and elegant ornaments, gold rings, necklaces, etc., is sufficiently known from the monuments (see *Rosellini* in *Hengstenberg's* Egypt, p. 137). Is it not likely, then, that the Israelites should have acquired a taste for jewellery of this kind, and should have possessed or discovered the means of procuring all kinds of gold and silver decorations, not to mention the gold and silver jewellery which they received from the Egyptians on their departure? The liking for such things even among nomad tribes is very well known. Thus, for example, after the defeat of the Midianites, the Israelites carried off so much gold, silver, copper, and other metals as spoil, that their princes alone were able to offer 16,750 shekels of gold as a heave-offering to Jehovah from the booty that had been obtained in this kind of jewellery (*Num.* xxxi. 50 sqq.). *Diodorus Sic.* (3, 44) and *Strabo* (xvi. p. 778) bear witness to the great wealth of the Nabateans and other Arab tribes on the Elanitic Gulf, and mention not only a river, said to flow through the land, carrying gold dust with it, but also gold that was dug up, and which was found, "not in the form of sand, but of nuggets, which did not require much cleaning, and the smallest of which were of the size of a nut, the average size being that of a medlar, whilst the largest pieces were as big as a walnut. These they bored, and made necklaces or bracelets by stringing them together alternately with transparent stones. They also sold the gold very cheap to their neighbours, giving three times the quantity for copper, and double the quantity for iron, both on account of their inability to work these metals, and also because of the scarcity of the metals which were so much more necessary for daily use" (*Strabo*). The Sabæans and Gerrhæans are also mentioned as the richest of all the tribes of Arabia,

statement in *Pliny's Hist. Nat.* 33, 3, on the conquest of Asia by Cyrus, he carried off booty to the extent of 34,000 lbs. of gold, beside the golden vessels and 500,000 talents of silver, including the goblet of Semiramis, which alone weighed 15 talents. Alexander the Great found more than 40,000 talents of gold and silver and 9000 talents of coined gold in the royal treasury at Susa (*Diod. Sic.* 17, 66), and a treasure of 120,000 talents of gold in the citadel of Persepolis (*Diod. Sic.* 17, 71; *Curtius*, v. 6, 9). For further accounts of the enormous wealth of Asia in gold and silver, see *Bähr*, *Symbolik* i. pp. 258 sqq.

through their trade in incense and in cinnamon and other spices.¹ From the Arabs, who carried on a very extensive caravan trade through the desert even at that time, the Israelites would be able to purchase such spices and materials for the building of the tabernacle as they had not brought with them from Egypt; and in Egypt itself, where all descriptions of art and handicraft were cultivated from the very earliest times (for proofs see *Hengst. Egypt*, pp. 133-139), they might so far have acquired all the mechanical and artistic ability required for the work, that skilled artisans could carry out all that was prescribed, under the superintendence of the two master-builders who had been specially inspired for the purpose.

Chap. xxxix. 1-31. *Preparation of the priests' clothes.*—Previous to the description of the dress itself, we have a statement in ver. 1 of the materials employed, and the purpose to which they were devoted ("cloths of service," see at chap. xxxi. 10). The robes consisted of the *ephod* (vers. 2-7, as in chap. xxviii. 6-12), the *choshen* or breastplate (vers. 8-21, as in chap. xxviii. 15-29), the *meil* or over-coat (vers. 22-26, as in chap. xxviii. 31-34); the *body-coats*, *turbans*, *drawers*, and *girdles*, for Aaron and his sons (vers. 27-29, as in chap. xxviii. 39, 40, and 42). The Urim and Thummim are not mentioned (cf. chap. xxviii. 30). The head-dresses of the ordinary priests, which are simply called "bonnets" in chap. xxviii. 40, are called "goodly bonnets" or "ornamental caps" in ver. 28 of this chapter (כִּנְוֵי מְנַבְעֵל, from נָבַע an ornament, cf. נָבַע *ornatus fuit*). The singular, "girdle," in ver. 29, with the definite article, "the girdle," might appear to refer simply to Aaron's girdle, *i.e.* the girdle of the high priest; but as there is no special description of the girdles of Aaron's sons (the ordinary priests) in chap. xxix. 40, where they are distinctly mentioned and called by the same name (*abnet*) as the girdle of Aaron himself, we can only conclude

¹ "They possess an immense quantity of gold and silver articles, such as beds, tripods, bowls, and cups, in addition to the decorations of their houses; for doors, walls, and ceilings are all wrought with ivory, gold, silver, and precious stones" (*Strabo* ut sup.). In accordance with this, *Pliny* (*h. n.* 6, 28) not only calls the Sabæans "*ditissimos silvarum fertilitate odorifera, auri metallis, etc.*," but the tribes of Arabia in general, "*in universum gentes ditissimas, ut apud quas mazimæ opes Romanorum Parthorum que subsistant, videntibus quæ e mari aut silvis capiunt, nihil invicem redimentibus.*"

that they were of the same materials and the same form and make as the latter, and that the singular, הַתְּאֵבָה, is used here either in the most general manner, or as a generic noun in a collective sense (see *Ges.* § 109, 1). The last thing mentioned is the diadem upon Aaron's turban (vers. 30, 31, as in chap. xxviii. 36-38), so that the order in which the priests' robes are given here is analogous to the position in which the ark of the covenant and the golden altar stand to one another in the directions concerning the sacred things in chap. xxv.-xxx. "For just as all the other things are there placed between the holy ark and the golden altar as the two poles, so here all the rest of the priests' robes are included between the shoulder-dress, the principal part of the official robes of the high priest, and the golden frontlet, the inscription upon which rendered it the most striking sign of the dignity of his office" (*Baumgarten*).

Vers. 32-43. *Delivery of the work to Moses.*—The different things are again mentioned one by one. By "the tent," in ver. 33, we are to understand the two tent-cloths, the one of purple and the other of goats' hair, by which the dwelling (מִשְׁכָּן, generally rendered tabernacle) was made into a tent (אֹהֶל). From this it is perfectly obvious, that the variegated cloth formed the inner walls of the dwelling, or covered the boards on the inner side, and that the goats' hair-cloth formed the other covering. Moreover it is also obvious, that this is the way in which הַתְּאֵבָה is to be understood, from the fact, that in the list of the things belonging to the *ohel* the first to be mentioned are the gold and copper hooks (xxvi. 6, 11) with which the two halves of the drapery that formed the tent were joined together, and then after that the boards, bolts, pillars, and sockets, as though subordinate to the tent-cloths, and only intended to answer the purpose of spreading them out into a tent or dwelling.—Ver. 37. "The lamps of the order," i.e. the lamps set in order upon the candlestick. In addition to all the vessels of the sanctuary, shew-bread (ver. 36), holy oil for the candlestick and for anointing, and fragrant incense (ver. 38), were also prepared and delivered to Moses,—everything, therefore, that was required for the institution of the daily worship, as soon as the tabernacle was set up.—Ver. 40. "Vessels of service:" see chap. xxvii. 19.—Ver. 43. When Moses had received and examined all the different articles, and found that everything was

made according to the directions of Jehovah, he blessed the children of Israel. The readiness and liberality with which the people had presented the gifts required for this work, and the zeal which they had shown in executing the whole of the work in rather less than half a year (see at chap. xl. 17), were most cheering signs of the willingness of the Israelites to serve the Lord, for which they could not fail to receive the blessing of God.

ERECTION AND CONSECRATION OF THE TABERNACLE.—

CHAP. XL.

Vers. 1-16. After the completion of all the works, the command was given by God to Moses to set up the dwelling of the tabernacle on the first day of the first month (see at chap. xix. 1), *sc.* in the second year of the Exodus (see ver. 17), and to put all the vessels, both of the dwelling and court, in the places appointed by God; also to furnish the table of shew-bread with its fitting out (עָרַךְ לֶחֶם = עָרַכְוּ ver. 23), *i.e.* to arrange the bread upon it in the manner prescribed (ver. 4 cf. Lev. xxiv. 6, 7), and to put water in the laver of the court (ver. 7). After that he was to anoint the dwelling and everything in it, also the altar of burnt-offering and laver, with the anointing oil, and to sanctify them (vers. 9-11); and to consecrate Aaron and his sons before the door of the tabernacle, and clothe them, anoint them, and sanctify them as priests (vers. 12-15). When we read here, however, that the dwelling and the vessels therein would be rendered "*holy*" through the anointing, but the altar of burnt-offering "*most holy*," we are not to understand this as attributing a higher degree of holiness to the altar of burnt-offering than to the dwelling and its furniture; but the former is called "*most holy*" merely in the sense ascribed to it in chap. xxx. 10, namely, that every one who touched it was to become holy; in other words, the distinction has reference to the fact, that, standing as it did in the court, it was more exposed to contact from the people than the vessels in the dwelling, which no layman was allowed to enter. In this relative sense we find the same statement in chap. xxx. 29, with reference to the tabernacle and all the vessels therein, the dwelling as well as the court, that they would become *most holy* in consequence of the anointing (see

the remarks on chap. xxx. 10). It is stated provisionally, in ver. 16, that this command was fulfilled by Moses. But from the further history we find that the consecration of the priests did not take place contemporaneously with the erection of the tabernacle, but somewhat later, or not till after the promulgation of the laws of sacrifice (cf. Lev. viii. and Lev. i. 1 sq.).

Vers. 17–33. On the day mentioned in ver. 2 the dwelling and court were erected. As not quite nine months had elapsed between the arrival of the Israelites at Sinai, in the third month after the Exodus (chap. xix. 1), and the first day of the second year, when the work was finished and handed over to Moses, the building, and all the work connected with it, had not occupied quite half a year; as we have to deduct from the nine months (or somewhat less) not only the eighty days which Moses spent upon Sinai (chap. xxiv. 18, xxxiv. 28), but the days of preparation for the giving of the law and conclusion of the covenant (chap. xix. 1–xxiv. 11), and the interval between the first and second stay that Moses made upon the mountain (chap. xxxii. and xxxiii.). The erection of the dwelling commenced with the fixing of the sockets, into which the boards were placed and fastened with their bolts, and the setting up of the pillars for the curtains (ver. 18). “*He (Moses) then spread the tent over the dwelling, and laid the covering of the tent upon the top.*” By the “covering of the tent” we are to understand the two coverings, made of red rams’ skins and the skins of the sea-cow (chap. xxvi. 14). In analogy with this, פָּרֹשֶׁת אֶת־הָאֹהֶל denotes not only the roofing with the goats’ hair, but the spreading out of the inner cloth of mixed colours upon the wooden frame-work.—

Vers. 20–21. *Arrangement of the ark.* “He took and put the testimony into the ark.” הַקְּרִיָּה does not mean “the revelation, so far as it existed already, viz. with regard to the erection of the sanctuary and institution of the priesthood (chap. xxv.–xxxi.), and so forth,” as *Knobel* arbitrarily supposes, but “the testimony,” i.e. the decalogue written upon the two tables of stone, or the tables of the covenant with the ten words; “the testimony,” therefore, is an abbreviated expression for “the tables of testimony” (chap. xxxi. 18, see at chap. xxv. 16). After the ark had been brought into the dwelling, he “hung the curtain” (vail, see at chap. xxvi. 31; *lit.* placed it upon the hooks of the pillars), “and so covered over the ark of the testimony,” since

the ark, when placed in the back part of the dwelling, was covered or concealed from persons entering the dwelling or the holy place.—Vers. 22-28. *Arrangement of the front room of the dwelling.* The table was placed on the right side, towards the north, and the shew-bread was laid upon it. לֶחֶם פָּנֵי does not signify “a row of bread,” but the “position or placing of bread;” for, according to Lev. xxiv. 6, 7, the twelve loaves of shew-bread were placed upon the table in two rows, corresponding to the size of the tables (two cubits long and one cubit broad). The candlestick was placed upon the left side, opposite to the table, and the golden altar in front of the curtain, *i.e.* midway between the two sides, but near the curtain in front of the most holy place (see at chap. xxx. 6). After these things had been placed, the curtain was hung in the door of the dwelling.—Vers. 29-32. The altar of burnt-offering was then placed “*before the door of the dwelling of the tabernacle,*” and the laver “*between the tabernacle and the altar,*” from which it is evident that the altar was not placed close to the entrance to the dwelling, but at some distance off, though in a straight line with the door. The laver, which stood between the altar and the entrance to the dwelling, was probably placed more to the side; so that when the priests washed their hands and feet, before entering the dwelling or approaching the altar, there was no necessity for them to go round the altar, or to pass close by it, in order to get to the laver. Last of all the court was erected round about the dwelling and the altar, by the setting up of the pillars, which enclosed the space round the dwelling and the altar with their drapery, and the hanging up of the curtain at the entrance to the court. There is no allusion to the anointing of these holy places and things, as commanded in vers. 9-11, in the account of their erection; for this did not take place till afterwards, *viz.* at the consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests (Lev. viii. 10, 11). It is stated, however, on the other hand, that as the vessels were arranged, Moses laid out the shew-bread upon the table (ver. 23), burned sweet incense upon the golden altar (ver. 27), and offered “the burnt-offering and meat-offering,” *i.e.* the daily morning and evening sacrifice, upon the altar of burnt-offering (chap. xxix. 38-42). Consequently the sacrificial service was performed upon them before they had been anointed. Although this may appear surprising, there is no ground for rejecting a conclusion,

which follows so naturally from the words of the text. The tabernacle and its furniture were not made holy things for the first time by the anointing; this simply sanctified them for the use of the nation, *i.e.* for the service which the priests were to perform in connection with them on behalf of the congregation (see at Lev. viii. 10, 11). They were made holy things and holy vessels by the fact that they were built, prepared, and set up, according to the instructions given by Jehovah; and still more by the fact, that after the tabernacle had been erected as a dwelling, the "glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle" (ver. 34). But the glory of the Lord entered the dwelling before the consecration of the priests, and the accompanying anointing of the tabernacle and its vessels; for, according to Lev. i. 1 sqq., it was from the tabernacle that Jehovah spake to Moses, when He gave him the laws of sacrifice, which were promulgated before the consecration of the priests, and were carried out in connection with it. But when the glory of the Lord had found a dwelling-place in the tabernacle, Moses was not required to offer continually the sacrifice prescribed for every morning and evening, and by means of this sacrifice to place the congregation in spiritual fellowship with its God, until Aaron and his sons had been consecrated for this service.

Vers. 34-38. When the sanctuary, that had been built for the Lord for a dwelling in Israel, had been set up with all its apparatus, "*the cloud covered the tabernacle, and the glory of Jehovah filled the dwelling,*" so that Moses was unable to enter. The cloud, in which Jehovah had hitherto been present with His people, and guided and protected them upon their journeying (see at chap. xiii. 21, 22), now came down upon the tabernacle and filled the dwelling with the gracious presence of the Lord. So long as this cloud rested upon the tabernacle the children of Israel remained encamped; but when it ascended, they broke up the encampment to proceed onwards. This sign was Jehovah's command for encamping or going forward "throughout all their journeys" (vers. 36-38). This statement is repeated still more elaborately in Num. ix. 15-23. The mode in which the glory of Jehovah filled the dwelling, or in which Jehovah manifested His presence within it, is not described; but the glory of Jehovah filling the dwelling is clearly distinguished from the cloud coming down upon the tabernacle. It is obvious, however, from

Lev. xvi. 2, and 1 Kings viii. 10, 11, that in the dwelling the glory of God was also manifested in a cloud. At the dedication of the temple (1 Kings viii. 10, 11) the expression "the cloud filled the house of Jehovah" is used interchangeably with "the glory of Jehovah filled the house of Jehovah." To consecrate the sanctuary, which had been finished and erected as His dwelling, and to give to the people a visible proof that He had chosen it for His dwelling, Jehovah filled the dwelling in both its parts with the cloud which shadowed forth His presence, so that Moses was unable to enter it. This cloud afterwards drew back into the most holy place, to dwell there, above the outspread wings of the cherubim of the ark of the covenant; so that Moses and (at a later period) the priests were able to enter the holy place and perform the required service there, without seeing the sign of the gracious presence of God, which was hidden by the curtain of the most holy place. So long as the Israelites were on their journey to Canaan, the presence of Jehovah was manifested outwardly and visibly by the cloud, which settled upon the ark, and rose up from it when they were to travel onward.

With the completion of this building and its divine consecration, Israel had now received a real pledge of the permanence of the covenant of grace, which Jehovah had concluded with it; a sanctuary which perfectly corresponded to the existing circumstances of its religious development, and kept constantly before it the end of its calling from God. For although God dwelt in the tabernacle in the midst of His people, and the Israelites might appear before Him, to pray for and receive the covenant blessings that were promised them, they were still forbidden to go directly to God's throne of grace. The barrier, which sin had erected between the holy God and the unholy nation, was not yet taken away. To this end the law was given, which could only increase their consciousness of sin and unworthiness before God. But as this barrier had already been broken through by the promise of the Lord, that He would meet the people in His glory before the door of the tabernacle at the altar of burnt-offering (chap. xxix. 42, 43); so the entrance of the chosen people into the dwelling of God was effected mediatorially by the service of the sanctified priests in the holy place, which also prefigured their eventual reception into the house of the Lord. And even the curtain, which still hid the glory of God from the

chosen priests and sanctified mediators of the nation, was to be lifted at least once a year by the anointed priest, who had been called by God to be the representative of the whole congregation. On the day of atonement the high priest was to sprinkle the blood of atonement in front of the throne of grace, to make expiation for the children of Israel because of all their sin (Lev. xvi.), and to prefigure the perfect atonement through the blood of the eternal Mediator, through which the way to the throne of grace is opened to all believers, that they may go into the house of God and abide there for ever, and for ever see God.

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES.

(LEVITICUS.)

INTRODUCTION.

CONTENTS AND PLAN OF LEVITICUS.



THE third book of Moses is headed קָרָא 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 Ex. xxv., 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 (Ex. xl. 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 chap. i. to chap. xvi., the second from chap. xvii. to chap. xxv. The *first* of these, which occupies the earlier half of the book of Leviticus, opens with the laws of sacrifice in chap. i.-vii. 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 chap. viii.-x. 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 chap. xi.-xv. 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 (chap. xvi.), 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 (chap. xvii.-xxv.), 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 (chap. xvii.-xx.); it then advances to the holiness of the priests and the sacrifices (chaps. xxi. and xxii.), and from that to the sanctification of the feasts and the daily worship of God (chaps. xxiii. and xxiv.), and closes with the sanctification of the whole land by the appointment of the sabbatical and jubilee years (chap. xxv.). 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 (chap. xxvi.). 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 chap. xxvi. 46 and xxvii. 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.

CHAP. I.—XVI.

THE LAWS OF SACRIFICE.—CHAP. I.—VII.

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 Ex. xxv. 22, to make known His sacred will through him to the people (i. 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.¹

¹ Works relating to the sacrifices: *Guil. Outram de sacrificiis libri duo*, Amst. 1688; *Bähr, Symbolik des mos. Cultus* ii. pp. 189 sqq.; *Kurtz* on the

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 (Ex. v. 1–3, compared with chap. iv. 31, viii. 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 (Ex. xviii. 12), but young men offered burnt-offerings and slain-offerings by the command of Moses at the conclusion of the covenant (Ex. xxiv. 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 (chap. i. 2, 3, 10, 14, ii. 1, 4, 5, 14, iii. 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. viii. 20), but Abel brought of the firstlings of his flock an offering to the Lord (Gen. iv. 4).¹ The object of the sacrificial laws in this book

Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament (Clark, 1863); and *Oehler*, in *Herzog's Cyclopædia*. 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. 631 sqq.

¹ 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 Elohist 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

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

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 *Porphry*, 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.

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. ix. 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. ix. 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 animal 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. xxii.). 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. xv.). Now, though nothing has been handed down concerning the sacrifices of the patriarchs, with the exception of Gen. xvi. 1 sqq., 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. xii. 7, xiii. 4, 18, xxvi. 25, xxxiii. 20, xxxv. 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. xiv. 3, Heb. xiii. 15, and is universally admitted.¹ To the burnt-offering there was added, in the course of time, the slain-offering, which is mentioned for the first time in Gen. xxxi. 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. xvi. 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

¹ Outram (*l. c.* p. 213) draws the following conclusion from Hos. xiv. 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."

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.¹ 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. vi. 13 sqq., xviii. 16 sqq.), and had commanded Abraham to walk blamelessly before Him (Gen. xvii. 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. (Ex. iii. 5), and unfolded it more and

¹ 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 *Kahn'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. iv. and v.

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 (Ex. xix. 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 (Ex. xx. 18 sqq.). 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 chap. i.-vii. are divisible into two groups. The first (chap. i.-v.) contains the general instructions, which were applicable both to the community as a whole and also to the individual Israelites. Chap. i.-iii. 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 chap. iv. and v. 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 (chap. vi. and vii.) 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.*—CHAP. I.—V.

The common term for sacrifices of every kind was CORBAN (presentation; see at chap. i. 2). It is not only applied to the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, and slain or peace-offerings, in chap. i. 2, 3, 10, 14, ii. 1, 4 sqq., iii. 1, 6, etc., but also to the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings in chap. iv. 23, 28, 32, v. 11, Num. v. 15, etc., as being holy gifts (Ex. xxviii. 38 cf. Num. xviii. 9) with which Israel was to appear before the face of the Lord (Ex. xxiii. 15; Deut. xvi. 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 (chap. i. 2, 3, 10, xxii. 21; Num. xv. 3), two collective terms, for which ox and sheep, or goat (ox, sheep and goat) were the *nomina usitatis* (chap. vii. 23, xvii. 3, xxii. 19, 27; Num. xv. 11; Deut. xiv. 4), that is to say, none but tame animals whose flesh was eaten (chap. xi. 3; Deut. xiv. 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 (Deut. xiv. 5). Both male and female were offered in sacrifice, from the herd as well as the flock (chap. iii. 1), and young as well as old, though not under eight days old (chap. xxii. 27; Ex. xxii. 29); so that the ox was offered either as *calf* (chap. ix. 2; Gen. xv. 9; 1 Sam. xvi. 2) or as *bullock*, *i.e.* as young steer or heifer (chap. iv. 3), or as full-grown cattle. Every sacrificial animal was to be without blemish, *i.e.* free from bodily faults (chap. i. 3, 10, xxii. 19 sqq.). The only birds that were offered were turtle-doves and young pigeons (chap. i. 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 (chap. v. 7, xii. 8, xiv. 22, 31), or as sin and burnt-offerings, for defilements of a less serious kind (chap. xii. 6, 7, xv. 14, 29, 30; Num. vi. 10, 11). The vegetable

sacrifices consisted of meal, for the most part of fine flour (chap. ii. 1), of cakes of different kinds (chap. ii. 4-7), and of toasted ears or grains of corn (chap. ii. 14), to which there were generally added oil and incense, but never leaven or honey (chap. ii. 11); and also of wine for a drink-offering (Num. xv. 5 sqq.).

The *bleeding sacrifices* were divided into four classes: viz. (1) *burnt-offerings* (chap. i.), for which a male animal or pigeon only was admissible; (2) *peace-offerings* (slain-offerings of peace, chap. iii.), which were divisible again into praise-offerings, vow-offerings, and freewill-offerings (chap. vii. 12, 16), and consisted of both male and female animals, but never of pigeons; (3) *sin-offerings* (chap. iv. 1-v. 13); and (4) *trespass-offerings* (chap. v. 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 (chap. v. 11). But for the trespass-offerings either a ram (chap. v. 15, 18, 25, xix. 21) or a lamb had to be sacrificed (chap. xiv. 12; Num. vi. 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 (chap. i. 3, 5, 11, iii. 1, 7, 12, iv. 4). There the offerer was to rest his hand upon the head of the animal (chap. i. 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 (chap. i. 5-9, vi. 2 sqq., xxi. 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 (chap. i. 5, 11, iii. 2, 8, 13, vii. 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 (iv. 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 (chap. i. 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

(chap. iii. 9-11, 14-16, iv. 8-10, 19, 26, 31, 35, vii. 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 (chap. vii. 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 (chap. vi. 19, 22, vii. 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 (chap. iv. 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 *fæces*; but if it was brought for a sin-offering, he probably followed the rule laid down in chap. i. 15 and v. 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 (chap. vi. 13 sqq.) and the so-called jealousy-offering (Num. v. 15 sqq.), 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. xv. 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 chap. ii., 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. xv. 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 chap. vii. 12 sqq., and probably with the two other species of peace-offerings as well; so that we should introduce an irreconcilable discrepancy between Num. xv. and Lev. ii., if we were to restrict all the meat-offerings to the accompaniments mentioned in Num. xv., 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 (chap. ii. 2, 9, 16); the rest was to be baked without leaven, and eaten by the priests in the court, as being most holy (chap. vi. 8-11): it was only the meat-offering of the priests that was all burned upon the altar (chap. vi. 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. i. 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."¹ The true significance of the legal sacri-

¹ 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,

fices 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 (Deut. xvi. 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” (chap. iii. 11, 16) and “bread of God” (chap. xxi. 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.* chap. iii. 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 vitæ*, but the food which he procured in 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 to 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.

the exercise of his God-appointed calling, as a symbol of the spiritual food which endureth unto everlasting life (John vi. 27, cf. chap. iv. 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 (chap. xvii. 11).

The verb "to expiate" (כָּפַר, from כָּפַר to cover, construed with לְ *objecti*; see chap. i. 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 (chap. xvii. 11). The end it answered was "to cover him" (the offerer, chap. i. 4); and even in the case of the sin-offering the only object was to cover him who had sinned, as concerning his sin (chap. iv. 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. xxxii. 20, and still more clearly from Ex. xxxii. 30. In the former case Jacob's object is to reconcile (כַּפֵּר) 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 (Ex. xxxii. 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. xvii. 11, 12, xxv. 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" (chap. xvii. 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. ix. 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 pœna 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. liii.) 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 אָמֻם , *ámmos*, 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 (chap. i. 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 (chap. i. 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 (Ex. xxix. 42), to reconcile them to Himself, and bestow His grace upon them (see p. 207). 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 (chap. vi. 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 (1 Cor. iii. 12, 13). Hence fire is employed as a symbol and vehicle of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii. 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 chap. ii.).

Chap. i. THE BURNT-OFFERING.—Ver. 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 (chap. vii. 38; Num. xviii. 9, xxviii. 2, etc.), but to the first-fruits (chap. ii. 12), and dedicatory offerings, which were presented to the Lord for His sanctuary and His service without being laid upon the altar (Num. vii. 3, 10 sqq., xxxi. 50). The word is only used in Leviticus and Numbers, and two passages in Ezekiel (chap. xx. 28, xl. 43), where it is taken from the books of Moses, and is invariably rendered δῶρον in the LXX. (cf. Mark vii. 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 הַבְּקָר (*from the herd*). The actual antithesis to "the cattle" is "the fowl" in ver. 14; though grammatically the latter is connected with ver. 10, rather than ver. 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. i. 25).—Vers. 3–9. *Ceremonial connected with the offering of an ox as a burnt-offering.* עֹלָה (*vid.* Gen. viii. 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 (*אַמוּמוֹס*, *integer*, i.e. free from bodily faults, see chap. xxii. 19–25), and to be presented "at the door of the tabernacle,"—i.e. near to the altar of burnt-offering (Ex. xl. 6), where all the offerings were to be presented (chap. xvii. 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 (Ex. xxviii. 38).—Ver. 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 יָשַׁב 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 (chap. iii. 2, 7, 13), and the sin-offerings (chap. iv. 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 (ver. 11), the sin-offering (chap. v. 6), and the trespass-offering (chap. v. 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*¹ 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:² 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 vol. i. p. 279). 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

¹ Hence *Knobel's* assertion (at Lev. vii. 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.

² 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 archæologists 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, quæ vel morti devota erant, vel Dei gratiæ commendata, vel denique gravi alicui muneri usuque sacro destinata. Eique ritui semper adhiberi solebant verba aliqua explicata, quæ rei susceptæ 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 pœnæ deprecatione junctas, voluntariis bonorum preces, eucharisticis autem et votivis post res prosperas impetratas periculave depulsa factis laudes et gratiarum actiones, omnique denique victimarum generi ejusmodi preces adjunctas putem, quæ cuique maxime conveniebant*" (c. 9).

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. vi. 14 being merely a *denom.* verb, but which signifies *texit* 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," chap. iv. 26, 31, 35, v. 6, 10 sqq., xiv. 20, 29, etc. ; "for them," chap. iv. 20, x. 17 ; "for her," chap. xii. 7 ; for a soul, chap. xvii. 11 ; Ex. xxx. 15, cf. Num. viii. 12), and in the case of the sin-offerings with a second object governed either by עַל or מִן (עַל הַפֶּאֱחָהוּ chap. iv. 35, v. 13, 18, or מִן הַפֶּאֱחָהוּ chap. iv. 26, v. 6, etc., to expiate him over or on account of his sin) ; also, though not so frequently, with עָבַר *pers.*, ἐξιλάζεσθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ (chap. xvi. 6, 24 ; 2 Chron. xxx. 18), and עָבַר הַפֶּאֱחָהוּ, ἐξιλάζεσθαι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Ex. xxxii. 30), and with הָאָדָם *pers.*, to permit expiation to be made (Deut. xxi. 8 ; Ezek. xvi. 63) ; also with the accusative of the object, though in prose only in connection with the expiation of inanimate objects defiled by sin (chap. xvi. 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.* Deut. xxi. 8 ; Ps. lxxviii. 4, lxxviii. 38 ; Jer. xviii. 23).¹ The medium of

¹ The meaning "to make atonement" lies at the foundation in every passage in which the word is used metaphorically, such as Gen. xxxii. 21,

expiation in the case of the sacrifice was chiefly the blood of the sacrificial animal that was sprinkled upon the altar (chap. xvii. 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 (chap. x. 17). In other cases it was the intercession of Moses (Ex. xxxii. 30); also the fumigation with holy incense, which was a symbol of priestly intercession (Num. xvii. 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. xxv. 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 (Deut. xxi. 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. xxxv. 33). In Isa. xxvii. 9, a divine judgment, by

where Jacob seeks to *expiate* the face of his angry brother, *i.e.* to appease his wrath, with a present; or Prov. xvi. 14, "The wrath of a king is as messengers of death, but a wise man *expiates* it, *i.e.* softens, pacifies it;" Isa. xlvii. 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. xxviii. 18, "and your covenant with death is disannulled" (annihilated) (כִּפֶּר), the use of the word כִּפֶּר 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. vi. 7 and xxii. 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 כִּפֶּר to cover, there was another denominative verb, founded upon the word כִּפֶּר a covering, or payment, the stumblingblock in the use of the word lies simply in 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 Ex. xxxii. 30 as compared with vers. 10 and 22. The meaning of expiation which properly belongs to the verb כִּפֶּר 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 Ex. xxx. 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.

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 כֹּפֶר , such, for example, as the atonement-money paid at the numbering of the people (Ex. xxx. 12 sqq.), and the payment made in the case referred to in Ex. xxi. 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 *pœna*; 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 Deut. xxvi. 13, apart altogether from Lev. xvi. 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.

Vers. 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 (2 Chron. xxix. 22, 24, 34). The slaughtering took place "before Jehovah" (see ver. 3), or, according to the more precise account in ver. 11, on the side of the altar northward, for which the expression "before the door of the tabernacle" is sometimes used (chap. iii. 2, 8, 13, etc.). בֶּן־בָּקָר (a young ox) is applied to a calf (עֵגֶל) in chap. ix. 2, and a mature young bull

(פֶּזֶם) in chap. iv. 3, 14. But the animal of one year old is called עֵזֶל in chap. ix. 2, and the mature ox of seven years old is called פֶּזֶם in Judg. vi. 25. At the slaughtering the blood was caught by the priests (2 Chron. xxix. 22), and sprinkled upon the altar. When the sacrifices were very numerous, as at the yearly feasts, the Levites helped to catch the blood (2 Chron. xxx. 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 (chap. iii. 2, 8, 13, ix. 18) and trespass-offerings (chap. vii. 2) were sacrificed; but it was not so with the sin-offering (see at chap. iv. 5).—Vers. 6 sqq. The offerer was then to flay the slaughtered animal, to cut it (חָתַךְ 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" (Judg. xix. 29),—that he might boil its flesh in pots (Ezek. xxiv. 4, 6). He was also to wash its intestines and the lower part of its legs (ver. 9). קֶרֶב, 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 envelops 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. פֶּרְעִים, which is only found in the dual, and always in connection either with oxen and sheep, or with the springing legs of locusts (chap. xi. 21), denotes the shin, or calf below the knee, or the leg from the knee down to the foot.—Vers. 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, vi. 6),

and to lay "wood in order upon the fire" (לָעֵץ 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. פָּרַר, which is only used in connection with the burnt-offering (vers. 8, 12, and chap. viii. 20), signifies, according to the ancient versions (LXX. *στέαρ*) 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," ver. 9) was to be burned upon the altar, with the exception of the skin, which was given to the officiating priest (chap. vii. 8), and the contents of the intestines. הִקְטִיר, to cause to ascend in smoke and steam (Ex. xxx. 7), which is frequently construed with הַמִּזְבֵּחַ towards the altar (ה' local, so used as to include position in a place; *vid.* vers. 13, 15, 17, chap. ii. 2, 9, etc.), or with הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (chap. vi. 8), or עַל-הַמִּזְבֵּחַ (chap. ix. 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 (chap. ii. 2, 11, 16), and is also applied to the incense laid upon the shew-bread (chap. xxiv. 7); and hence the shew-bread itself (chap. xxiv. 7), and even those portions of the sacrifices which Jehovah assigned to the priests for them to eat (Deut. xviii. 1 cf. Josh. xiii. 14), came also to be included in the firings for Jehovah. The word does not occur out of the Pentateuch, except in Josh. xiii. 14 and 1 Sam. ii. 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. viii. 21), which is used in connection with all the

sacrifices, even the expiatory or sin-offerings (chap. iv. 31), and with the drink-offering also (Num. xv. 7, 10).

Vers. 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 (chap. iv. 24, 29, 33, vi. 18, vii. 2, xiv. 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 chap. iii. 2, 8, 13, as it is to the trespass-offerings in chap. iv. 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 (ver. 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 ver. 12 וְאֶת־רִאשׁוֹ יִגַּד is to be connected *per zeugma* with לְנִתְחָיו, "let him cut it up according to its parts, and (sever) its head and its fat."

Vers. 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.* lx. 8, cf. *2 Kings* vi. 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 nip off its head, and cause it to ascend in smoke upon the altar. כָּרַע , which only occurs in ver. 15 and chap. v. 8, signifies undoubtedly to pinch off, and not merely to pinch; for otherwise the words in chap. v. 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. (*ἀποκνίξειν*) 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.—Vers. 16, 17. He then took out $\text{אֶת־מְרִאתוֹ בְּנִצְתָהּ}$, *i.e.*, according to the probable explanation of these obscure words, "its crop in (with) the *feces* thereof,"¹ 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 (chap. vi. 3). He then made an incision in the wings of the pigeon, but with-

¹ This is the rendering adopted by *Onkelos*. The LXX., on the contrary, render it *ἀφελεί τον 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 וְנִצְתָּהּ . In *Mishnah, Sebach*, vi. 5, the instructions are the following: "et remouet ingluuiem et pennas et viscera egredientia cum illa." This interpretation may be substantially correct, although the reference of בְּנִצְתָהּ 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.

out severing them, and burned them on the altar-fire (ver. 17, cf. ver. 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. viii. 20), but זֶבַח , a whole-offering (Deut. xxxiii. 10; Ps. li. 21; 1 Sam. vii. 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. 280); 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.

Chap. ii. 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. iv. 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. xxxii. 21, 22, xliii. 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. iv. 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: $\delta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\nu\ \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$ or

προσφορά, also θυσία alone (LXX.). The meat-offerings consisted of fine wheaten flour (vers. 1-3), or cakes of such flour (vers. 4-6), or roasted grains as an offering of first-fruits (vers. 14-16). To all of them there were added oil (vers. 1, 4-7, 15) and salt (ver. 13); and to those which consisted of flour and grains, incense also (vers. 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" (ver. 3).

Vers. 1-3. The *first* kind consisted of *soleth*, probably from סֶלֶת = סָלַת to swing, swung flour, like πάλη from πάλλω, *i.e.* fine flour; and for this no doubt wheaten flour was always used, even when חֲמִיץ is not added, as in Ex. xxix. 2, to distinguish it from קֶמַח, or ordinary meal (σεμίδαλις: 1 Kings v. 2). The suffix in קֶרְבְּנוֹ (his offering) refers to שֹׁפֵן, which is frequently construed as both masculine and feminine (chap. iv. 2, 27, 28, v. 1, etc.), or as masculine only (Num. xxxi. 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 (ver. 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 קַרְבָּנוֹ: 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 אֲשֶׁמְרָה from שָׁמַר) is only applied to Jehovah's portion, which was burned upon the altar in the case of the meat-offering (vers. 9, 16, and chap. vi. 8), the sin-offering of flour (chap. v. 12), and the jealousy-offering (Num. v. 26), and to the incense added to the shew-bread (chap. xxiv. 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 (chap. xxiv. 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 *memento* ('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 Ex. xxvi. 33 and xxx. 10). Thus the independent meat-offerings, which were not entirely consumed upon the altar (vers. 3, 10, vi. 10, x. 12), the sin-offerings and trespass-offerings, the flesh of which was not burned outside the camp (chap. vi. 18, 22, vii. 1, 6, x. 17, xiv. 13, Num. xviii. 9), the shew-bread (chap. xxiv. 9), and even objects put under the ban and devoted to the Lord, whether men, cattle, or property of other kinds (chap. xxvii. 28), as well as the holy incense (Ex. xxx. 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 (chap. vi. 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.

Vers. 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 תנור we are not to understand a baker's oven (Hos. vii. 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 חלל to pierce, perforated cakes, of a thicker kind. *Rekikim*: from רקק to be beaten out thin; hence cakes or pancakes. As the latter were to be smeared with oil, we cannot understand לכלב 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*, *μεμυγμένους*).—Vers. 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 Ezek. iv. 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 *τήγανον*, 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 *Ex.* xiii. 3, xx. 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.—*Ver.* 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 *חָרַשׁ*, *ebullivit*, it must apply to a vessel in which food was boiled. We have therefore to think of cakes boiled in oil.—*Vers.* 8–10. The presentation of the *minchah* “made of these things,” *i.e.* of the different kinds of pastry mentioned in *vers.* 4–7, resembled in the main that described in *vers.* 1–3. The *הָרִים מִן* in *ver.* 9 corresponds to the *קָמַץ מִן* in *ver.* 2, and does not denote any special ceremony of heaving, as is supposed by the Rabbins and many archæological writers, who understand by it a solemn movement up and down. This will be evident from a comparison of *chap.* iii. 3 with *chap.* iv. 8, 31, 35, and *vii.* 3. In the place of *הָרִים מִפָּנֵי* in *chap.* iv. 8 we find *הִקְרִיב מִזְבֵּחַ* in *chap.* iii. 3 (cf. *chap.* *vii.* 3), and instead of *הָרִים מִפָּנֵי* in *chap.* iv. 10, *הָרִים מִפָּנֵי* in *chap.* iv. 31 and 35; so that *הָרִים מִן* 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 *vers.* 11–13 there follow two laws which were applicable to all the meat-offerings: *viz.* to offer nothing leavened (*ver.* 11), and to salt every meat-offering, and in fact every sacrifice, with salt (*ver.* 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, *חֲדַשׁ* 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 2 Chron. xxxi. 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. 393 sqq.). 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 (chap. xxiii. 17, 20). So also were the cakes offered with the vow-offerings, which were applied to the sacrificial meal (chap. vii. 13); but not the shew-bread, as *Knobel* maintains (see at chap. xxiv. 5 sqq.). 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. xviii. 19; 2 Chron. xiii. 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 (Ezek. xliii. 24; Mark ix. 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 עַל* (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).¹

Vers. 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 *נָרַשׁ בְּרִמְלָה* "rubbed out of field-fruit." *נָרַשׁ*, from *נָרַשׁ*=*נָרַס*, to rub to pieces, that which is rubbed to pieces; it only occurs here and in vers. 14 and 16. *בְּרִמְלָה* is applied generally to a corn-field, in Isa. xxix. 17 and xxxii. 16 to cultivated ground, as distinguished from desert; here, and in chap. xxiii. 14 and 2 Kings iv. 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, Ruth ii. 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:

¹ 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).*

it consisted, therefore, not of crushed corn or groats, but only of toasted grains. In the place of אֲנִיב קִלְיִי we find קִלְיִי (chap. xxiii. 14), or קִלְיִי (Josh. v. 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 (vers. 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 (chap. xxiii. 10, 11, xvii. 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 vitæ* (see p. 174), so bread-flour and bread, procured from the seed of the field, are symbols of the word of God (Deut. viii. 3; Luke viii. 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 (Matt. v. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 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 (Luke xii. 1) and of malice and wickedness (1 Cor. v. 8), and also from the honey of the *delicia 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 fruit 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.

Chap. iii. THE PEACE-OFFERINGS.—The third kind of sacrifice is called **זָבַח שְׁלָמִים**, 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 **זָבַחִים** and **שְׁלָמִים**: *e.g.* **זָבַח** in chap. vii. 16, 17, xxiii. 37, more especially in combination with **עֹלָה**, chap. xvii. 8 cf. Ex. x. 25, xviii. 12; Num. xv. 3, 5; Deut. xii. 27; Josh. xxii. 27; 1 Sam. vi. 15, xv. 22; 2 Kings v. 17, x. 24; Isa. lvi. 7; Jer. vi. 20, vii. 21, xvii. 26, etc.,—and **שְׁלָמִים** in chap. ix. 22; Ex. xx. 24, xxxii. 6; Deut. xxvii. 7; Josh. viii. 31; Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 9; 2 Sam. vi. 17, 18, xxiv. 25; 1 Kings iii. 15, etc. **זָבַח** is derived from **זָבַח**, which is not applied to slaughtering generally (**שָׁחַט**), but, with the exception of Deut. xii. 15, where the use of **זָבַח** for slaughtering is occasioned by the retrospective reference to Lev. xvii. 3, 4, is always used for slaying as a sacrifice, or sacrificing; and even in 1 Sam. xxviii. 24, Ezek. xxxiv. 3 and xxxix. 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 (1 Sam. i. 21, ii. 19), especially in connection with *minchah* (1 Sam. ii. 29; Ps. xl. 7; Isa. xix. 21; Dan. ix. 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 Amos v. 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 שָׁלֵם (Deut. xxxii. 35), שְׁלֵימָה (Hos. ix. 7), and שְׁלֵמָה (Ps. xci. 8), formed from the *Piel* שָׁלַם, but *integritas completa, pacifica, beata*, answering to the *Sept.* rendering σαθήριον. 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 (Judg. xx. 26, xxi. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 9; 2 Sam xxiv. 25).¹ The law distinguishes three different kinds: praise-offerings, vow-offerings, and freewill-offerings (chap. vii. 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.

Vers. 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 (chap. i. 3-5). It was in the application of the flesh that the difference first appeared.—Ver. 3. The person presenting the sacrifice was to offer as a firing for Jehovah, *first*, "the fat which covered the entrails" (chap. i. 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 (הַכִּסְלִים)," *i.e.* upon the inner muscles of the loins, or in the region of the kidneys; and *fourthly*, "the net

¹ Cf. Hengstenberg, *Dissertations*. Outram's explanation is quite correct: *Sacrificia salutaria in sacris litteris shelamim dicta, ut quæ semper de rebus prosperis fieri solerent, impetratis utique aut impetrandis.*

upon the liver." The net (הַיִּתְרָה) upon (עַל vers. 4, 10, 15, chap. iv. 9, vii. 4; Ex. xxix. 13), or from (מִן chap. ix. 10), or of the liver (chap. viii. 16, 25, ix. 19; Ex. xxix. 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 (*reticulum 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 *יִתְרָה*, 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 *יִתְרָה* a cord (Judg. xvi. 7; Ps. xi. 2), and *מִיתְרָה* the bow-string (Ps. xxi. 13) or extended tent-ropes (Ex. xxxv. 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 (ver. 16, chap. iv. 8, 19, 26, 31, 35, vii. 3), or briefly "the fat" (*הַחֵלֶב* ver. 9, chap. vii. 33, xvi. 25, xvii. 6; Num. xviii. 17), "the fat portions" (*הַחֵלְבִים* chap. vi. 5, viii. 26, ix. 19, 20, 24, x. 15).—Ver. 5. This fat the priests were to burn upon the altar, over the burnt sacrifice, on the pieces of wood upon the fire. *עַל־הַזֶּבַח* 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־הַזֶּבַח* is placed beyond all doubt, both by chap. vi. 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 (*עָלֶיהָ*), and upon that to cause the fat portions of the peace-offerings to evaporate in smoke, and also by chap. ix. 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 הָעֹלֹתָיִם*, *i.e.* upon (over) the portions of the burnt-offering that were burning already.

Vers. 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 (vers. 3, 4) and goats (vers. 14, 15), the *fat tail* of the sheep was to be consumed as well. *הָאֵלֶּיָּהּ תְּמִימָה*: “*the fat tail whole*” (ver. 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. 556 sqq.). 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. *אֵפֶן*, *ἀπ. λεγ.*, is, according to *Saad.*, *os caudæ s. coccygis*, *i.e.* the rump or tail-bone, which passes over into the vertebræ of the tail (cf. *Bochart*, i. pp. 560-1). In vers. 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. xxviii. 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. xxviii. 2); but the sacrifices generally are described as “the food of God” (“the bread of their God,” chap. xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22, and xxii. 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 chap. vii. 11-36, where the meaning of these sacrifices is more fully ex-

plained.—In ver. 17 (ver. 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 Ex. xii. 14, 24) in all their dwelling-places (see Ex. x. 23 and xii. 20).

Chap. iv. and v. THE EXPIATORY SACRIFICES.—The sacrifices treated of in chap. i.–iii. are introduced by their names, as though already known, for the purpose of giving them a legal sanction. But in chap. iv. and v. 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* (chap. iv. 3, 8, 14, 19, etc.), and דִּבְחָן *debt, i.e. debt-offering* (chap. v. 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 chap. iv. 1, 2, which is repeated in chap. v. 14. This repetition proves that chap. iv. 2–v. 13 treats of the sin-offerings, and chap. v. 14–26 of the trespass-offerings; and this is confirmed by the substance of the two series of laws.

Chap. iv. 2–v. 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 (chap. iv. 2–12); (2) the whole congregation of Israel (vers. 13–21); (3) the prince (vers. 22–26); (4) the common people (ver. 27–v. 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 (chap. v. 1–13).—Ver. 2. “*If a soul sin in wandering from any (לְכָל in a partitive sense) of the commandments of Jehovah, which ought not to be done, and do any one of them*” (לְכָל with לְ partitive, cf. vers. 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. xv. 27-31). בְּשִׁגְגָה , from שָׁגַג = חָטָא to wander or go wrong, signifies mistake, error, oversight. But sinning "in error" is not merely sinning through ignorance (vers. 13, 22, 27, v. 18), hurry, want of consideration, or carelessness (chap. v. 1, 4, 15), but also sinning unintentionally (Num. xxxv. 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.

Vers. 3-12. *The sin of the high priest.*—The high priest is here called the "anointed priest" (vers. 3, 5, 16, vi. 15) on account of the completeness of the anointing with which he was consecrated to his office (chap. viii. 12); in other places he is called the great (or high) priest (chap. xxi. 10; Num. xxxv. 25, etc.), and by later writers שֵׂרֵף הָרִאשִׁית , the priest the head, or head priest (2 Kings xxv. 18; 2 Chron. xix. 11). If he sinned לְפָנֵי 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.—Ver. 4. The presentation, laying on of hands, and slaughtering, were the same as in the case of the other sacrifices (chap. i. 3-5). The first peculiarity occurs in connection with the blood (vers. 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" (Ex. xxvi. 31), i.e. in the direction towards the curtain; after that, he was to put (יָזַק) 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

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 (Ex. xix. 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.—Vers. 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 (chap. iii. 3, 4, פֶּלֶאֱיִקָב is the subject to יִרָם in ver. 10), and burn it upon the altar of burnt-offering.—Vers. 11, 12. The skin of the bullock, and all the flesh, together with the head and the shank and the entrails (chap. i. 9) and the fœces, 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 (chap. i. 16), and there burnt on the wood with fire. (On the construction of vers. 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 ἀνθρώπου* (Rom. vii. 22; Eph. iii. 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 (ver. 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 (chap. vii. 17, viii. 32, xix. 6; Ex. xii. 10, xxix. 34), or the flesh of the sacrifices, which had been defiled by contact with unclean objects (chap. vii. 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 (*חָטָוּ*) the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them" (chap. x. 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 מִזְבֵּחַ 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 chap. x. 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 (chap. xiv. 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.¹

Vers. 13-21. *Sin of the whole congregation.*—This is still further defined, as consisting in the fact that the thing was hid (נִסְתָּר)² from the eyes of the congregation, i.e. that it was a sin

¹ The most holy character of the flesh of the sin-offering (chap. vi. 18 sqq.) 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. xix.), and also occurs among the Greeks (see *Oehler* in *Herzog's Cycl.*).

² In the correct editions נִסְתָּר has *dagesh* both here and in chap. v. 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 וַיִּצְטַרְפוּ in Gen. xli. 29, Ex. xiv. 6, וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ in Ps. x. 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 וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ Ps. ix. 2, וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ Ps. xv. 3, etc., the *dagesh* is introduced

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 (vers. 14–23 compared with vers. 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. אָפַר with לֵךְ signifies to incur guilt upon (on the foundation of) sin (chap. v. 5, etc.); it is usually construed with an accusative (vers. 3, 28, chap. v. 6, 10, etc.), or with בְּ , to sin with a sin (ver. 23; Gen. xlii. 22). The subject of $\text{אָפַר$ (ver. 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 ver. 21, “the former bullock” (ver. 12).—Ver. 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. vers. 26, 31, 35, v. 10, 13; Num. xv. 25, 26, 28; also with the trespass-offerings, chap. v. 16, 18, 26, xix. 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 (chap. xii. 7, 8, xiv. 20, 53; Num. viii. 21).

Vers. 22–26. *The sin of a ruler.*—Ver. 22. וְהָיָה : *ἔτε, when* $\text{אָפַר$ is the head of a tribe, or of a division of a tribe (Num. iii. 24, 30, 35).—Ver. 23. “*If* (אִם , 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

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.

of the altar, and then to burn the whole of the fat upon the altar, as in the case of the peace-offering (see chap. iii. 3, 4), and thus to make atonement for the prince on account of his sin. שְׂעִיר עִזִּים, or שְׂעִיר alone (*lit.* hairy, shaggy, Gen. xxvii. 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. vii. 16 sqq., xv. 24), and that of the nation at the yearly festivals (chap. xvi. 9, 15, xxiii. 19; Num. xxviii. 15, 22, 30, xxix. 5, 16 sqq.) and at the consecration of the tabernacle (chap. ix. 3, 15, x. 16). It is distinguished in Num. vii. 16 sqq. 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 (Ps. l. 9, 13, lvi. 15; Isa. i. 11, xxxiv. 6; Ezek. xxxix. 18). According to *Knobel*, שְׂעִיר עִזִּים, or שְׂעִיר, was an old he-goat, the hair of which grew longer with age, particularly about the neck and back, and שְׂעִירָה עִזִּים (ver. 28, chap. v. 16) an old she-goat; whilst עִזִּיב was the younger he-goat, which leaped upon the does (Gen. xxxi. 10, 12), and served for slaughtering like lambs, sheep, and goats (Deut. xxxii. 14; Jer. li. 40). But as the שְׂעִיר עִזִּים was also slaughtered for food (Gen. xxxvii. 31), and the skins of quite young he-goats are called שְׂעִירָה (Gen. xxvii. 23), the difference between שְׂעִיר and עִזִּיב is hardly to be sought in the age, but more probably, as *Bochart* supposes, in some variety of species, in which case *seir* and *seirah* might denote the rough-haired, shaggy kind of goat, and *attud* the buck-goat of stately appearance.

Vers. 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. xxiii. 7), that is to say, of an Israelite belonging to the people, as distinguished from the chiefs who ruled over the people (2 Kings xi. 18, 19, xvi. 15), the sin-offering was to consist of a shaggy she-goat without blemish, or a ewe-sheep (ver. 32). The ceremonial in both cases was the same as with the he-goat (vers. 23 sqq.).—"According to the offerings made by fire unto the Lord" (ver. 35): see at chap. iii. 5.

Chap. v. 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 chap. iv. 27 sqq.; 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* (ver. 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. וְהָיָה does not mean a curse in general, but an oath, as an imprecation upon one's self (= the "oath of cursing" in Num. v. 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.*). וְהָיָה וְהָיָה, to bear the offence or sin, *i.e.* to take away and endure its consequences (see Gen. iv. 13), whether they consisted in chastisements and judgments, by which God punished the sin (chap. vii. 18, xvii. 16, xix. 17), such as diseases or distress (Num. v. 31, xiv. 33, 34), childlessness (chap. xx. 20), death (chap. xxii. 9), or extermination (chap. xix. 8, xx. 17; Num. ix. 13), or in punishment inflicted by men (chap. xxiv. 15), or whether they could be expiated by sin-offerings (as in this passage and ver. 17) and other kinds of atonement. In this sense וְהָיָה וְהָיָה is also sometimes used (see at chap. xix. 17).—Vers. 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 him-

self 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.—Ver. 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. xxiv. 13; Isa. xli. 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.—Vers. 5, 6. If any one therefore (the three cases enumerated are comprehended under the one expression כִּי יִדְבַר , for the purpose of introducing the apodosis) had contracted guilt with reference to one of these (the things named in vers. 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. $\text{זֶבֶחַ$ (ver. 6) does not mean either guilt-offering or *debitum* (*Knobel*), but *culpa, delictum, reatus*, as in ver. 7: “as his guilt,” *i.e.* for the expiation of his guilt, which he had brought upon himself.

Vers. 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 (chap. i. 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 ver. 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, כִּשְׂפֵי, according to the right laid down in chap. i. 14 sqq., 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.¹

Vers. 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. יָדָיו תִּשְׁעֶינִי (ver. 7): his hand reaches to anything, is able to raise it, or with an accusative, obtains, gets anything (used in the same sense in chap. xiv. 30, 31), or else absolutely, acquires, or gets rich (chap. xxv. 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

¹ 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.

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 chap. ii. 2. “*In one of these*” (ver. 13 as in ver. 5): cf. chap. iv. 2. “*And let it (the remainder of the meal offered) belong to the priest like the meat-offering:*” *i.e.* as being most holy (chap. ii. 3).

Chap. v. 14-26 (chap. v. 14-vi. 7).¹ 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 מַעַל 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 (chap. xxvi, 40; Deut. xxxii. 51; Josh. xxii. 16), or by infringing upon His rights, abstracting something that rightfully belonged to Him. Thus in Josh. vii. 1, xxii. 20, it is applied to fraud in relation to that which had been put under the ban; and in Num. v. 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 chap. xxi. 22). חַטָּא with חַט is *constructio prægna*: to sin in anything by taking away from Jehovah that which belonged to Him. בְּשִׁגְגָה, *in error.* (see chap. iv. 2): *i.e.* in a forgetful or negligent way. Whoever sinned in this way was to offer to the Lord as his guilt (see ver.

¹ 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.

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 (chap. xxvii. 12; Num. xviii. 16). כֶּסֶף 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 Ex. xxx. 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 (chap. xxvii. 27, 31, and xxvii. 13, 15, 19). The ceremony to be observed in the offering of the ram is described in chap. vii. 1 sqq. 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 (vers. 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 chap. iv. 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 ver. 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 men-

tioned, 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 (chap. vi. 1-7, or vers. 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 (שָׁחַד עִמּוֹ with a double כּ obj., to deny a thing to a person) a *pikkadon* (i.e. a deposit, a thing entrusted to him to keep, Gen. xli. 36), or תְּשִׁימָה בְּיָדוֹ, "a thing placed in his hand" (handed over to him as a pledge) "or גָּנַב, a thing robbed" (i.e. the property of a neighbour unjustly appropriated, whether a well, a field, or cattle, Gen. xxi. 25; Micah ii. 2; Job xxiv. 2), "or if he have *oppressed his neighbour*" (i.e. forced something from him or withheld it unjustly, chap. xix. 13; Deut. xxiv. 14; Hos. xii. 8; Mal. iii. 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 (vers. 23, 24), was to be restored "according to its sum" (cf. Ex. xxx. 12, Num. i. 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 ver. 16). "To him to whom it (belongs), shall he give it" בְּיָוֶם אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמָח: 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 vers. 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,¹ we look at once at the other cases, for which trespass-offerings were commanded in the law; we find in Num. v. 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 vers. 2-7 of the present chapter. So also the guilt of a man who had lain with the slave of another (Lev. xix. 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 (chap. xiv. 12 sqq.), or of a Nazarite who had been defiled by a corpse (Num. vi. 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,² and the ritual also points to this. The animal sacrificed was always a ram, except in the cases mentioned in chap. xiv. 12 sqq. and Num. vi. 12. This fact alone clearly distinguishes the trespass-offerings from the sin-offerings, for which all kinds of sacrifices were offered from

¹ For the different views, see *Bühr's Symbolik*; *Winer's bibl. R. W.*; *Kurtz on Sacrificial Worship*; *Riehm, theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1854, pp. 93 sqq.; *Rinck, id.* 1855, p. 369; *Oehler in Herzog's Cycl.*

² Even in the case of the trespass-offering, which those who had taken heathen wives offered at Ezra's instigation (Ezra x. 18 sqq.), it had reference to a trespass (*cf.* vers. 2 and 10), an act of unfaithfulness to Jehovah, which demanded satisfaction. And so again the Philistines (1 Sam. vi. 3 sqq.), 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.

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 (chap. vii. 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.*
—CHAP. VI. and VII.

The instructions contained in these two chapters were made known to "*Aaron and his sons*" (chap. vi. 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.

Chap. vi. 8-13 (Heb. vers. 1-6). THE LAW OF THE BURNT-OFFERING commences the series, and special reference is made to the daily burnt-offering (Ex. xxix. 38-42).—Ver. 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 *לִבְרֹךְ* is wanting in the first clause, and only introduced in the second; but it belongs to the first clause as well. The pronoun *אִתּוֹ* 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 (Ex. xxix. 38, 39; Num. xxxiii. 3, 4).—Vers. 3, 4. In the morning of every day the priest was to put on his linen dress (see Ex. xxviii. 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 (*לִבְרֹךְ* is construed with a double accusative, to consume the sacrifice to ashes), and pour them down beside the altar (see chap. i. 16). The *י* in *לִבְרֹךְ* is not to be regarded as the old form of the connecting vowel, as in Gen. i. 24 (*Ewald*, § 211 *b*; see *Ges.* § 90, 3*b*), but as the suffix, as in 2 Sam. xx. 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.—Ver. 12. The fire of the altar was also to be kept burning "*with it*" (*אִתּוֹ*, 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.—Ver. 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 chap. ix. 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.*)

Vers. 14-18. THE LAW OF THE MEAT-OFFERING.—The regulations in vers. 14, 15, are merely a repetition of chap. ii. 2 and 3; but in vers. 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. לֶחֶם תֵּאֱכָלוּ in ver. 16 is explained by “*it shall not be baked with leaven*” in ver. 17. It was the priests’ share of the firings of Jehovah (see chap. i. 9), and as such it was most holy (see chap. ii. 3), like the sin-offering and trespass-offering (vers. 25, 26, chap. vii. 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 chap. iii. 17). “*Every one that touches them (the most holy offerings) becomes holy.*” שִׁקְיָם 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 (ver. 27), to the altar of the burnt-offering (Ex. xxix. 37), and to the most holy vessels of the tabernacle (Ex. xxx. 29), the word *is* not to be interpreted by Num. xvii. 2, 3, or Deut. xxii. 9, or by the expression “*shall be holy*” in chap. xxvii. 10, 21, and Num. xviii. 10, but by Isa. lxv. 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 (chap. xxi. 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.

Vers. 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*” (הַיּוֹם הַהוּא, construed as a passive with the accusative as in Gen. iv. 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. Ex. xxix. 42, Num. xxviii. 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. ii. 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 (Ex. xxix. 38, 39), and before the offering described in chap. ix. 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 (chap. xlv. 14, where we cannot suppose the daily burnt-offering to be intended) and also of *Josephus* (*Ant.* iii. 10, 7).¹ 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 אֲפֵי מִנְחָה בְּתִים (“*broken pieces of a minchah of crumbs*”), *i.e.* in broken pieces, like a *minchah* composed of crumbs. מִרְפֶּכֶת (ver. 14 and 1 Chron. xxiii. 29) is no doubt synonymous with מִלֶּחֶם מִרְפֶּכֶת, and to be understood as denoting fine flour sufficiently burned or roasted in oil; the meaning mixed or mingled does not harmonise with chap. vii. 12, where

¹ *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 ver. 13, as they were consecrated together, in ver. 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).

the mixing or kneading with oil is expressed by בָּלִילָה בְּשֶׁמֶן. The *hapax legomenon* חֲפִינִי signifies either broken or baked, according as we suppose the word to be derived from the Arabic اَنَّنٌ diminuit, or, as *Gesenius* and the Rabbins do, from חָפַן 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 (chap. ii. 3, 10). *Origen* observes in his *homil.* iv. in *Levit.*: *In cæteris quidem præceptis pontifex in offerendis sacrificiis populo præbet officium, in hoc vero mandato quæ 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.

Vers. 24-30. The LAW OF THE SIN-OFFERING, which is introduced with a new introductory formula on account of the interpolation of vers. 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 chap. iv. 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 ver. 16). Whoever touched it became holy (see at ver. 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 ver. 20 are addressed to the priest.—Ver. 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 (כִּרְסָה *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 chap. xi. 33, 35).—Vers. 29, 30. The flesh of the sin-offering was to be eaten after it had been boiled, like the meat-offering (vers. 16 and 18), by the males among the priests alone. But this only applied to the sin-offerings of the laity (chap. iv. 22–v. 13). The flesh of the sin-offerings for the high priest and the whole congregation (chap. iv. 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 (chap. iv. 12, 21).—On the signification of this act of eating the flesh of the sin-offering, see at chap. x. 17.

Chap. vii. 1–10. The LAW OF THE TRESPASS-OFFERING embraces first of all the regulations as to the ceremonial connected with the presentation.—Ver. 2. The slaughtering and sprinkling of the blood were the same as in the case of the burnt-offering (chap. i. 5); and therefore, no doubt, the signification was the same.—Vers. 3–5. The fat portions only were to be burned upon the altar, *viz.* the same as in the sin and peace-offerings (see chap. iv. 8 and iii. 9); but the flesh was to be eaten by the priests, as in the sin-offering (chap. vi. 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 chap. vi. 26).—Certain analogous instructions respecting the burnt-offering and meat-offering are appended in vers. 8–10 by way of supplement, as they ought properly to have been given in chap. vi., in the laws relating to the sacrifices in question.—Ver. 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. וְהַיִּבֶשֶׁת 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 vers. 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 chap. ii. 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 chap. ii. 3). As the meat-offerings, which consisted of pastry, and were offered in the form of prepared food (ver. 9), are the same as those described in chap. ii. 4-8, it is evident that by those mentioned in ver. 10 we are to understand the kinds described in chap. ii. 1-3 and 14-16, and by the "dry," primarily the *אֲרִיב קֹלֵי*, which consisted of dried grains, to which oil was to be added (לֵךְ chap. ii. 15), though not poured upon it, as in the case of the offering of flour (chap. ii. 1), and probably also in that of the sin-offerings and jealousy-offerings (chap. v. 11, and Num. v. 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.

Vers. 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 (vers. 12-14), (2) as to the eating of the

flesh of the sacrifices (vers. 15–21), with the prohibition against eating fat and blood (vers. 22–27), and (3) as to Jehovah's share of these sacrifices (vers. 28–36).—In vers. 12 and 16 three classes of *shelamim* are mentioned, which differ according to their occasion and design, viz. whether they were brought על-התודה, upon the ground of praise, i.e. to praise God for blessings received or desired, or as vow-offerings, or thirdly, as freewill-offerings (ver. 16). To (*lit.* upon, in addition to) the sacrifice of thanksgiving (ver. 12, “sacrifice of thanksgiving of his peace-offerings,” vers. 13 and 15) they were to present “*unleavened cakes kneaded with oil, and flat cakes anointed with oil* (see at chap. ii. 4), and *roasted fine flour* (see vi. 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,” chap. viii. 26; *Ex.* xxix. 23), or “cake unleavened, kneaded with oil” (*Ex.* xxix. 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.—Vers. 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 ver. 12, as a heave-offering for Jehovah, which was to fall to the priest who sprinkled the blood of the peace-offering. According to chap. ii. 9, an *azcarah* of the unleavened pastry was burned upon the altar, although this is not specially mentioned here any more than at vers. 9 and 10; whereas none of the leavened bread-cake was placed upon the altar (chap. ii. 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.—Vers. 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. chap. xxii. 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 (טָרֵף) "good pleasure," see chap. i. 4), and was "not reckoned to the offerer," *sc.* as a sacrifice well-pleasing to God; it was "an abomination." אָבִימָה, an abomination, is only applied to the flesh of the sacrifices (chap. xix. 7; Ezek. iv. 14; Isa. lxxv. 4), and signifies properly a stench;—compare the talmudic word אָבִימָה *fœtidum reddere*. Whoever ate thereof would bear his sin (see chap. v. 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 (Ex. xxix. 34); and in chap. xix. 8, where this command is repeated,¹ 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 (אָבִימָה) on the third day. But to eat flesh that was putrid or stinking, would be like eating unclean carrion, or the אָבִימָה with which putrid flesh is associated in Ezek. iv. 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*).

Vers. 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. Ver. 19*b*, which is not found in the Septuagint and Vulgate, reads thus: "and as

¹ There is no foundation for *Knobel's* assertion, that in chap. xix. 5 sqq. 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 chap. xix. 5 sqq. 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.

for the flesh, every clean person shall eat flesh," i.e. take part in the sacrificial meal.—Ver. 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 שׂוֹמֵן construed as a masculine, see chap. ii. 1), "shall be cut off" (see Gen. xvii. 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. chap. 12–15), or from an unclean beast (see at chap. xi. 4–8), or from any other unclean abomination. טְרֵפָה, abomination, includes the unclean fishes, birds, and smaller animals, to which this expression is applied in chap. xi. 10–42 (cf. Ezek. viii. 10, and Isa. lxvi. 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 chap. xi. 8).

There is appended to these regulations, as being substantially connected with them, the prohibition of fat and blood as articles of food (vers. 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" (ver. 25), we are to understand only those portions of fat which are mentioned in chap. iii. 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.—Ver. 24. The fat of cattle that had fallen (נֶבֶלָה), or been torn to pieces (viz. by beasts of prey), was not to be eaten, because it was unclean and defiled the eater (chap. xvii. 15, xxii. 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 chap. xvii. 3 sqq., 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 (Deut. xii. 15, 16, 21 sqq.), 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 which 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. xv. 30, 31. The prohibition of blood in vers. 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 (Ex. xii. 20, cf. chap. x. 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 (chap. xvii. 11), whereby the blood acquired a much higher degree of holiness than the fat.

Vers. 28-36. *Jehovah's share of the peace-offerings.*—Ver. 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.—Vers. 30, 31. His hands were to bring the firings of Jehovah, i.e. the portions to be burned upon the altar (chap. i. 9), viz. “the fat (the fat portions, chap. iii. 3, 4) with the

breast,"—the former to be burned upon the altar, the latter "to wave as a wave-offering before Jehovah." חֲוֵה, τὸ στήθιον (LXX.), i.e., according to Pollux, τῶν στήθων τὸ μέσον, *pectusculum* or *pectus* (*Vulg.* cf. chap. ix. 20, 21, x. 15), signifies the breast, the breast-piece of the sacrificial animals,¹ 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, *στήθια 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). חֲוֵה, from חָוָה, חָוָה, to swing, to move to and fro (see Ex. xxxv. 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.² In the peace-offerings the waving was performed with the breast-piece, which was called the "wave-breast" in consequence (ver. 34, chap. x. 14, 15; Num. vi. 20, xviii. 18; Ex. xxix. 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 (chap. viii. 25–29; Ex. xxix. 22–26). The ceremony of waving was also carried out with the sheaf of first-

¹ The etymology of the word is obscure. According to *Winer, Gesenius*, and others, it signifies *ad spectui 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.

² In the Talmud (cf. *Gemar. Kiddush* 36, 2, *Gem. Succa* 37, 2, and *Tosapha 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.

fruits at the feast of Passover; with the loaves of the first-fruits, and thank-offering lambs, at the feast of Pentecost (chap. xxiii. 11, 20); with the shoulder and meat-offering of the Nazarite (Num. vi. 20); with the trespass-offering of the leper (chap. xiv. 12, 24); with the jealousy-offering (Num. v. 25); and lastly with the Levites, at their consecration (Num. viii. 11 sqq.). 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. viii. 19). The *waving*, therefore, had nothing in common with the *porricere* of the Romans, as the portions of the sacrifices which were called *porriciæ* 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. $\pi\psi$ is the thigh in the case of a man (Isa. xlvi. 2; Song of Sol. v. 15), and therefore in the case of an animal it is not the fore-leg, or shoulder (*ἄρσενον*, *armus*), which is called $\psi\eta$, or the arm (Num. vi. 19; Deut. xviii. 3), but the hind-leg, or rather the upper part of it or ham, which is mentioned in 1 Sam. ix. 24 as a peculiarly choice portion (*Knobel*). As a portion lifted off from the sacrificial gifts, it is often called "the *heave-leg*" (ver. 34, chap. x. 14, 15; Num. vi. 20; Ex. xxix. 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" (chap. x. 15), includes the offering of the heave-leg (see my *Archæologie* i. pp. 244-5).—Ver. 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. Ex. xxvii. 21).—With vers. 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 ver. 36, “*in the day of their anointing.*” The word מִשְׁחָה in ver. 35, like מִשְׁחָה in Num. xviii. 8, signifies not “*anointing,*” but share, *portio*, literally a measuring off, as in Aramæan 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 (Deut. xii. 12, 18), and on the other, the blessedness of eating and drinking in the kingdom of God (Luke xiv. 15, xxii. 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.

With vers. 37 and 38 the whole of the sacrificial law (chap. i.-vii.) is brought to a close. Among the sacrifices appointed, the fill-offering (הַמְלִיאִים) is also mentioned here; though it is not first instituted in these chapters, but in Ex. xxix. 19, 20 (vers. 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. xxii. 21 (*Knobel*), but was applied primarily to the ceremony of consecrating the priests, as described in chap. viii. 25 sqq., and was restricted to the idea of investiture with the *priesthood* (cf. chap. viii. 33, xvi. 32; Ex. xxviii. 41, xxix. 9, 29, 33, 35; Num. iii. 3; Judg. xvii. 5, 12). This gave rise to the expression "to fill the hand for Jehovah," i.e. to provide something to offer to Jehovah (1 Chron. xxix. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 31, cf. Ex. xxxii. 29). Hence מְלִיאִים denotes the filling of the hand with sacrificial gifts to be offered to Jehovah, and was 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 (chap. viii. 33, "the days of your consecration"). The allusion to the place in ver. 38, viz. "*in the wilderness of Sinai*," points on the one hand back to Ex. xix. 1, and on the other hand forward to Num. xxvi. 63, 64, and xxxvi. 13, "*in the plains of Moab*" (cf. Num. i. 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. ix. 9, x. 1), because the blood of bulls and of goats could not possibly take away sin (Heb. x. 4). The forgiveness of sin which the atoning sacrifices procured, was only a *πάρεσις* of past sins through the forbearance of God (Rom. iii. 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 for 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.—CHAP. VIII.—X.

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 (Ex. xxviii. and xxix.). 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 (chap. viii.),—their solemn entrance upon their office by sacrifices for themselves and the people (chap. ix.),—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 (chap. x.).

Chap. viii. CONSECRATION OF THE PRIESTS AND THE

SANCTUARY (cf. Ex. xxix. 1-37).—The consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests was carried out by Moses according to the instructions in Ex. xxix. 1-36, xl. 12-15; and the anointing of the tabernacle, with the altar and its furniture, as prescribed in Ex. xxix. 37, xxx. 26-29, and xl. 9-11, was connected with it (vers. 10, 11).—Vers. 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 (ver. 1). Moses brought the persons to be consecrated, the official costume that had been made for them (Ex. xxviii.), the anointing oil (Ex. xxx. 23 sqq.), and the requisite sacrificial offerings (Ex. xxix. 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 ver. 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 Ex. xxix. 2, 3, (1) unleavened bread, which is called חֻלְיָה in ver. 26, *i.e.* round flat bread-cakes, and לֶחֶם כֶּפֶר (loaf of bread) in Ex. xxix. 23, and was baked for the purpose of the consecration (see at vers. 31, 32); (2) unleavened oil-cakes; and (3) unleavened flat cakes covered with oil (see at chap. ii. 4 and vii. 12).—Ver. 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 Ex. xxviii. 1 and xxix. 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.—Vers. 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 (vers. 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 (vers. 16-36).

Vers. 6-13. The *washing, clothing, and anointing.*—Ver. 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. —Vers. 7-9. Then followed the clothing of Aaron. Moses put upon him the body-coat (Ex. xxviii. 39) and girdle (Ex. xxviii. 39 and xxxix. 22), then clothed him with the *meil* (Ex. xxviii. 31-35) and ephod (Ex. xxviii. 6-14), and the *choshen* with the Urim and Thummim (Ex. xxviii. 15-30), and put the cap (Ex. xxviii. 39) upon his head, with the golden diadem over his forehead (Ex. xxviii. 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.—Vers. 10-12. According to the directions in Ex. xxx. 26-30 (cf. chap. xl. 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 ver. 13 (according to Ex. xxviii. 40), the anointing not being expressly mentioned, although it had not only been commanded, in Ex. xxviii. 41 and xl. 15, but the performance of it is taken for granted in chap. vii. 36, x. 7, and Num. iii. 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*” (ver. 12, cf. Ex. xxix. 7 ; Ps. cxxxiii. 2),

which is applied to Aaron only, but also in chap. xxi. 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 א (the initial letter of אהרן), 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 *שׁוּבַת* “to sanctify,” in vers. 10–12, as well as in Ex. xl. 9–11 and 13; and in Ex. xl. 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 Ex. xl. 16). To impress upon it this highest grade of holiness, it was sprinkled seven 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 (1 Sam. x. 1, 6, xvi. 13, 14; Isa. lxi. 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. xxviii. 18, xxxv. 14), and it occurs again in the instructions concerning the expiation of the sanctuary on the annual day of atonement (chap. xvi.). 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 Ex. xxix. 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 Ex. xl. 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 chap. vi. 15 (cf. Ex. xxix. 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 chap. vi. 15, that as every fresh generation entered upon office, the anointing would be repeated or renewed.

Vers. 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.—Vers. 14–17. The first sacrifice was a sin-offering, for which a young ox was taken (Ex. xxix. 1), as in the case of the sin-offerings for the high priest and the whole congregation (chap. iv. 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 chap. iii. 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 (chap. vi. 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* (*קָדַשׁ*) *and sanctify the altar, to expiate it.*” As the altar had been sanctified immediately before by the anointing with holy oil (ver. 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 of worship generally applied only to the sins of the nation, by which these vessels had been defiled (chap. xvi. 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 the 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 chap. iv. 11, 12). For the rest, the remarks made on p. 306 are also applicable to the symbolical meaning of this sacrifice.—Vers. 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 (chap. i. 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.

Vers. 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 (chap. ix. 4, 18), the tribe-princes (Num. vii. 17 sqq.), and a Nazarite (Num. vi. 14, 17), who also occupied a higher position in the congregation (Amos ii. 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 (vers. 23 and 24, cf. Ex. xxix. 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 (ver. 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.¹

In addition to this, the following appointment is contained in Ex. xxix. 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 (אֲשֵׁרֵי with the suffix אֶ- as in Gen. xix. 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. xx. 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. 337 that this is not involved in Ex. xl. 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.²

The ceremony performed with the flesh of this sacrifice was also peculiarly significant (vers. 25-29). Moses took the fat portions, which were separated from the flesh in the case

¹ In the instructions in Ex. xxix. 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.

² 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 ver. 13 proves that the priests were not anointed at all.

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 (מִלֵּא) 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 מִלֵּא and מִלֵּא 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 (ver. 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 Ex. xxix. 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.—Vers. 31, 32. For the sacrificial meal, the priests were to boil the flesh in front of the door of the tabernacle, or, according to Ex. xxix. 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 (Ex. xxix. 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 chap. i. 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 chap. vii. 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 chap. vii. 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 (Ex. xii. 8 sqq.).

Vers. 33-36 (cf. Ex. xxix. 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*" (ver. 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 Ex. xxix. 36, 37, besides the filling of the hands 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. Heiligth.* 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. xxvi. 5, and *Hengstenberg, Christology*).

Chap. ix. ENTRANCE OF AARON AND HIS SONS UPON THEIR OFFICE.—Vers. 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 revela-

tion 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 (vers. 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. x. 1 sqq.). 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 chap. viii. 14 and iv. 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. xxviii. 11 sqq.). 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.—Vers. 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 Ex. xvi. 10). Aaron was to offer the sacrifices that had been brought for the reconciliation of himself and the nation.

Vers. 8-21. Accordingly, he offered first of all the sin-offering and burnt-offering for himself, and then (vers. 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 ver. 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 (chap. iv. 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 (vers. 8-11) as Moses had pursued with the sin-offering at the consecration of the priests (chap. viii. 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 (chap. iv. 11, 12).—Vers. 12-14. The burnt-offering was presented according to the general rule (chap. i. 3-9), as in chap. viii. 18-21. **הִמְצִיא** (ver. 12): to cause to attain; here, and in ver. 18, to present, hand over. **לְנִתְחִיָּהּ**, according to its pieces, into which the burnt-offering was divided (chap. i. 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. xv. 2 sqq. had not yet been given, but more especially because Aaron had to bring the special meat-offering commanded in chap. vi. 13, and had offered this in connection with the morning burnt-offering mentioned in ver. 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.—Vers. 15 sqq. 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 (vers. 8 sqq.). 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 chap. iv. 16 sqq., but only applied to the horns of the altar of burnt-offering; for the same reason as in the previous case (vers. 8 sqq.), *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 (chap. x. 16 sqq.), but was able to justify it (see at chap. x. 16-20). The sin-offering (ver. 16) was also offered "*according to the right*" (as in chap. v. 10). Then followed the meat-offering (ver. 17), of which Aaron burned a handful upon the altar (according to the rule in chap. ii. 1, 2). He offered this in addition to the morning burnt-offering (Ex. xxix. 39), to which a meat-offering also belonged (Ex. xxix. 40), and with which, according to chap. vi. 12 sqq., the special meat-offering of the priests was associated. Last of all (vers. 18-21) there followed the peace-offering, which was also carried out according to the general rule. In *הַמִּכְסָּה*, "*the covering*" (ver. 19), the two fat portions mentioned in chap. iii. 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 chap. vii. 30-36. The meat-offering of pastry, which belonged to the peace-offering according to chap. vii. 12, 13, is not specially mentioned.

Vers. 22-24. When the sacrificial ceremony was over, Aaron blessed the people from the altar with uplifted hands (cf. Num. vi. 22 sqq.), and then came down: *sc.* from the bank surrounding the altar, upon which he had stood while offering the sacrifice (see at Ex. xxvii. 4, 5).—Ver. 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. xvi. 19, xvii. 7, and xx. 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 (1 Chron. xxi. 26; 2 Chron. vii. 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 (2 Chron. xxxiii. 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 (chap. i. 7), and, according to chap. vi. 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. vi. 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 (vers. 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 ver. 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 (chap. vi. 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 (Ex. xl. 29), there were sacrifices presented every day during the seven days of the consecration of the priests (chap. viii.); and according to chap. i. 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 (chap. viii. 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 Æn.* xii. 200; *Solin.* v. 23; *Pausan.* v. 27, 3; *Bochart, Hieroz.* lib. ii. c. 35, pp. 378 sqq.; *Douglass's analect.* ss. pp. 79 sqq.).

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 *לִבְנֵה* admits of both meanings, setting on fire and burning up (see Judg. vi. 21, and 1 Kings xviii. 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 more 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.

Chap. x. THE SANCTIFICATION OF THE PRIESTHOOD BY BOTH THE ACT AND WORD OF GOD.—Vers. 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 (Ex. vi. 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.—Ver. 1. Nadab and Abihu took their censers (*machtah*, Ex. xxv. 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 (chap. xvi. 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 Ex. xxx. 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 vers. 12 sqq. and 16 sqq. that it occurred in the interval between the sacrificial transaction in chap. ix. and the sacrificial meal which followed it, and therefore upon the day of their inauguration. For in ver. 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 ver. 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.* chap. iv. 6, 7, xvi. 13) and also in the court (*e.g.* chap. i. 5, etc.). It is in the latter sense that it is to be taken here, as is evident from ver. 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 (Ex. xix. 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 (2 Cor. ii. 16).—In ver. 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 My-*

self in the face of all the people." אָפְנֵי is unquestionably to be taken in the same sense as in Ex. xiv. 4, 17; consequently אָפְנֵי is to be taken in a reflective and not in a passive sense, as in Ezek. xxxviii. 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. xvi. 5), made them קָרְבֵי = קָרְבִים לַיהוָה "*persons standing near to Jehovah*" (Ezek. xlii. 13, xliii. 19), and sanctified them to Himself by anointing (chap. viii. 10, 12; Ex. xxix. 1, 44, xl. 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 (Ezek. xxxviii. 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.

Vers. 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 chap. ix. 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.—Vers. 6 sqq. 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 (chap. xiii. 45). פָּרַע ראֵשׁ 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 chap. xxi. 10), but is to be taken in a similar sense to פָּרַע שְׂעַר ראֵשׁוֹ, the free growth of the hair, not cut short with scissors (Num. vi. 5; Ezek. xlv. 20). It is derived from פָּרַע, to let loose from anything (Prov. i. 25, iv. 5, etc.), to let a people loose, equivalent to giving them the reins (Ex. xxxii. 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 Ebræorum 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. xxxvii. 29, xlv. 13; 2 Sam. i. 11, iii. 31, xiii. 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 chap. xiii. 45, xxi. 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 (chap. xxi. 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 (chap. iv. 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 sor-

row 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.—Ver. 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. chap. xxi. 12).

Vers. 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 (Ex. xii. 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 (! . . .), vers. 10 and 11, *et . . . et*, both . . . and also). *Shecar* was an intoxicating drink made of barley and dates or honey. שֵׁכָר, *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 ver. 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.

Vers. 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 (vers. 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 (chap. ii. 3, vi. 9-11), and then (vers. 14, 15) of that relating to the wave-breast and heave-leg (chap. vii.

32-34). By the *minchah* in ver. 12 we are to understand the meal and oil, which were offered with the burnt-offering of the nation (chap. ix. 4 and 7); and by the דִּשְׁחָן in vers. 12 and 15, those portions of the burnt-offering, meat-offering, and peace-offering of the nation which were burned upon the altar (chap. ix. 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 (chap. ix. 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 (chap. vi. 19, 22);—“*and, behold, it was burned*” (הִשָּׂחָה, 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 (שָׂחָה construed as a passive with an accusative, as in Gen. iv. 18, etc.). “*To bear the iniquity*” does not signify here, as in chap. v. 1, to bear and atone for the sin in its consequences, but, as in Ex. xxviii. 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 Ex. xxviii. 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). Ex. xxviii. 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 reatum*

in se recipiebant" (*Deyling observv. ss. i. 45, 2*).¹—Vers. 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 vers. 1 sqq. has befallen me (אָרָא = קָרָא, as in Gen. xlii. 4); "and if I had eaten the sin-offering to-day, would it have been well-pleasing to Jehovah?" וְאִם אֶכְלֶה יוֹם יוֹם is a conditional clause, as in Gen. xxxiii. 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 chap. vi. 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 chap. vi. 19).²

¹ *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 expietis." 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. xvii. 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.

² 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.

LAWS RELATING TO CLEAN AND UNCLEAN ANIMALS.—CHAP. XI.

(Cf. Deut. xiv. 3–20.)

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. viii. 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. iii. 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 (ver. 2); but they pass beyond these bounds by prohibiting at the same time all contact with animal carrion (vers. 8, 11, 24 sqq.), and show thereby that they are connected in principle and object with the subsequent laws of purification (chap. xii.-xv.), to which they are to be regarded as a preparatory introduction.

Vers. 1-8. The laws which follow were given to Moses and Aaron (ver. 1, chap. xiii. 1, xv. 1), as Aaron had been sanctified through the anointing to expiate the sins and uncleannesses of the children of Israel.—Vers. 2-8 (cf. Deut. xiv. 4-8). Of the larger quadrupeds, which are divided in Gen. i. 24, 25 into beasts of the earth (living wild) and tame cattle, only the cattle (*behemah*) 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 פְּרָסָה, literally “tearing (having) a rent in the hoofs,” according to Deut. xiv. 5 into “two claws,” *i.e.* with a hoof completely severed in two. גִּירָה, rumination, μῆρυκατισμός (LXX.), from גִּירָה (cf. גִּירָה ver. 7), to draw (Hab. i. 15), to draw to and fro; hence to bring up the food again, to ruminate. מֵעֲלֵת גִּירָה 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. vers. 4 sqq.). These marks are combined in the oxen, sheep, and goats, and also in the stag and gazelle. The latter are expressly mentioned in Deut. xiv. 4, 5,

where—in addition to the *common stag* (אֵיל), and *gazelle* (צִי, *δορκάς*, 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) חֲמִיר, 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) קִפִּי, 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) שִׁרְיָה, 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) אֵיִל, 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) גִּירָף, 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 *caprea sylvestris species*, according to the Chaldee.—Vers. 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 (Ps. civ. 18), are very gregarious, being often seen seated in troops before the openings to their caves, and extremely timid as they are quite defenceless (Prov. xxx. 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.¹—Ver. 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.—Ver. 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 (ver. 39).

Vers. 9–12 (cf. Deut. xiv. 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*).

Vers. 13–19 (cf. Deut. xiv. 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.² The list commences with the *eagle*,

¹ See *Shaw*, iii. p. 301; *Seetzen*, ii. p. 228; *Robinson's Biblical Researches*, p. 387; and *Roediger on Gesenius thesaurus*, p. 1467.

² 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 *הָאֵרָב* and

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 xxxix. 30, Prov. xxx. 17, and Matt. xxiv. 28. But the bald-headedness mentioned in Micah i. 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. either 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 γρύψ = 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, עֲנִיָּה, 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 vultures, it forms a very fitting link of transition to the other species of vulture and falcon (ver. 14). דָּאָה (*Deut.* דָּהּ, according to a change which is by no means rare when the *aleph* stands between two vowels: cf. דָּוָה in 1 Sam. xxi. 8, xxii. 9, and דָּוָה in 1 Sam. xxii. 18, 22), from דָּהּ 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.* xxxiv. 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 דָּהּ to be dark, is overthrown by the use of the word לְמִינֵהּ in Deuter- enumerated twenty-one varieties; and no doubt, under other circumstances, he could have made the list still longer. In *Deut.* xiv. 11 צִפּוֹרִי is used, as synonymous with עֲוִי in ver. 20.

onomy, which shows that רָמָה is intended to denote the whole genus. הָיָא, which is referred to in Job xxviii. 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 *ικρίν*, the kite, here, and *γρίψ*, the griffin, in Deut. and Job), of which there are three species in Palestine (*Lynch*, p. 229). In Deut. xiv. 13 הָרָמָה is also mentioned, from הָרָמָה to see. Judging from the name, it was a keen-sighted bird, either a falcon or another species of vulture (*Vulg. ixion*).—Ver. 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 ו before הָמָה, 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.—Ver. 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.* xiii. 21, xxxiv. 13, etc.), or as the mournful screamer (*Micah* i. 8; *Job* xxxix. 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. הַחֲמָס, 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. 45 sqq.); but this is mentioned later under another name. According to *Saad. Ar. Erp.* it is the *swallow*; but this is called חֲמָס in *Jer.* viii. 7. *Knobel* supposes it to be the *cuckoo*, which is met with in Palestine (*Seetzen*, 1, p. 78), and derives the name from חָמָס, *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). לָפֹס is the $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$, 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 נָז . נָז , from נָזַף to fly, is the *hawk*, which soars very high, and spreads its wings towards the south (*Job xxxix.* 26). It stands in fact, as לְמִינֵיהֶם shows, for the hawk-tribe generally, probably the $\iota\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\kappa\varsigma$, *accipiter*, of which the ancients enumerate many different species. בֹּש , which is mentioned in *Ps. cii.* 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. לָפֹס , 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. $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\acute{\rho}\acute{\alpha}\kappa\tau\eta\varsigma$; in the *Targ.* and *Syr.* לִפְּיֵי נַיִנָא , *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. נִשְׁנֵי : from נִשְׁנַף to snort, according to *Isa. xxxiv.* 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*. תַּנְשֵׁמָה , which occurs again in *ver.* 30 among the names of the lizards, is, according to *Damiri*, a bird resembling the uhu, but smaller. *Jonathan* calls it *uthya* = $\acute{\omega}\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, a *night-owl*. The primary meaning of the word נִשְׁנֵי is essentially the same as that of נִשְׁנַף , 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. נֹסֵף , which also lived in desolate places (Isa. xxxiv. 11; Zeph. ii. 14), or in the desert itself (Ps. cii. 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. xxxiv. 11 and Zeph. ii. 14, but the *pelican* (*πελεκάν*, LXX.), as all the ancient versions render it, which *Ephraem* (on Num. xiv. 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 נֹסֵף 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). חֲסִידָה , in Deut. חֲסִידָה , 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, אָבִיבָה , *avis pia*, a bird of passage according to Jer. viii. 7, which builds its nest upon the cypresses (Ps. civ. 17, cf. *Bochart, iii.* pp. 85 sqq.). 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.¹ אָבִיבָה , according

¹ *Oedmann* (v. 58 sqq.), *Knobel*, and others follow the Greek translation

to the LXX. and *Vulgate* *χαρადριός*, 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 *וְאֵת* before *הַחֲנֹפֶה*, 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 *וְ* before *אֵת* in ver. 15.¹ *הַיְכִיפָה*: 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, *הַעֵטָף* is the bat (*Isa.* ii. 20), which the Arabs also classified among the birds.

of Leviticus and the Psalms, and the *Vulgate* rendering of Leviticus, the Psalms, and Job, and suppose the reference to be to the *ἱραδιός*, *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 ἱραδιούσας ἀκούω ποιεῖν ταύτων* (i.e. feed their young by spitting out their food) *καὶ τοὺς πελεκῆνας μίτροι*, nothing is said about the parental affection of the heron. And the testimony of *Bellonius*, "*Ciconiæ quæ ætate 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 *Sæetzen* there are no storks in Mount Lebanon.

¹ On account of the omission of *וְאֵת* *Knobel* would connect *הַחֲנֹפֶה* as an adjective with *הַחֲסִידָה*, and explain *חֲנֹפֶה* as derived from *עֲנָף* *frons*, *עֲנָף* *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 *ס* for *פ* in such a word as *עֲנָף*, *frons*, which occurs as early as chap. xxiii. 40, and has retained its *פ* even in the Aramæan dialects, is destitute of all probability. In addition to this, there is the improbability of the *chasidah* being the only bird to which a special epithet was applied, or of its being restricted by *anaphah* to the different species of heron, with three of which the ancients

Vers. 20-23 (cf. Deut. xiv. 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" (כף for יף as in Ex. xxi. 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,

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 *Tummaj*, is not raised into a probability by a comparison with the similarly sounding ἀνοραία of Od. 1, 320, by which *Aristarchus* understands a kind of eagle.

and then grind them into meal and make cakes of them. The Israelites were allowed to eat the *arbeh*, *i.e.*, according to Ex. x. 13, 19, Nahum iii. 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 Ps. lxxviii. 46, cv. 34, as לִיִּם, *the devourer*, and עֹרֵב, *the eater-up*; but *Knobel* is mistaken in supposing that these names are applied to certain species of the *arbeh*. עֹרֵב, 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 ἀττάκης and *attacus* of the LXX. and Vulg. are altogether unexplained. לָרֶגֶל: 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. צָרְבָה, a word of uncertain etymology, occurs in Num. xiii. 33, where the spies are described as being like *chagabim* by the side of the inhabitants of the country, and in 2 Chron. vii. 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 ἀπτέλαβος, 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 Nahum iii. 17*).¹

¹ In Deut. xiv. 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.

In vers. 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 (vers. 24 and 25) to aquatic and winged animals, which were not to be eaten because they were unclean (the expression “*for these*” in ver. 24 relates to them); and then (vers. 26–28) to quadrupeds, both cattle that have not the hoof thoroughly divided and do not ruminate (ver. 26), and animals that go upon their hands, *i.e.* upon paws, and have no hoofs, such as cats, dogs, bears, etc.—Vers. 27, 28. The same rule was applicable to all these animals: “*whoever toucheth the carcase 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.

Vers. 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 vers. 41, 42, as none of these were usually eaten. *Sherez*, the swarm, refers to animals which swarm together in great numbers (see at Gen. i. 21), and is synonymous with *remes* (cf. Gen. vii. 14 and vii. 21), “the creeping;” it denotes the smaller land animals which move without feet, or with feet that are hardly perceptible (see at Gen. i. 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. חִלְדָּה is not the *mole* (according to *Saad. Ar. Abyss.*, 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 חִלְדָּה, 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). עֲכָבֵר is the *mouse* (according to the ancient versions and the Talmud), and in 1 Sam. vi. 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. \aleph 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. 436 sqq., also by *Hasselquist* under the name of *lacerta Ægyptia*, 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.

—Ver. 30. The early translators tell us nothing certain as to the three following names, and it is still undecided how they should be rendered. $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ is translated $\mu\nu\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$ 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 $\aleph\aleph$ 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. 361 sqq., 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. $\aleph\aleph$ is not the chameleon (LXX.), for this is called *tinshemeth*, but the *chardawn* (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 $\kappa\omicron\acute{\alpha}\xi$, the Romans *coaxare*. But this is very improbable, and the frog would be quite out of place in the midst of simple lizards. $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, according to the ancient versions, is also a lizard. *Leyrer* supposes it to be the nocturnal, salamander-like family of *geckons*; *Knobel*, on the contrary, imagines it to be the tortoise, which creeps upon the earth (*terræ adhæret*), because the Arabic verb signifies *terræ adhæsit*. This is very improbable, however. $\aleph\aleph\aleph$ (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 שִׁבְלִיל in Ps. lviii. 9; although the purple snail and all the marine species are eaten in Egypt and Palestine. Lastly, תַּנְשֵׁמֶת, the self-inflating animal (see at ver. 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).—Ver. 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 (vers. 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.—Ver. 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 Ex. xxii. 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.—Ver. 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 chap. vi. 21). Of course the contents of such a vessel, supposing

there were any, were not to be used.—Ver. 34. “*Every edible food* (אֵלֶּכָּה before לְּ partitive, as in chap. iv. 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 ver. 34a, “*every food upon which water out of such a vessel comes,*” is untenable; because מֵיִם without an article cannot mean such water, or this water.—Ver. 35. Every vessel also became unclean, upon which the body of such an animal fell: such as אֶרְצֵי, the *earthen baking-pot* (see chap. ii. 4), and בְּרִירִים, the *covered pan or pot*. בְּיֵר, a *boiling or roasting vessel* (1 Sam. ii. 14), can only signify, when used in the dual, a vessel consisting of two parts, *i.e.* a pan or pot *with a lid*.—Ver. 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.—Vers. 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.

Vers. 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. vers. 39, 40 with vers. 24-28). This was the case, too, with the eating of the swarming land animals, whether they went upon the belly,¹ as snakes and worms, or upon four feet, as rats, mice, weasels, etc., or upon many feet, like the insects (vers. 41-43). Lastly (vers. 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 (Ex. vi. 7, xxix. 45, 46).—Vers. 46, 47, contain the concluding formula to the whole of this law.

If we take a survey, in closing, of the animals that are enu-

¹ The large ך in חַמְּץ (ver. 42) shows that this *vav* is the middle letter of the Pentateuch.

merated 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. vii. 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.¹

LAWS OF PURIFICATION.—CHAP. XII.—XV.

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

¹ "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

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 (chap. xii.), leprosy (chap. xiii. and xiv.), and both natural and diseased secretions from the sexual organs of either male or female (emissio seminis and gonorrhœa, also menses and flux: chap. xv.); and to these there is added in Num. xix. 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. (chap. xv. 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 (chap. xv. 3–12, 19–27). In the case of the menses, the uncleanness lasted seven days (chap. xv. 19, 24); in that of child-birth, either seven or fourteen days, and then still further thirty-three or sixty-six, according to circumstances (chap. xii. 2, 4, 5); and in that of a diseased flux, as long as the disease itself lasted, and seven days afterwards (chap. xv. 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 (chap. xii. 6, 8, xv. 14, 15, 29, 30). Leprosy made those who were affected with it so unclean, that they were ex-

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.*

cluded from all intercourse with the clean (chap. xiii. 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 (chap. xiv. 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 (chap. xiii. 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 (chap. xiv. 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. xix. 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. xix. 12, 17 sqq.), 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. xix. 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 (chap. xi. 25 sqq.).

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. iii. 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. iii. 24, Rom. vii. 24, viii. 19 sqq.; Phil. iii. 21)."
Leyrer.

Chap. xii. UNCLEANNESS AND PURIFICATION AFTER CHILD-BIRTH.—Vers. 2–4. "If a woman bring forth (תִּזְרֶיץ) seed and bear a boy, she shall be unclean seven days as in the days of the uncleanness of her (monthly) sickness." נִדָּה, from נָדַד to flow, *lit.* that which is to flow, is applied more especially to the uncleanness of a woman's secretions (chap. xv. 19). נִדָּה, inf. of נָדַד, to be sickly

or ill, is applied here and in chap. xv. 33, xx. 18, to the suffering connected with an issue of blood.—Vers. 3, 4. After the expiration of this period, on the eighth day, the boy was to be circumcised (see at Gen. xvii.). 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.—Ver. 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 child-birth, 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 Ex. xxiv. 18).—Vers. 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 source of her issue. בֶּן שָׁנָה, *lit. son of his year*, which is a year old (cf. chap. xxiii. 12; Num. vi. 12, 14, vii. 15, 21, etc.), is used interchangeably with בֶּן שָׁנָה (Ex. xii. 5), and with בְּנֵי שָׁנָה in the plural (chap. xxiii. 18, 19; Ex. xxix. 38;

Num. vii. 17, 23, 29). מְקוֹר דָּמִים, fountain of bleeding (see at Gen. iv. 10), equivalent to hemorrhage (cf. chap. xx. 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 (ver. 8, cf. chap. v. 7, 11).

Chap. xiii. and xiv. LEPROSY.—The law for leprosy, the observance of which is urged upon the people again in Deut. xxiv. 8, 9, treats, in the *first* place, of leprosy in men: (*a*) in its dangerous forms when appearing either on the skin (vers. 2–28), or on the head and beard (vers. 29–37); (*b*) in harmless forms (vers. 38 and 39); and (*c*) when appearing on a bald head (vers. 40–44). To this there are added instructions for the removal of the leper from the society of other men (vers. 45 and 46). It treats, *secondly*, of leprosy in linen, woollen, and leather articles, and the way to treat them (vers. 47–59); *thirdly*, of the purification of persons recovered from leprosy (chap. xiv. 1–32); and *fourthly*, of leprosy in houses and the way to remove it (vers. 33–53).—The laws for leprosy in man relate exclusively to the so-called white leprosy, λεύκη, λέπρα, *lepra*, which probably existed at that time in hither Asia alone, not only among the Israelites and Jews (Num. xii. 10 sqq.; 2 Sam. iii. 29; 2 Kings v. 27, vii. 3, xv. 5; Matt. viii. 2, 3, x. 8, xi. 5, xxvi. 6,

etc.), but also among the Syrians (2 Kings v. 1 sqq.), 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. 135 sqq.) and Egypt; though at the present time the pimply leprosy, *lepra tuberosa s. articulorum* (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).

Chap. xiii. 2-28. *The symptoms of leprosy, whether proceeding directly from eruptions in the skin, or caused by a boil or burn.*—Vers. 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." שָׂמַח, a lifting up (Gen. iv. 7, etc.), signifies here an elevation of the skin in some part of the body, a raised spot like a pimple. סִפָּחַת, an eruption, scurf, or scab, from סָפַח to pour out, "a pouring out as it were from the flesh or skin" (*Knobel*). בִּהָרַח, from בָּהַר, 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*. בַּרַס , a stroke (*lit.* "stroke of leprosy"), is applied not only to the spot attacked by the leprosy, the leprous mole (vers. 3, 29-32, 42, etc.), but to the persons and even to things affected with leprosy (vers. 4, 12, 13, 31, 50, 55).—Ver. 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.—Vers. 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.—Vers. 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 noticed this on his second appearance, he was to declare him unclean, for in that case it was leprosy.

The *second case* (vers. 9-17): if the leprosy broke out without previous eruptions.—Vers. 9 sqq. "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 vers. 9 and 10 commences with ver. 11. חַי בְּשָׂרָהּ living, *i.e.* raw, proud flesh. מְחַיֶּה the preservation of life (Gen xlv. 5), sustenance (Judg. vi. 4); here, in vers. 10 and 24, it signifies life in the sense of that which shows life, not a blow or spot (נָגַף, 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. xxxiv. 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.—Vers. 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 leprosy 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.—Ver. 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 ver. 18 בָּשָׂר is first of all used absolutely, and then resumed with בָּ, and the latter again is more closely defined in בְּעוּרָו: "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."—Ver. 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."—Vers. 21 sqq. 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 צִרְבַּת הַשָּׁחִין, “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*).

The *fourth case* (vers. 24-28): if there was a burnt place upon the skin of the flesh (מִבְּרִית 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 ver. 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. שִׂאת הַמִּבְרִית (ver. 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.

Vers. 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 (צָהֹב golden, reddish, fox-colour) and thin, he was to regard it as נִחַק. Leprosy on the head or chin is called נִחַק, probably from נָחַק to pluck or tear, from its plucking out the hair, or causing it to fall off; like κνίφη, the itch, from κνίω, 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 בוֹ (ver. 31) there is certainly an error of the text: either שָׁחַר must be retained and אֵין dropped, or שָׁחַר must be altered into צָהֹב, according to ver. 37. The latter is probably the better of the two.—Vers. 32 sqq. 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 ver. 6).—Vers. 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.—Ver. 37. But if, on the contrary, the eruption stood

(see ver. 5), and black hair grew out of it, he was healed, and the person affected was to be declared clean.

Vers. 38 and 39. *Harmless leprosy*.—This broke out upon the skin of the body in בְּהֵרֵת plaits, “white rings.” If these were dull or a pale white, it was the harmless *bohak*, $\alpha\lambda\phi\acute{o}\varsigma$ (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.

Vers. 40–44. *The leprosy of bald heads*.— בְּהֵרֵת is a head bald behind; בְּהֵרֵת , 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.—Vers. 42 sqq. 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.

Vers. 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 chap. x. 6), keep the beard covered (Ezek. xxiv. 17, 22), and cry “Unclean, unclean,” that every one might avoid them for fear of being defiled (Lam. iv. 15); and as long as the disease lasted they were to dwell apart outside the camp (Num. v. 2 sqq., xii. 10 sqq., cf. 2 Kings xv. 5, vii. 3),¹ 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).

Vers. 47–59. *Leprosy in linen, woollen, and leather fabrics and clothes*.—The only wearing apparel mentioned in ver. 47 is either woollen or linen, as in Deut. xxii. 11, Hos. ii. 7, Prov. xxxi. 13; and among the ancient Egyptians and ancient Greeks these were the materials usually worn. In vers. 48 sqq. שָׂרָי and עֵרֶב , “the

¹ 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).

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 (ver. 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." *מִמְאֲרַת*, from *מָאָר* *irritavit, recruduit (vulnus)*, is to be explained, as it is by *Bochart*, as signifying *lepra exasperata*. *מִמְאֲרַת הַפְּנֵעַ* making the mole bad or angry; not, as *Gesenius* maintains, from *מָאָר* = *מָרַר acerbum faciens, i.e. dolorem acerbum excitans*, which would not apply to leprosy in fabrics and houses (chap. xiv. 44), and is not required by Ezek. xxviii. 24. All such fabrics were to be burned as unclean.—Vers. 53 sqq. 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 or leather). *פְּחָתָת*, from *פָּחַת*, in Syriac *fodit*, from which comes *פִּתָּח* a pit, *lit.* a digging: here a corroding depression. *קֶרְחַת* a bald place in the front or right side, *צִבְחָת* a bald place in the back or left side of the fabric or leather.—Ver. 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 ver. 58) the garment or fabric from which the mole had disappeared was to be washed

a second time, and would then be clean.—Ver. 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.”

Chap. xiv., vers. 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 was 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.

The first act (vers. 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.—Vers. 2 sqq. 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 (לֵבָשׁוֹת, *const. prægnaus*, 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 Ex. xii. 22).

—Vers. 5 sqq. The priest was to have one of the birds killed into an earthen vessel upon fresh water (water drawn from a fountain or brook, chap. xv. 13, Gen. xxvi. 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 chap. iv. 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 his 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 Ezek. xvii. 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 ῥηπτική*, *herba humilis, medicinalis, purgandis pulmonibus apta*: *August.* on Ps. li.), 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.—Ver. 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. ver. 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 suæ*, that he might not defile himself again by conjugal rights, and so interrupt his preparation for readmission into fellowship with Jehovah.

The *second act* (vers. 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 waved 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 fact 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. viii. 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.¹—Vers. 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 chap. vii. 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 command-

¹ Others, *e.g.* *Riehm* and *Oehler*, regard this trespass-offering also as a kind of *multa*, 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 (Luke viii. 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.

ments, might thereby be sanctified through the power of the atoning blood of the sacrifice; just as in the dedication of the priests (chap. viii. 24).—Vers. 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 (chap. viii. 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 before Jehovah, after which the oil was 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

atonement 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.—Vers. 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. xv. 4 prescribed for the burnt-offering.—Vers. 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 vers. 21-32.

Vers. 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 (ver. 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 (vers. 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 ver. 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."¹—Vers. 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.—Vers. 37 sqq. 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.—Vers. 43 sqq. 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.—Vers. 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

¹ 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*."

whoever slept or ate therein during this time, was to wash his clothes, and of course was unclean till the evening. הִסְבִּיר אֹתוֹ (ver. 46) may be a perfect tense, and a relative clause dependent upon יָצָא, or it may be an infinitive for הִסְבִּיר as in ver. 43.—Ver. 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 (vers. 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 (vers. 4-7). The purpose was also the same, namely, to cleanse (תִּטַּהַר 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.—Vers. 54-57 contain the concluding formula to chap. xiii. and xiv. 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.

Chap. xv. The UNCLEANNESS OF SECRETIONS.—These include (1) a running issue from a man (vers. 2-15); (2) involuntary emission of seed (vers. 16, 17), and the emission of seed in sexual intercourse (ver. 18); (3) the monthly period of a woman (vers. 19-24); (4) a diseased issue of blood from a woman (vers. 25-30). They consist, therefore, of two diseased and two natural secretions from the organs of generation.

Vers. 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 ver. 13, “he shall wash his clothes and bathe his *flesh* in water,” when compared with chap. xvi. 23, 24, 28, etc., where flesh cannot possibly have any such meaning. The “flesh” is the body as in ver. 7, “whoever touches the flesh of him that hath the issue,” as compared with ver. 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 (ver. 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 (*gonorrhœa virulenta*), for the occurrence of this at all in antiquity is very questionable; but it is either a diseased flow of *semen* (*gonorrhœa*), *i.e.* an involuntary flow drop by drop arising from weakness of the organ, as *Jerome* and the Rabbins assume, or more probably, simply *blenorrhœa urethræ*, a discharge of mucus arising from a catarrhal affection of the mucous membrane of the urethra (*urethritis*). The participle נָזַח is expressive of continued duration. In ver. 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.—Ver. 4. Every bed upon which he lay, and everything upon which he sat, was defiled in consequence; also every one who touched his bed (ver. 5), or sat upon it (ver. 6), or touched his flesh, *i.e.* his body (ver. 7), was unclean, and had to bathe himself and wash his clothes in consequence.—Vers. 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.—Ver. 11. This also applied to every one whom the man with an issue might touch, without first rinsing his hands in water.—Vers. 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 chap. xi. 33 and vi. 21.—Vers. 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.

Vers. 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.—Ver. 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 (Ex. xix. 5; 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6; 2 Sam. xi. 4), in which many other nations resembled the Israelites. (For proofs see Leyrer’s article in *Herzog’s Cyclopædia*, and *Knobel in loco*, though the latter is wrong in supposing that conjugal intercourse itself defiled.)

Vers. 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 (ver. 19), everything upon which she lay or sat (ver. 20), every one who touched her bed or whatever she sat upon (vers. 21, 22), also any one who touched the blood upon her bed or seat (ver. 23, where *אִי* and *בֵּד* are to be referred to *בֵּד*); and they remained unclean till the evening, when they had to wash their clothes and bathe themselves.—Ver. 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 chap. xx. 18 and Num. v. 13 (cf. Gen. xxvi. 10, xxxiv. 2, xxxv. 22; 1 Sam. ii. 22). It cannot be adduced as an objection to this explanation, which is the only admissible one, that according to chap. xviii. 19 and xx. 18 intercourse with a woman during her menses was an accursed crime, to be punished by extermination. For the law in chap. xx. 18 refers partly to conjugal intercourse during the hemorrhage of a woman after child-birth, as the similarity of the words in chap. xx. 18 and xii.

7 (מִקְוֵי רֵמִיָּה) 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.

Vers. 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.—Vers. 28–30. After the issue had ceased, she was to purify herself like the man with an issue, as described in vers. 13–15.—Obedience to these commands is urged in ver. 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.” הִיִּיר, *Hiphil*, to cause that a person keeps aloof from anything, or loosens himself from it, from נִיָּר, *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 was irreconcilable with the calling of Israel to be a holy nation, in the midst of which Jehovah the Holy One had His dwelling-place (chap. xi. 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.—Vers. 32, 33. *Concluding formula.* The words, “*him that lieth with her that is unclean,*” are more general than the expression, “*lie with her,*” in ver. 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.—CHAP. XVI.

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 (vers. 2–28), and (2) directions for the celebration of this festival every year (vers. 29–34). From the expiation effected upon this day it received the name of “*day of expiations*,” *i.e.* of the highest expiation (chap. xxiii. 27). The Rabbins call it briefly *ספי*, the day *κατ' ἐξοχήν*.

Vers. 1, 2. The chronological link connecting the following law with the death of the sons of Aaron (chap. x. 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 vail, before the mercy-seat upon the ark,” *i.e.* into the most holy place (see Ex. xxv. 10 sqq.), but only at the time to be appointed by Jehovah, and for the purposes instituted by Him, *i.e.*, according to vers. 29 sqq., only once a year, on

the day of atonement, and only in the manner prescribed in vers. 3 sqq., 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 (Ex. xxv. 22), was not the cloud of the incense, with which Aaron was to cover the capporeth on entering (ver. 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.

Vers. 3-5. Only *אֲשֶׁר*, “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 ver. 2, into the inmost division of the tabernacle, which is called *Kodesh hakkadashim*, “the holy of holies,” in Ex. xxvi. 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, ver. 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 Ex. xxviii. 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 chap. viii. 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

Ex. xxviii. 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 Ex. xxviii. 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 vers. 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 (Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11, x. 2, 6, 7, and Dan. x. 5, xii. 6, 7), whose whole appearance, as described in Dan. x. 6, resembled the appearance of the glory of Jehovah, which Ezekiel saw in the vision of the four cherubim (chap. i.), and was almost exactly like the glory of Jesus Christ, which John saw in the Revelation (chap. i. 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. i. 3, vii. 26, ix. 12, 24).

Vers. 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 chap. i. 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 (לֹטְךָ, from

the coming up of the lot out of the urn, Josh. xviii. 11, xix. 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 ver. 21), to send it (them) into the desert to Azazel. עֲזַזְאֵל, 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 עָז to turn off, "the goat departing or sent away," as *Symm., Theodot., the Vulgate, Luther, and others* render it); nor "complete removal" (*Bähr, Winer, Thaluck, 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 עָזָר *removit, dimovit*, and comes from עָזָר by absorbing the liquid, like *Babel* from *balbel* (Gen. xi. 9), and *Golgotha* from *gulgalta* (*Ewald, § 158c*). The Septuagint rendering is correct, ὁ ἀποπομπᾶιος; although in ver. 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 viii. 1, x. 12, xiii. 1 sqq.), like the terrible fiend *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. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 14; Matt. xii. 43; Luke xi. 24; Rev. xviii. 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.

Vers. 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, ver. 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, Ex. xxv. 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” (Ex. xxx. 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.—Ver. 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 (chap. iv. 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 ver. 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.¹—Vers. 16*b* and 17. "*And so shall he do to the tabernacle of the congregation that dwelleth among them*" (i.e. has its place among them, Josh. xxii. 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 vers. 16 and 17, as well as vers. 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 ver. 18, and also in vers. 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 Ex. xxx. 10 or from the context. Ex. xxx. 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 ver. 16*b*. 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

¹ 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.

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 ver. 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.—Ver. 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.—Vers. 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 (chap. iv. 25, 30, 34), to which the priests also belonged; and the sevenfold sprinkling effected the purification of the place of sacrifice from the uncleannesses 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. 280 and 304). 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 did indeed manifest 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.

Vers. 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. אָפּ, ἀπαξ λεγ. from אָפּ an appointed time, signifies opportune, present at the right time, or ready. נִזְרָה , which is also met with in this passage alone, from נָזַר 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 ver. 5, the two goats were to serve as a sin-offering (זֶבַח חַטָּאת). 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 זֶבַח עֹלֹת (ver. 10), *i.e.* not that an expiatory rite might be performed over it, for עָלָה with זֶבַח always applies to the object of the expiation, but properly to expiate it, *i.e.* to make it the object of 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 chap. iv. 4 sqq. was followed.¹ 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 the 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, on 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 sinner 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.

¹ 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.

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 (chap. xiv. 4 sqq.), 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.

Vers. 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 chap. i. 4), and to burn the fat portions of the sin-offerings upon the altar.—Vers. 26 sqq. The man who took the goat into the desert, and those who burned the two sin-offerings outside the camp (see at chap. iv. 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.

Vers. 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 Ex. xii. 14). On that day the Israelites were to “afflict their souls,” *i.e.* to fast, according to chap. xxiii. 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 (Ex. xx. 10), by both natives and foreigners (see Ex. xii. 49), because this day was a high Sabbath (Ex. xxxi. 15). Both fasting and sabbatical rest are enjoined again in chap. xxiii. 27 sqq. and Num. xxix. 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* (צום). The latter word came first of all into use in the time of the Judges (Judg. xx. 26; 1 Sam. vii. 6; cf. Ps. xxxv. 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*).—Vers. 32 sqq. 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. ix. 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 ver. 34, "and he (*i.e.* Aaron, to whom Moses was to communicate the instructions of God concerning the feast of atonement, ver. 2), did as the Lord commanded Moses," are anticipatory in their character, like Ex. xii. 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. x. 11 with Ex. xl. 17, not till after the departure of Israel from Sinai.

II.—LAWS FOR THE SANCTIFICATION OF ISRAEL IN THE
COVENANT-FELLOWSHIP OF ITS GOD.

CHAP. XVII.—XXV.

HOLINESS OF CONDUCT ON THE PART OF THE ISRAELITES.—

CHAP. XVII.—XX.

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.

Chap. xvii. 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 (vers. 3-7), and were to offer all their burnt-offerings or slain-offerings before the door of the tabernacle (vers. 8 and 9); and they were not to eat either blood or carrion (vers. 10-16). These laws are not intended simply as supplements to the food laws in chap. xi.; 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 (1 Tim. iv. 4, 5).—Vers. 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 chap. xviii.—xx. are addressed to "the children of Israel," or "the whole congregation" (chap.

xviii. 2, xix. 2, xx. 2), just as special laws are laid down for the priests in chap. xx. and xxi. with reference to the circumstances mentioned there.

Vers. 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. xvii. 14). The severity of this prohibition required some explanation, and this is given in the reason assigned in vers. 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 אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׂדֵה, after whom they go a whoring" (ver. 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 chap. iii. 2-5). "The face of the field" (ver. 5, as in chap. xiv. 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 ver. 6 instead of "the altar" only (chap. i. 5, xi. 15, etc.), on account of the contrast drawn between it and the altars upon which they offered sacrifice to *Seirim*. אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׂדֵה, literally goats, is here used to signify *dæmones* (*Vulg.*), "field-devils" (*Luther*), demons, like the אֱלֹהֵי הַשָּׂדֵה in Deut. xxxii. 17, who were supposed to inhabit the desert (Isa. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 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 (Josh. xxiv. 14; Ezek. xx. 7, xxiii. 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 (Deut. xii. 15).

Vers. 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.—Vers. 8, 9 contain the command, that whoever offered a burnt-offering or 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 Deut. xii. clearly proves, for the purpose of suppressing the disposition to offer sacrifice to other gods, as well as in other places. In vers. 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 ver. 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. קָ with כִּפָּר has only a local or instrumental signification (chap. vi. 23, xvi. 17, 27; also vii. 7; Ex. xxix. 33; Num. v. 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.—Ver. 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 Deut. xii. 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. i. 24). Hence pouring it out upon the earth like water was substantially the same as pouring it out and covering it with earth (cf. Ezek. xxiv. 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.—Ver. 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." נַפְשָׁא is to be taken as a predicate in its meaning, introduced with *beth essentialis*. 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 was, 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.¹—Lastly (vers. 15, 16), the prohibition against eating “that which died” (xi. 39, 40), or “that which was torn” (Ex. xxii. 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. chap. v. 2), and neglected the legal purification afterwards, was to bear his iniquity (chap. v. 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 Ex. xxii. 30, the נִבְלָה (that which had fallen) was to be thrown to the dogs; but in Deut. xiv. 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.

Chap. xviii. 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

¹ 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. 242 sqq. “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).

judgments and ordinances of Jehovah (vers. 2-5), and is brought to a close with a threatening allusion to the consequences of all such defilements (vers. 24-30).—Vers. 1-5. By the words, "I am Jehovah your God," which are placed at the head and repeated at the close (ver. 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 (ver. 5).—Ver. 5. "*The man who does them (the ordinances of Jehovah) shall live (gain true life) through them*" (see at Ex. i. 16 and Gen. iii. 22).

Vers. 6-18. The *laws against incest* are introduced in ver. 6 with the general prohibition, descriptive of the nature of this sin, "None of you shall approach **אֶל־כָּל־בְּשָׂר׃ בְּשָׂר׃** to any flesh of his flesh, to uncover nakedness." The difference between **בְּשָׂר׃** flesh, and **בָּשָׂר׃** 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. ii. 24), and is applied to a blood-relation, blood-relationship being called **שָׂרְיָהוּ** (or flesh-kindred) in Hebrew (ver. 17). Sexual intercourse is called uncovering the nakedness of another (Ezek. xvi. 36, xxiii. 18). The prohibition relates to both married and unmarried intercourse, though the reference is chiefly to the former (see ver. 18, chap. xx. 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 Deut. xxvii. 23 as an accursed crime, is included here in No. 10, and the second in No. 3, whilst the first, like parricide in Ex. xxi. 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 (chap.

xx. 11, 12, 14, 17), on account of their being accursed crimes (Deut. xxiii. 1, xxvii. 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 (chap. xx. 19-21). The cases noticed under Nos. 4 and 5 are passed over in chap. xx., 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 ver. 18.¹

The enumeration of the different cases commences in ver. 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. ii. 24), the nakedness of the husband is uncovered in that of his wife, or, as it is described in Deut. xxii. 30, xxvii. 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 (Ruth iii. 9). For, strictly speaking, *גלה ערוה* is only used with reference to the wife; but in the dishonouring of his wife the honour of the husband is violated

¹ 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. xxxix. 6 sqq.). With the Persians marriage was allowed with mother, daughter, and sister (*Clem. Al. Strom.* iii. p. 431; *Eusebii præp.* 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. 619 sqq.). 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. 20 sqq.).

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

also, and his bed defiled, Gen. xlix. 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 ver. 8, where the nakedness of the father's wife is distinctly called the father's shame.—Ver. 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 (chap. xx. 11; Deut. xxvii. 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. xlix. 4), and an accursed crime was committed, the punishment of which was death. At all events, it cannot be inferred from chap. xix. 20–22 and Ex. xxi. 9, as *Knobel* supposes, that a milder punishment was inflicted in this case.—Ver. 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 הִקְדָּשׁ in chap. xx. 17, and threatened with extermination. This word generally signifies sparing love, favour, grace; but here, as in Prov. xiv. 34, it means dishonour, shame, from the *Piel* הִקְדָּשׁ , to dishonour.—Ver. 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.—Ver. 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 ver. 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."—Vers. 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. שְׂאֵר בְּשֵׁר = שְׂאֵר (ver. 6, as in chap. xx. 19, xxi. 2, Num. xxvii. 11), hence שְׂאֵרָה, blood-relationship (ver. 17).—Ver. 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 chap. xx. 19 and 20 against the alliances prohibited in vers. 12-14, is that the persons concerned should bear their iniquity or sin, *i.e.* should suffer punishment in consequence (see at chap. v. 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.—Ver. 15. Sexual connection with a daughter-in-law, a son's wife, is called תְּבִילָה in chap. xx. 12, and threatened with death to both the parties concerned. תְּבִילָה, from לָלַךְ 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 (ver. 23).—Ver. 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 (Deut. xxv. 5).—Ver. 17. Marriage with a woman and her daughter, whether both together or in succession, is described in Deut. xxvii. 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 (chap. xx. 14), because they were “wickedness,” *מִצְחָה*, *lit.* invention, design, here applied to the crime of licentiousness and whoredom (chap. xix. 29; Judg. xx. 6; Job xxxi. 11.)—Ver. 18. Lastly, it was forbidden to take a wife to her sister (*עַל־הָאָחֻזָּה* upon her, as in Gen. xxviii. 9, xxxi. 50) in her life-time, that is to say, to marry two sisters at the same time, *לְצַרְרָהּ* “to pack together, to uncover their 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.

Vers. 19–23. *Prohibition of other kinds of unchastity and of unnatural crimes.*—Ver. 19 prohibits intercourse with a woman during her uncleanness. *נִדַּחַת טְמֵאָה* signifies the uncleanness of a woman’s hemorrhage, whether menstruation or after childbirth, which is called in chap. xii. 7, xx. 18, the fountain of bleeding. The guilty persons were both of them to be cut off from their nation according to chap. xx. 18, *i.e.* to be punished with death.—Ver. 20. “To a neighbour’s wife thou shalt not give *שָׁבַבְתָּ* thy pouring as seed” (*i.e.* make her pregnant), “to defile thyself with her,” viz. by the *emissio seminis* (chap. xv. 16, 17), a defilement which was to be punished as adultery by the stoning to death of both parties (chap. xx. 10; Deut. xxii. 22, cf. John ix. 5).—Ver. 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; Deut. xviii. 10) for Moloch.*” *הַפִּלֶטֶה* is constantly written with the article: it is rendered by the LXX. *ἄρχων* both here and in chap. xx. 2 sqq., but *ὁ Μολόχ βασιλεύς* in other places (2 Kings xxiii. 10; Jer. xxxii. 35). *Moloch* was an old Canaanitish idol, called by the Phœnicians 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 (Ezek. xvi. 20, 21, xx. 31; Jer. xxxii. 35; 2 Kings xxiii. 10, xvi. 3, xvii. 17, xxi. 6, cf. Ps. cvi. 37, 38). Now although this offering of children in the valley of Ben-Hinnom is called a "slaughtering" by Ezekiel (chap. xvi. 21), and a "burning through (in the) fire" by Jeremiah (chap. vii. 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" (2 Kings xxiii. 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 (1 Kings xi. 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 (chap. xx. 3), *i.e.* as a practical contempt of the manifestations of the grace of the living God (chap. xx. 2, 3).—Vers. 22, 23. Lastly, it was forbidden to "lie with mankind as with womankind," *i.e.* to commit the crime of *pæderastia*, that sin of Sodom (Gen. xix. 5), to which the whole of the heathen were more or less addicted (Rom. i. 27), and from which even the Israelites did not keep themselves free (Judg. xix. 22 sqq.); 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.” רָבַע = רָבַעַ “to lie,” is the term used particularly to denote a crime of this description (chap. xx. 13 and 15, 16, cf. Ex. xxii. 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.

Vers. 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 מְשַׁלַּח 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. אֲרִיקָא (ver. 25) and אֲרִיקָא (ver. 28) are prophetic (cf. chap. xx. 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 ipsæ creaturæ irrationales suo creatori semper obedientes et pro illo pugnantes detestentur peccatores tales eosque terra quasi evomat, cum illi expelluntur ab ea”* (*C. a Lap.*).

Chap. xix. 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 ver. 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.—Vers. 2–8. The commandment in ver. 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.—Ver. 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.—Ver. 4 embraces the first two commandments of the decalogue: viz. not to turn to idols to worship them (Deut. xxxi. 18, 20), nor to make molten gods (see at Ex. xxxiv. 17). The gods beside Jehovah are called *elilim*, i.e. nothings, from their true nature.—Vers. 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 chap. vii. 15-18 is emphatically repeated, and transgressors are threatened with extermination. On the singular *כֶּבֶד* in ver. 8, see at Gen. xxvii. 29, and for the expression "shall be cut off," Gen. xvii. 14.

Vers. 9-18. Laws concerning the conduct towards one's neighbour, which should flow from unselfish love, especially with regard to the poor and distressed.—Vers. 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. *כֶּרֶם*, lit. a noble plantation, generally signifies a vineyard; but it is also applied to an olive-plantation (Judg. xv. 5), and here it is to be understood of both. For when this command is repeated in Deut. xxiv. 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 (*נֶחֱט*) 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 glean-
ing 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 (chap. xxiii. 20); and in Deut. xxiv. 19 it is ex-
tended, 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 Deut. xxiii. 25, 26.)
—Vers. 11 sqq. The Israelites were not to steal (Ex. xx. 15);
nor to deny, viz. anything entrusted to them or found (chap. v.
21 sqq.); 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 Ex. xx. 7, 16); nor to oppress
and rob a neighbour (cf. chap. v. 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 (Deut. xxiv.
14, 15).—Ver. 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 him-
self (Ps. xxxviii. 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 Deut. xxvii. 18, where a curse is pro-
nounced 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. ver. 32, xxv. 17, 36, 43).—
Ver. 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. xix. 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 Ex. xxiii. 3).—
Ver. 16. They were not to go about as calumniators among their
countrymen, to bring their neighbour to destruction (Ezek. xxii.
9); nor to set themselves against the blood of a neighbour, *i.e.* to
seek his life. רַבִּי does not mean calumny, but, according to its
formation, a calumniator (*Ewald*, § 149e).—Ver. 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 Matt. xviii. 15-17, and "not to load a sin upon themselves." נָשָׂא עָלָיו חַטָּאת does not mean to have to bear, or atone for a sin on his account (*Onkelos, Knobel, etc.*), but, as in chap. xxii. 9, Num. xviii. 32, to bring sin upon one's self, which one then has to bear, or atone for; so also in Num. xviii. 22, שָׂאת חַטָּאת, from which the meaning "to bear," *i.e.* atone for sin, or suffer its consequences, was first derived.—Ver. 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. נָצַר to watch for (*Song of Sol. i. 6, viii. 11, 12*), hence (= *τηρεῖν*) to cherish a design upon a person, or bear him malice (*Ps. ciii. 9; Jer. iii. 5, 12; Nahum i. 2*).

Vers. 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 ver. 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." מִלְּמַדָּי, from מִלְּמַדָּי separation, signifies *duæ res diversi generis, heterogeneæ*, and is a substantive in the accusative, giving a more precise definition. שְׂעִטָּנוּ is in apposition to מִלְּמַדָּי, and according to Deut. xxii. 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 Deut. xxii. 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, Ex. xxii. 28), the seed, and the produce of the vineyard (*i.e.* the corn and wine grown upon the vineyard) may not become holy" (*cf.* chap. xxvii. 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. i. 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 2 Sam. xiii. 29, xviii. 9, 1 Kings i. 33, may have been imported from abroad, as we may conclude from 1 Kings x. 25.—Vers. 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 (chap. xx. 10), or the seduction of a free virgin who was betrothed (Deut. xxii. 23 sqq.), 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 chap. v. 15 sqq.). *נִחַרְפָּת*, from *חָרַף* *carpere*, *lit.* plucked, *i.e.* set apart, betrothed to a man, not abandoned or despised. *קָפְדָהּ* redeemed, *חֲפִשָּׁהּ* emancipation without purchase,—the two ways in which a slave could obtain her freedom. *בִּקְרָת*, *ἀπ. λεγ.*, from *בָּקַר* to examine (chap. xiii. 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.—Vers. 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 *עֲרַלְתָּהּ* refers to *כֵּל*, and the verb *עָל* is a *denom.* from *עָרַלָהּ*, to make into a foreskin, to treat as uncircumcised, *i.e.* to throw away as unclean or un-

eatable. 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 הַלֵּלִים (*Judg. ix. 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 (ver. 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.

Vers. 26-32. The Israelites were to abstain from all unnatural, idolatrous, and heathenish conduct.—Ver. 26. "Ye shall not eat upon blood" (לֹא as in *Ex. xii. 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. *1 Sam. xiv. 32*). These words were not a mere repetition of the law against eating blood (*chap. xvii. 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." שִׁשִּׁי: from שָׁשַׁר to whisper (see *Gen. xlv. 5*), or, according to some, a *denom.* verb from שָׁרָר a serpent; literally, to prophesy from observing snakes, then to prophesy from auguries generally, *augurari*. עָנָן a *denom.* verb, not from עָנָן 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 עָיַן an eye, literally, to ogle, then to bewitch with an evil eye.—Ver. 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 'Oporál, whom he identifies with the *Dionysos* of the Greeks. In Jer. ix. 25, xxv. 23, xlix. 32, the persons who did this are called פִּנְיָאֵי מִצָּדָה, round-cropped, from their peculiar tonsure. "Neither shalt thou mar the corners of thy beard," sc. by cutting it off (cf. chap. xxi. 5), which *Pliny* reports some of the Arabs to have done, *barba abraditur, præterquam in superiore labro, aliis et hæc intonsa*, whereas the modern Arabs either wear a short moustache, or shave off the beard altogether (*Niebuhr*, Arab. p. 68).—Ver. 28. "Ye shall not make cuttings on your flesh (body) on account of a soul, i.e. a dead person (שְׂמֵן = מֵן שְׂמֵן, chap. xxi. 11, Num. vi. 6, or מֵן, Deut. xiv. 1; so again in chap. xxii. 4, Num. v. 2, ix. 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 (Deut. xiv. 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 Ebræor. luctu*, c. 10), and to be still practised by the Arabs (*Arvioux 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. xvi. 6, xli. 5, xlvii. 5),—as well as to the custom, which is also forbidden in chap. xxi. 5 and Deut. xiv. 1, of cutting off the hair of the head and beard (cf. Isa. iii. 24, xxii. 12; Micah i. 16; Amos viii. 10; Ezek. vii. 18). It cannot be inferred from the words of *Plutarch*, quoted by *Spencer*, δοκούντες χαρίζεσθαι τοῖς τετελευτηκόσω, that the heathen associated with this custom the idea of making an expiation to the dead. The prohibition of שְׂמֵן מִצָּדָה, *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 (*Arvioux 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 Israel-

ites a proper reverence for God's creation.—Ver. 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 chap. xviii. 17). The reference is not to spiritual whoredom or idolatry (Ex. xxxiv. 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.—Ver. 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.—Ver. 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. זַיִם 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 prædicarent quæ ab eis petebantur* (Cler.). This is the meaning in Isa. xxix. 4, as well as here and in chap. xx. 6, as is evident from chap. xx. 27, “a man or woman in whom is an *ob*,” and from 1 Sam. xxviii. 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 (1 Sam. xxviii. 3; 2 Kings xxiii. 24). The word is connected with *ob*, a skin. יָבוֹן , 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 at 1 Sam. xxviii. 7 sqq.)—Ver. 32. This series concludes with the moral precept, “Before a hoary head thou shalt rise up (*sc.* with reverence, Job xxix. 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).

Vers. 33–37. A few commandments are added of a judicial character.—Vers. 33, 34. The Israelite was not only not to oppress the foreigner in his land (as had already been commanded in Ex. xxii. 20 and xxiii. 9), but to treat him as a native, and love him as himself.—Vers. 35, 36. As a universal rule, they were to do no wrong in judgment (the administration of justice, ver. 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 Ex. xvi. 36 and xxix. 40. In the renewal of this command in Deut. xxv. 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 (Prov. xvi. 11, xx. 10, 23; Amos viii. 5; Micah vi. 10, cf. Ezek. xlv. 10).—Ver. 37. Concluding exhortation, summing up all the rest.

Chap. xx. PUNISHMENTS FOR THE VICES AND CRIMES PROHIBITED IN CHAP. XVIII. AND XIX.—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.—Ver. 2. Whoever, whether an Israelite or a foreigner in Israel, dedicated of his seed (children) to Moloch (see chap. xviii. 21), was to be put to death. The people of the land were to stone him. לִבְנֵי אֱלֹהִים, *lapide obruere*, is synonymous with לִבְנֵי אֱלֹהִים, *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.—Ver. 3. By this punishment the nation only carried out the will of Jehovah; for He would cut off such a man (see at chap. xvii. 10 and xviii. 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 (chap. xv. 31, xvi. 16).—Vers. 4, 5. If the people, however (the people of the land), should hide their eyes from him (on the *dagesh* in עַלְמַי and עַלְמַי see the note on p. 307), 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.—Ver. 6. He would also do the same to every soul that turned to familiar spirits and necromantists (chap. xix. 31, cf. Ex. xxii. 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.—Vers. 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 (chap. xi. 44, xix. 2), and to keep the statutes of their God who sanctified them (Ex. xxxi. 13).

Vers. 9-18. Whoever cursed father or mother was to be punished with death (chap. xix. 3); “*his blood would be upon him.*” The cursing of parents was a capital crime (see at chap. xvii. 4, and for the plural אָבֹתָי Ex. xxii. 1 and Gen. iv. 10), which was to return upon the doer of it, according to Gen. ix. 6. The same punishment was to be inflicted upon adultery (ver. 10, cf. chap. xviii. 20), carnal intercourse with a father’s wife (ver. 11, cf. chap. xviii. 7, 8) or with a daughter-in-law (ver. 12, cf. chap. xviii. 17), sodomy (ver. 13, cf. chap. xviii. 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 (ver. 14, cf. chap. xviii. 17), lying with a beast (vers. 15, 16, cf. chap. xviii. 23), sexual intercourse with a half-sister (ver. 17, cf. chap. xviii. 9 and 11), and lying with a menstruous woman (ver. 18, cf. chap. xviii. 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 (vers. 15, 16), was to be by stoning, according to vers. 2, 27, and Deut. xxii. 21 sqq.; and by the burning (ver. 14) we are not to understand death by fire, or burning alive, but, as we may clearly see from Josh. vii. 15 and 25, burning the corpse after death. This was also the case in chap. xxi. 9 and Gen. xxxviii. 24.

Vers. 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 (ver. 19, cf. chap. xviii. 12, 13), with an uncle's wife (ver. 20, cf. chap. xviii. 4), or with a sister-in-law, a brother's wife (ver. 21, cf. chap. xviii. 16). In all these cases the threat is simply held out, "they shall bear their iniquity," and (according to vers. 20, 21) "die childless;" that is to say, God would reserve the punishment to Himself (see at chap. xviii. 14). In the list of punishments no reference is made to intercourse with a mother (chap. xviii. 7) or a granddaughter (chap. xviii. 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 chap. xviii.

Vers. 22-27. The list of punishments concludes, like the prohibitions in chap. xviii. 24 sqq., with exhortations to observe the commandments and judgments of the Lord, and to avoid such abominations (on ver. 22 cf. chap. xviii. 3-5, 26, 28, 30; and on ver. 23 cf. chap. xviii. 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 (ver. 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 chap. xi.). For (ver. 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 Ex. xix. 4-6).—Ver. 27. But because Israel was called to be the holy nation of Jehovah, every one, either man or woman, in whom there was a heathenish spirit of soothsaying, was to be put to death, viz. stoned (cf. chap. xix. 31), to prevent defilement by idolatrous abominations.

HOLINESS OF THE PRIESTS, OF THE HOLY GIFTS, AND
OF SACRIFICES.—CHAP. XXI. AND XXII.

Chap. xxi. 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 (vers. 1-6 and 10-12); (2) they were to contract and maintain a spotless marriage (vers. 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 (vers. 16-24).

Vers. 1-6. The priest was not to defile himself on account of a soul, *i.e.* a dead person (*nephesh*, as in chap. xix. 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. ver. 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. Ezek. xlv. 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. xix. 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 ver. 4 are obscure: "*He shall not defile himself* לַעֲבֹדָה לְעַבְדָּהּ, *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 לַעֲבֹדָה 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 ver. 2, though not in the way that many Rabbins suppose, who maintain that אִשָּׁה signifies wife, but *implicite*, the wife not being expressly mentioned, because man and wife form one flesh (Gen.

ii. 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 vers. 1b-3 stand in a very close relation to vers. 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 ver. 4 as standing in a similar relation to ver. 7, and to understand it as a general prohibition, which is still more clearly expounded in vers. 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. vers. 9 and 15).—In ver. 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* יִקְרַח is to be pointed with הָ attached, and the *Keri* יִקְרַחִי is a grammatical alteration to suit the plural suffix in בְּרֵאשִׁים, which is obviously to be rejected on account of the parallel וְפִתַּח זְקָנְכֶם לֹא יִגְדְּלוּ. 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” (Deut. xiv. 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 Deut. xiv. 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 chap. xix. 27, 28, and the latter is repeated in Deut. xiv. 1. The reason for the prohibition is given in ver. 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 chap. iii. 11 and 16.

Vers. 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 ver. 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 (Ex. xxxiv. 16; Deut. vii. 3).—Ver. 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 ver. 6; and that for the second, the same as in chap. xx. 8, 26, Ex. xxxi. 13, etc.—Ver. 9. The priest’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 chap. xx. 14). כֹּהֵן אִישׁ, a man who is a priest, a priest-man.

Vers. 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 chap. viii. 7-12 and vii. 37), was not to go with his hair flying loose when a death had taken place, nor to

rend his clothes (see chap. x. 6), nor to go in to any dead body (נִשְׂתַּחֲוֶה נַפְשׁוֹ souls of a departed one, *i.e.* dead persons); he was not to defile himself (cf. ver. 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. chap. x. 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. chap. x. 7), and defilement was incompatible with this. כִּי־נִשְׂתַּחֲוֶה does not mean the diadem of the high priest here, as in Ex. xxix. 6, xxxix. 30, but consecration (see at Num. vi. 7).—Vers. 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 (זֵנוּת without a copulative is in apposition to הִלָּלָה 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.—Ver. 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.

Vers. 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 *ὁλόκληροι*, *integri corporis* (*Plato de legg.* 6, 759; *Seneca excerpt. controuv.* 4, 2; *Plutarch quest. rom.* 73). Consequently none of the descendants of Aaron, “according to their generations,” *i.e.* in all future generations (see Ex. xii. 14), who had any blemish (*num*, *μῶμος*, 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 *עָרָץ*, *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 (2 Sam. xxi. 20).—Ver. 19. Whoever had a fracture in his foot or hand.—Ver. 20. **נִנְיָ** a hump-backed man. **פָּרָה**, *lit.* crushed to powder, fine: as distinguished from the former, it signified one who had an unnaturally thin or withered body or member, not merely consumptive or wasted away. **תִּבְלַל בְּעֵינָיו** mixed, *i.e.* spotted in his eye, one who had a white speck in his eye (*Onk., Vulg., Saad.*), not blear-eyed (LXX.). **נִרְבָּ**, which occurs nowhere else except in chap. xxii. 22 and Deut. xxviii. 27, signifies, according to the ancient versions, the itch; and **יִפְפֹּת**, which only occurs here and in chap. xxii. 22, the ring-worm (LXX., *Targ.*, etc.). **טָרוּחַ אֲבָנִים**, crushed in the stones, one who had crushed or softened stones; for in Isa. xxxviii. 21, the only other place where **טָרוּחַ** 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 *μόνονοργος*, 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. Deut. xxiii. 2), and that there is not sufficient ground for altering the text into **פְּרוּחַ** extension.—Ver. 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. xviii. 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 (ver. 23, cf. ver. 12).—Ver. 24. Moses communicated these instructions to Aaron and his sons.

Chap. xxii. Vers. 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 (vers. 2-9), and (2) that no one was to eat them who was not a member of a priestly family (vers. 10-16).—Ver. 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. **יָנַח** with **מִן** 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. xviii. 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.—Vers. 4, 5. No leper was to touch them (see chap. xiii. 2), or person with gonorrhœa (chap. xv. 2), until he was clean; no one who had touched a person defiled by a corpse (chap. xix. 28; Num. xix. 22), or whose seed had gone from him (chap. xv. 16, 18); and no one who had touched an unclean creeping animal, or an unclean man. לְכֹל טְמֵאָתוֹ, as in chap. v. 3, a closer definition of אִשֶּׁר יִטְמָא לֵי, "who is unclean to him with regard to (on account of) any uncleanness which he may have."—Vers. 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.—Ver. 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 (chap. xvii. 15, 16), is repeated with special reference to the priests. (On ver. 9, see chap. viii. 35, xviii. 30, and xix. 17.) וְהִלָּלְהוּ, "because they have defiled it (the sanctified thing)."—Vers. 10-16. No stranger was to eat a sanctified thing. זָר 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. Ex. xii. 49), who were neither of them members of his family.—Ver. 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. xvii. 12, 13).—Vers. 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.—Ver. 14. But if any one (*i.e.* any 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 (chap. v. 16).—In the concluding exhortation in vers. 15 and 16, the subject to ^{וְיִחַלְלֵי} (profane) and ^{וְיִשְׂאוּ} (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 ver. 14), if they eat their (the priests’) sanctified gifts.*” Understood in this way, both verses furnish a fitting conclusion to the section vers. 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 vers. 10-14 do not refer to the priests but to laymen, and in the latter case we should expect ^{וְלֹא יִשְׂאוּ אֲלֵיהֶם} (cf. ver. 9) instead of the unusual ^{וְיִשְׂאוּ אֹתָם}.

Vers. 17-33. ACCEPTABLE SACRIFICES. — Vers. 18-20. Every sacrifice offered to the Lord by an Israelite or foreigner, in consequence of a vow or as a freewill-offering (cf. chap. vii. 16), was to be faultless and a male, “for good pleasure to the offerer” (cf. i. 3), *i.e.* to secure for him the good pleasure of God. An animal with a fault would not be acceptable.—Vers. 21, 22. Every peace-offering was also to be faultless, whether brought “to fulfil a special (important) vow” (cf. Num. xv. 3, 8: ^{וְהָיָה}, from ^{וְהָיָה} 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: Deut. xv. 21), or cutting (*i.e.* mutilation, answering to ^{וְהָיָה} chap. xxi.

18), or an abscess (יִבְלֶתָ, from יָבַל to flow, probably a flowing suppurating abscess).—Ver. 23. As a voluntary peace-offering they might indeed offer an ox or sheep that was שָׂרָץ וְקָלָטָה, “stretched out and drawn together,” i.e. with the whole body or certain limbs either too large or too small;¹ but such an animal could not be acceptable as a votive offering.—Ver. 24. Castrated animals were not to be sacrificed, nor in fact to be kept in the land at all. קָמַץ compressus, θλιβίλας, an animal with the stones crushed; כָּרַח contusus, θλασίλας, with them beaten to pieces; נָרַח avulsus, σπάδων, with them twisted off; כָּרַח excisus, τομίλας or ἐκτομίλας, 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. קָמַץ וְנָרַח, 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 קָמַץ 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 chap. xix. 19.—Ver. 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 vers. 26–30 three laws are given of a similar character.—Ver. 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 Ex. xxii. 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.²

¹ 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 δύν τι τοῦ σώματος.

² For this reason the following rule was also laid down by the Romans: *Suis fœtus sacrificio die quinto purus est, pecoris die octavo, bovis tricesimo* (*Plin.* h. n. 8, 51).

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 בָּקָר; chap. ix. 3), viz. as *burnt-offerings* in chap. xxiii. 18, Num. vii. 15, 21, 27, 33, 39 sqq., viii. 8, xv. 24, xxviii. 11, 19, 27, xxix. 2, 8, and as *sin-offerings* in chap. iv. 3, 14, xvi. 3;—*sheep* (lambs) of one year old are also prescribed as *burnt-offerings* in chap. ix. 3, xii. 6, xxiii. 12, Ex. xxix. 38, Num. vi. 14, vii. 17, 21, 27, 33, 39 sqq., xxviii. 3, 9, 19, 27, xxix. 2, 8, 13, 17 sqq., as *peace-offerings* in Num. vii. 17, 23, xxix. 35 sqq., and as *trespass-offerings* in Num. vi. 12; also a yearling *eve* as a sin-offering in chap. xiv. 10 and Num. vi. 14, and a yearling *goat* in Num. xv. 27. They generally brought older oxen or bullocks for peace-offerings (Num. vii. 17, xxiii. 29 sqq.), and sometimes as burnt-offerings. In Judg. vi. 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.—Ver. 28. The command not to kill an ox or sheep at the same time as its young is related to the law in Ex. xxiii. 19 and Deut. xxii. 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 vers. 29, 30, the command to eat the flesh of the animal on the day on which it was offered (chap. vii. 15, xix. 5, 6) is repeated with special reference to the praise-offering.—Vers. 31–33. Concluding exhortation, as in chap. xviii. 29, xix. 37. (On ver. 32, cf. chap. xviii. 21 and xi. 44, 45.)

SANCTIFICATION OF THE SABBATH AND THE FEASTS OF
JEHOVAH.—CHAP. XXIII.

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 (ver. 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. i. 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. xxviii. 2 and xxix. 39 it is extended so as to include the times of the daily morning and evening sacrifice. (On the "holy convocation" see Ex. xii. 16.)

Ver. 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. ii. 3, cf. Ex. xx. 8-11). On שַׁבַּת שְׁבִיטוֹן, see at Ex. xxxi. 15 and xvi. 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 (vers. 37, 38; Isa. i. 13, 14; 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. xxxi. 3; Neh. x. 34). This distinction is pointed out in the heading, "these are the feasts of Jehovah" (ver. 4).¹ In Num. xxviii. 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.

Vers. 4-14. Ver. 4 contains the special heading for the yearly feasts. בְּמִזְמָנָם at their appointed time.—Vers. 5-8. The leading directions for the *Passover* and *feast of Mazzoth* are

¹ Partly on account of this 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. xxviii. and xxix., *Hupfeld* and *Knobel* maintain that the words of vers. 2 and 3, from יְהוָה to מוֹעֲדֵיכֶם, notwithstanding their Elohistic 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 Elohistic 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.

repeated from Ex. xii. 6, 11, 15-20. מְלֶאכֶת עֲבֹדָה, occupation of a work, signifies labour at some definite occupation, *e.g.* the building of the tabernacle, Ex. xxxv. 24, xxxvi. i. 3; hence occupation in connection with trade or one's social calling, such as agriculture, handicraft, and so forth; whilst מְלֶאכֶת is the performance of any kind of work, *e.g.* kindling fire for cooking food (Ex. xxxv. 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 (vers. 3, 30, 31, cf. Ex. xx. 10, xxxi. 14, xxxv. 2, 3; Deut. v. 14 and Lev. xvi. 29; Num. xxix. 7); on the other feast-days with a holy convocation, only servile work (vers. 7, 8, 21, 25, 35, 36, cf. Ex. xii. 16, and the explanation in vol. i., and Num. xxviii. 18, 25, 26, xxix. 1, 12, 35). To this there is appended a fresh regulation in vers. 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,

xxviii. and xxix. 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.

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 chap. ii. 14. For the law in chap. ii. 14 refers to the offerings of first-fruits made by private persons, which are treated of in Num. xviii. 12, 13, and Deut. xxvi. 2 sqq. 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 (ver. 17). As no portion of these wave-loaves was burned upon the altar, because nothing leavened was to be placed upon it (chap. ii. 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. מִחֹרֶת 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 Bæthoseans supposed, still less the 22d of *Nisan*, or the day after the conclusion of the seven days' feast, which always closed with a Sabbath, as *Hitzig* imagines.¹ The

¹ The view advocated by the Bæthoseans, which has been lately supported by *W. Schultz*, is refuted not only by Josh. v. 11, but by the definite article used, הַשַּׁבָּת, which points back to one of the feast-days already mentioned, and still more decisively by the circumstance, that according to ver. 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 five 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 22d 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,

“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 (Ex. xxxi. 15, etc.), but the day of atonement (the tenth of the seventh month), is called “Sabbath,” and “*Shabbath shabbathon*” (ver. 32, chap. xvi. 31). As a day of rest, on which no laborious work was to be performed (ver. 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 Josh. v. 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 (ver. 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 Ex. xii. 15 sqq.). But

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 Josh. v. 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.

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. xxviii. 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 (Ex. xxix. 40; Num. xxviii. 9, 13, etc.), but of two-tenths, that the offering of corn at the harvest-feast might be a more plentiful one than usual.

Vers. 15–22. The law for the special observance of the *feast of Harvest* (Ex. xxiii. 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. xxviii. 26) or *feast of Weeks* (Ex. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10) was to be celebrated. From this reckoning the feast received the name of Pentecost (*ἡ πεντηκοστή*, Acts ii. 1). That *תּוֹרַת שָׁבֻעַ* (ver. 15) signifies weeks, like *תּוֹרַת שָׁבֻעַ* in Deut. xvi. 9, and *τὰ σάββατα* in the Gospels (*e.g.* Matt. xxviii. 1), is evident from the predicate *תּוֹמַת*, “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” (ver. 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 (chap. xxvi. 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 (Ex. xxxiv. 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 (ver. 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.—Vers. 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.—Ver. 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 (ver. 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 *Azereth* (Greek, Ἄσραθά), because it was the close of the seven weeks (see at ver. 36: *Josephus*, Ant. iii. 10).¹—Ver. 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 ver. 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 chap. xix. 9, 10 is repeated in ver. 22.

Vers. 23–25. On the first day of the seventh month there was to be *shabbathon*, rest, i.e. a day of rest (see Ex. xvi. 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. xxix. 2–6. תְּרוּעָה, a joyful noise, from רָעַע to make a noise, is used in ver. 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. x. 10), i.e. to call the congregation into remembrance before Jehovah, that He might turn towards it His favour and grace (see at Ex. xxviii. 12, 29, xxx. 16); and from this the feast-day is called the day of the trumpet-blast (Num. xxix. 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, græce κερὰτλην appellatur (Jerome on*

¹ 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.

Hos. v. 8).¹ 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 (chap. xxv. 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.

Vers. 26-32. On the tenth day of the seventh month the *day of atonement* was to be observed by a holy meeting, by fast-

¹ The word *תְּרִיעָה* is also used in Num. x. 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 (chap. xxv. 9, 10), but also because the silver trumpets are assigned to a different purpose in Num. x. 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).

ing 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 chap. xvi., and the general festal sacrifices are described in Num. xxix. 8–11. (For fuller particulars, see at chap. xvi.) By the restrictive אָס , the observance of the day of atonement is represented *a priori* as a peculiar one. The אָס 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.—Ver. 32. “Ye shall rest your rest,” *i.e.* observe the rest that is binding upon you from all laborious work.

Vers. 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. xxix. 13–33. Moreover, on the eighth day, *i.e.* the 22d of the month, the closing feast was to be observed in the same manner as on the first day (vers. 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 (ver. 42). עֲצוּת , which is used in ver. 36 and Num. xxix. 35 for the eighth day, which terminated the feast of Tabernacles, and in Deut. xvi. 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. xvi. 2; Deut. xi. 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 (Joel i. 14; Isa. i. 13; 2 Kings x. 20). The *azereth*, 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 offer-

ings (Num. xxix. 35 sqq.). 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. xxviii. seq.).—With ver. 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 (vers. 37, 38), which answers to the heading in ver. 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 vers. 2 and 3 and vers. 39-43 are later additions to the original list of feasts which were to be kept with a meeting for worship. לְהַקְרִיב וְנִי (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. דְּבַר יוֹם בֹּ: “every day those appointed for it,” as in Ex. v. 13.—Ver. 38. “Beside the Sabbaths:” *i.e.* the Sabbath sacrifices (see Num. xxviii. 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. כְּתִיבֹת, 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. vii.), the firstlings and tithes, and other so-called heave-offerings (Num. xviii. 11, 29). By the “vows” and נִדְבֹת, “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 Judg. xi. 31, where *Jephthah* vows a burnt-offering).—In vers. 39 sqq. there follows a fuller description of the observance of the last feast of the year, for which the title, “feast of Tabernacles” (ver. 34), had prepared the way, as the feast had already been mentioned briefly in Ex. xxiii. 16 and xxxiv. 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 ver. 39, as in vers. 35, 36, as a seven days' feast, with sabbatical rest on the first and eighth day; and in vers. 40 sqq. 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 ver. 40, and that it is wanting before *בַּפֶּתַח הַמִּשְׁכָּן*, there can hardly be any doubt that *פְּרֵי עֵץ הָהָר* is the generic term, and that the three names which follow specify the particular kinds of boughs. By "the fruit," therefore, we understand the shoots and branches of the trees, as well as the blossom and fruit that grew out of them. *עֵץ הָהָר*, "*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.* viii. 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 ye dwell.*" *בַּפֶּתַח* 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.* viii. 15 sqq.).¹

¹ Even in the time of the Maccabees, on the other hand (cf. 2 Macc. x. 6, 7), the feast of the Purification of the Temple was celebrated by the Jews after the manner of the Tabernacles (*κατὰ σκηνομαμάτων 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; and 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 κισσίων*: *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 *πρωσία*

The leading character of the feast of Tabernacles, which is indicated at the outset by the emphatic יָשׁוּעַ (ver. 39; see at ver. 27), was to consist in "joy before the Lord." As a "feast," *i.e.* a feast of joy (אָנָה , from $\text{אָנָה} = \text{אָנָה}$, denoting the circular motion of the dance, 1 Sam. xxx. 16), it was to be kept for seven days; so that Israel "should be only rejoicing," and give itself up entirely to joy (Deut. xvi. 15). Now, although the motive assigned in Deut. 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 43). הֶבְרַת , a booth or hut, is not to be confounded with אֹהֶל a tent, but comes from הֶבְרַת *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 (Ps. xxxi. 21; Isa. iv. 6; Jonah iv. 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

(peach or pomegranate?) upon it (*εἰσεσιώνη μουσαίης καὶ ἰτιάς σὺν κράτῃ φοίνικος πεποιημένην, τοῦ μήλου τοῦ τῆς Περσείας 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 *εἰσεσιώνη* were borrowed by *Josephus*, and had been tacked on by the scribes to the text of the Bible (ver. 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.*

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 (Deut. viii. 15). Whether the Israelites, in their journey through the wilderness, not only used the tents which they had taken with them (cf. chap. xiv. 8; Ex. xvi. 16, xviii. 7, xxxiii. 8 sqq.; Num. xvi. 26 sqq., xxiv. 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. iv. 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 (Deut. viii. 7 sqq.); 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" (Deut. viii. 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 (vers. 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 beau-

tiful 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.—Ver. 44. Communication of these laws to the people.

PREPARATION OF THE HOLY LAMPS AND SHEW-BREAD.

PUNISHMENT OF A BLASPHEMER.—CHAP. XXIV.

Vers. 1-9. The directions concerning the *oil for the holy candlestick* (vers. 1-4) and the preparation of the *shew-bread* (vers. 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 ver. 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 chap. xxiii. The first instructions in vers. 2-4 are a verbal repetition of Ex. xxvii. 20, 21, and have been explained already. Their execution by Aaron is recorded at Num. viii. 1-4; and the candlestick itself was set in order by Moses at the consecration of the tabernacle (Ex. xl. 25).—Vers. 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 (Ex. xxxix. 36, xl. 23). Twelve cakes (*challoth*, ii. 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 (Ex. xxv. 23 sqq.). Pure incense was then to be added to each row, which was to be (to serve) as a memorial (*azcarah*, see chap. ii. 2), as a firing for Jehovah. לַעֲרֹךְ 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 (Ex. xxviii. 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 (ver. 9, cf. chap. ii. 3 and vi. 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 (chap. ii. 11, 12, vi. 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 con-

tinually was to be "an everlasting covenant" (ver. 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. xvii. 13).

Vers. 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 (Ex. xii. 38), and who probably had their tents somewhere apart from those of the Israelites, who were encamped according to their tribes (Num. ii. 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. כִּפְּזָה: to bore, hollow out, then to sting, metaphorically to separate, fix (Gen. xxx. 28), hence to designate (Num. i. 17, etc.), and to prick *in malam partem*, to taunt, *i.e.* to *blaspheme, curse*, = כִּפְּזָה Num. xxiii. 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 vers. 15 and 16. The Jews, on the other hand, have taken the word כִּפְּזָה in this passage from time immemorial in the sense of *ερονόμαζειν* (LXX.), and founded upon it the well-known law, against even uttering the name *Jehovah* (see particularly ver. 16). "*The name*" κατ' ἐξ. is the name "*Jehovah*" (cf. ver. 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. 2432 sqq.). The blasphemer was brought before Moses and then put into confinement, "to determine for them (such blasphemers) according to the mouth (command) of Jehovah." וָרָב: to separate, distinguish, then to determine exactly, which is the sense both here and in Num. xv. 34, where it occurs in a similar connection.—Vers. 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. Ex. xxii. 27), and whoever blasphemed the name of Jehovah should be stoned, the native as well as the foreigner. By laying (resting, cf. i. 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 Deut. xxi. 6 is analogous; but the reference made by *Knobel* to Deut. xvii. 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.—Vers. 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 (Ex. xxi. 12 sqq.), and to proclaim their validity in the case of the foreigner also (vers. 17, 21, 22). To these there are appended the kindred commandments concerning the killing of cattle (vers. 18, 21, 22), which had not been given, it is true, *expressis verbis*, but were contained *implicite* in the rights of Israel (Ex. xxi. 33 sqq.), and are also extended to foreigners. הָרַבָּה נַפְשׁ אָדָם, to smite the soul of a man, *i.e.* to put him to death;—the expression "soul of a beast," in ver. 18, is to be understood in the same sense.—Ver. 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 Ex. xxi. 23 sqq.).—Ver. 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.—CHAP. XXV.

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 (ver. 1), which point back to Ex. xxxiv. 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. vii. 38 at the close of the laws of sacrifice, but also at chap. xxvi. 46, at the close of the promises and threats which follow the law for the sabbatical and jubilee years, and lastly, at chap. xxvii. 34, after the supplementary law concerning vows. The institution of the jubilee years corresponds to the institution of the day of atonement (chap. xvi.). Just as all the sins and uncleannesses of the whole congregation, which had remained unatoned for and uncleaned 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 (chap. xxvi.) bears the same relation to the giving of the law upon Sinai as Ex. xxiii. 20-33 to the covenant rights in Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 19.

Vers. 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 tilled was to rest (to keep, שָׁבַת שָׁבַת as in chap. xxiii. 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 (Ex. xxiii. 11: see the remarks on *cerem* at chap. xix. 10), and gather in their produce; but in the seventh

year the land was to keep a Sabbath of rest (*Sabbath sabbathon*, Ex. xxxi. 15), a Sabbath consecrated to the Lord (see Ex. xx. 10); and in this year the land was neither to be tilled nor reaped (cf. Ex. xxiii. 10, 11). זמַר in *Kal* applies only to the cutting of grapes, and so also in *Niphal*, Isa. v. 6; hence *zemorah*, a vine-branch (Num. xiii. 23), and *mazmerah*, a pruning-knife (Isa. ii. 4, etc.).¹ 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 (ver. 9), and the calculation in vers. 21, 22, fully agree.—Ver. 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. vi. 5), is used figuratively, both here and in ver. 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).—Vers. 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. ver. 12). The produce arising without tilling or sowing was to be a common good for man and beast. According to Ex. xxiii. 11, it was to belong to the poor and needy; but the owner was not forbidden to par-

¹ The meaning to sing 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*, Ps. iv. pp. 421-2, note.

take 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 overflowing 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 this 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. iii. 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 (ver. 8).

Vers. 8–55. The law for the YEAR OF JUBILEE refers first of all to its observance (vers. 8–12), and secondly to its effects (a) upon the possession of property (vers. 13–34), and (b) upon the personal freedom of the Israelites (vers. 35–55).—Vers. 8–12. *Keeping the year of jubilee.* Vers. 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 chap. xxiii. 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 (Ex. xix. 13, 16, 19, xx. 18). Just as the people were to come up to the mountain at the sounding of the שֹׁפָר, 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” (ver. 10),—deliverance from bondage (vers. 40 sqq.), return to their property and family (vers. 10, 13), and release from the bitter labour of cultivating the land (vers. 11, 12). This year of grace was 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 ver. 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.—Ver. 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 **יִבֹּל הַיָּמָּה** in vers. 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 vers. 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 Ezek. xlvi. 17. **יִבֹּל**, 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 (*Ex.* xix. 13; *Josh.* vi. 5). This meaning also applies here in vers. 10b, 11 and 12; whilst in vers. 15, 28, 30, 31, 33, xxvii. 18, and *Num.* xxxvi. 4, it is used as an abbreviated expression for **שָׁנַת יִבֹּל**, the year of the trumpet-blast.—Vers. 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 vers. 4, 5). “For it is **יִבֹּל**,” *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 (vers. 23, 24).

Vers. 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.—Vers. 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 (*chap.* xix. 33; *Ex.* xxii. 20), of slaves (*Deut.* xxiii. 17), of the poor, widows, and orphans (*Jer.* xxii. 3; *Ezek.* xviii. 8) in civil matters, by overreaching them or taking their property away. The *inf. abs.* **קָנָה**: as in *Gen.* xli. 43. The singular suffix in **עֲמִיתְךָ** is to be understood distributively of a particular Israelite.—Vers. 15, 16. The pur-

chase 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 make the price higher or lower according to the larger or smaller number of the years.—Vers. 17 sqq. Over-reaching 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 vers. 18–22 fit on exceedingly well to what precedes.¹—Vers. 20 sqq. 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 (שָׁנָה for שְׁנָה as in Gen. xxxiii. 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 vers. 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

¹ 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 vers. 23 and 24, which belong to what follows (vers. 25 sqq.) and lay down the general rule respecting the possession and redemption of land, as belonging to what precedes and connected with vers. 14–17; and (2) to explain vers. 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 (vers. 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 ver. 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.

eighth 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.

Vers. 23-28. What was already implied in the laws relating to the purchase and sale of the year's produce (vers. 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, ver. 23 contains the general rule, "the land shall not be sold לְעִמְיֹתָהּ" (*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 (ver. 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 (ver. 24) throughout the whole of the land of their possession they were to grant רְכֻשָׁם release, redemption to the land. There were three ways in which this could be done. The first case (ver. 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 vers. 48, 49.—The second case (vers. 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.—Ver. 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 com-

pensation. 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.

Vers. 29-34. *Alienation and redemption of houses.*—Vers. 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. ימים, “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. קפ to arise for a possession, *i.e.* to become a fixed standing possession, as in Gen. xxiii. 17. אֶשֶׁר לִי for אֶשֶׁר לָא as in chap. xi. 21 (see at Ex. xxi. 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 Josh. xiii. 23, etc.), which had no walls round them, it was not taken into consideration at all.—Ver. 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.—Ver. 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. עולם (eternal) is to be understood as a contrast to the year allowed in the case of other houses (vers. 29, 30).—Ver. 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 **קָנָה** (to redeem, *i.e.* to buy back), as the Rabbins do, in the sense of **קָנָה** to buy, acquire. The use of **קָנָה** 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. xxxv. 1 sqq. 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.¹ The words **וְעִיר אָח** 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 **אָח** 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

¹ This is the way in which it is correctly explained by *Hiskuni*: *Utitur scriptura verbo redimendi non emendi, quia quidquid Levitæ vendunt ex Israelitarum hæreditate est, non ex ipsorum hæreditate. 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 **אָח** before **קָנָה** 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.

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.—Ver. 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 מִנְרָשׁ pasturage for their flocks (from נָרַשׁ to drive, to drive out the cattle) round about these cities (Num. xxxv. 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.

Vers. 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 (vers. 35–38), and preserve to him his personal freedom.—Ver. 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.” וְיָיִן introduces the apodosis (see *Ges.* § 126, note 1).—Vers. 36 sqq. 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. Ex. xxii. 24; Deut. xxiii. 20, 21), from fear of God, who had redeemed Israel out of bondage, to give them the land of Canaan. In ver. 37 וְיָיִן is an abbreviation of וְיָיִן, which only occurs here.—From ver. 39 onwards there follow the laws relating to the bondage of the Israelite, who had been obliged to sell himself from poverty. Vers. 39–46 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 (Ex. i. 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 (Ex. xxi. 2–6), though without a contradiction arising, as *Knobel* maintains, between the different rules laid down. In Ex. xxi. 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 Ex. xxi. 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).—Vers. 42, 43. Because the Israelites were servants of Jehovah, who had redeemed them out of Pharaoh's bondage and adopted them as His people (Ex. xix. 5, xviii. 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 (ver. 43, cf. Ex. i. 13, 14). "Through this principle slavery was completely abolished, so far as the people of the theocracy were concerned" (*Oehler*).—Vers. 44 sqq. 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 (ver. 46, cf. ver. 43).—Vers. 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 (*גֵר תִּזְכֹּר*, to distinguish the non-Israelitish sojourner from the Israelitish, ver. 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.—Vers. 51, 52. According as there were few or many years to the year of jubilee would the redemption-money to be paid be little or much. רַבּוֹת בְּשָׁנִים much in years: רַבּוֹת neuter, and בְּ as in Gen. vii. 21, viii. 17 *etc.* לְפִיּוֹ according to the measure of the same.—Ver. 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.—Ver. 54. If he were not redeemed by these (the relations mentioned in vers. 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 (ver. 55) he was not to remain in bondage, because the Israelites were the servants of Jehovah (cf. ver. 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 a 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. lxi. 1-3; Luke iv. 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 (Acts iii. 19, 20; Rom. viii. 19 sqq.; Matt. xxv. 34; Col. i. 12; 1 Pet. i. 4).

PROMISES AND THREATS.—CHAP. XXVI.

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 (Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 19), concluded with promises and threats (Ex. xxiii. 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 (Ex. xxiii.) 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 (vers. 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 (vers. 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 (vers. 40-45).¹ The blessing

¹ 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

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 (Deut. xxviii.-xxx.), and on the threshold of the promised land.

Vers. 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 chap. xix. 4, calls to mind the fundamental law of the decalogue (Ex. xx. 3, 4, cf. chap. xxi. 23, Ex. xxiii. 24, 25). To *pesel* (cf. Ex. xx. 4) and *mazzebah* (cf. Ex. xxiii. 24), which were not to be set up, there is added the command not to put אֲבֹן 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. xxxiii. 52, and consequently we are to understand by *pesel* the wooden idol as in Isa. xlv. 15, etc. The construction of הַשְׁתַּחֲוֹתָהוּ 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. xviii. 2).—In ver. 3 the true way to serve God is urged upon the Israelites once more, in words copied verbally from chap. xix. 30.

Vers. 3-13. THE BLESSING OF FIDELITY TO THE LAW.—

Vers. 3-5. If the Israelites walked in the commandments of the Lord (for the expression see chap. xviii. 3 sqq.), 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 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.

upon which the fruitfulness of Palestine depends, viz. the early and latter rain (Deut. xi. 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, falls 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. 97 sqq.).—On vers. 5, 6, see chap. xxv. 18, 19.—Vers. 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. xiv. 30) exposed to no attacks from either wild beasts or men. פְּתִירִיר is generally applied to the frightening of men by a hostile attack (Micah iv. 4; Jer. xxx. 10; Ezek. xxxix. 26; Job xi. 19); but it is also applied to the frightening of flocks and animals (Isa. xvii. 2; Deut. xxviii. 26; Jer. vii. 33, etc.). הַיָּהּ רָעָה: an *evil animal*, for a beast of prey, as in Gen. xxxvii. 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 לְחֶרֶב 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 Deut. xxxii. 30 and Isa. xxx. 17.—Ver. 9. Moreover the Lord would bestow His covenant blessing upon them without intermission. אֵל פָּנָה אֵל signifies a sympathizing and gracious regard (Ps. xxv. 16, lxix. 17). The multiplication and fruitfulness of the nation were a constant fulfilment of the covenant promise (Gen. xvii. 4–6) and an establishment of the covenant (Gen. xvii. 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.—Ver. 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 præ multitudine et copia absumere non possitis, sed illam diutissime servare adeoque abjicere cogamini, novarum frugum suavitate et copia superveniente* (*C. a Lap.*). *חֵטֵא הַחֵטֵא* *vetustum triticum ex horreo et vinum ex cella promere* (*Calvin*).—Ver. 11. “I will make My dwelling among you, and My soul will not despise you.” *בְּיִשְׁבְּתִי*, applied to the dwelling of God among His people in the sanctuary, involves the idea of satisfied repose.—Ver. 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.—Ver. 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. *בְּיָמֵי*, *lit.* the poles of the yoke (cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 27), *i.e.* the poles which are laid upon the necks of beasts of burden (Jer. xxvii. 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. *קִוְיָתָא*, *lit.* a substantive, an upright position; here it is an adverb (cf. *Ges.* § 100, 2).

Vers. 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 (vers. 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 (vers. 16, 17): He would appoint over them יְהוָה 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 Ex. xxiii. 25, xv. 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.* Judg. vi. 3, 4).—Ver. 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.* ver. 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 (vers. 18–20); (2) the extermination of their cattle by beasts of prey, and childlessness,—*two* punishments (vers. 21, 22); (3) war, plague, and famine,—*three* punishments (vers. 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 (vers. 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.

Vers. 18-20. *First stage of the aggravated judgments.*—If they did not hearken אֲלֵךְ אֲלֵיךְ, “up to these” (the punishments named in vers. 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. Prov. xxiv. 16). אֲלֵךְ אֲלֵיךְ, *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 (Ex. xxx. 6, 18, xxxiii. 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. Deut. xxviii. 23); and when the land was cultivated, the people would exhaust their strength for nought. אֲכָלָהּ, *consumi.*

Vers. 21, 22. *The second stage.*—But if the people's resist-

ance 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. xxxiii. 8; Zeph. iii. 6), and the few inhabitants who still remained would be afraid to venture because of the wild beasts (Ezek. xiv. 15). הִלֵּךְ בְּקָרִי 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 vers. 21 and 23, and is strengthened in vers. 24, 27, 28, 40, 41 into הִלֵּךְ 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 ver. 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.

Vers. 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.—Ver. 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 (2 Kings vi. 25 sqq.), and upon Jerusalem through the invasions of the Chaldeans (cf. Isa. iii. 1, Jer. xiv. 18, Ezek. iv. 16, v. 12).

Vers. 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 (2 Kings vi. 28, 29), and in Jerusalem in that of the Chaldeans (Lam. ii. 20, iv. 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 (ver. 30); (2) the overthrow of the towns and sanctuaries (ver. 31); (3) the devastation of the land, to the amazement of the enemies who dwelt therein (ver. 32); and (4) the dispersion of the people among the heathen (ver. 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. **מִזְבְּחֵי**, 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. 343 sqq.). “And I give your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols.” **עַל עַלְלֵימָם**, *lit.* clods, from **עָלַל** 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 Ezek. vi. 4 sqq. 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.—Ver. 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 Ps. lxxviii. 36, lxxiv. 7. רִיחַ נִיחֹחַ (chap. i. 9) is the odour of the sacrifice; and רִיחַ, to smell, an anthropomorphic designation of divine satisfaction (cf. Amos v. 21, Isa. xi. 3).—Vers. 32, 33. The land was to become a wilderness, so that even the enemies who dwelt therein would be terrified in consequence (cf. Jer. xviii. 16, xix. 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. Ezek. v. 2, 12, xii. 14).

Vers. 34–45. OBJECT OF THE DIVINE JUDGMENTS IN RELATION TO THE LAND AND NATION OF ISRAEL.—Vers. 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. הַשְׁפָּחָה לְכָל יְמֵי הַשְׁפָּחָה, during the whole period of its devastation. הַשְׁפָּחָה, *inf. Hophal* with the suffix, in which the *mappik* is wanting, as in Ex. ii. 3 (cf. *Ewald*, § 131*e*). רָצָה to have satisfaction: with קָ and an accusative it signifies to take delight, take pleasure, in anything, *e.g.* in rest after the day's work is done (Job xiv. 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. הַשְׁפָּחָה אֶת אֲשֶׁר וּגְוֹ: 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 2 Chron. xxvi. 31 as having actually occurred.—Vers. 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 right-

eousness of the divine punishments. הַנִּשְׁאָרִים בְּכֶם (nominative abs.): "as for those who are left in (as in chap. v. 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. מָרַר from מָרַר, 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 Deut. xxviii. 65 in even stronger terms as "a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind." There should not be to them תְּקִיפָה, *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. xiii. 32; Ezek. xxxvi. 13).—Ver. 39. But those who still remained under this oppression would pine away in their iniquities (יִפְקֶי), *lit.* to rot, moulder away), and "also in the iniquities of their fathers with them." אִתָּם refers to עֲוֹנוֹת, "which are with them," which they carry with them and must atone for (see at Ex. xx. 5).—Vers. 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: וְזָכַרְתִּי (ver. 42) corresponds to הִתְעוּרִי (ver. 40) as the apodosis; so that, according to the more strictly logical connection, which is customary in our language, we may unite vers. 40, 41 in one period with ver. 42. "If they shall confess their iniquity . . . or rather their uncircumcised heart shall humble itself . . . I will remember My covenant." With בְּמַעְלָם 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

יִבְנֶה אֲרָאָה, "or if, etc.," the main sentence is resumed. אִם, "or rather" (as in 1 Sam. xxix. 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. יִרְצוּ אֲדֵרְעֹנִים יְרֵצִי εὐδοκήσουσι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν (LXX.), they will take pleasure, rejoice in their misdeeds, *i.e.* in the consequences and results of them—that their misdeeds 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 ver. 43 also.¹ 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 chap. vi. 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 ver. 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.—Ver. 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 נִמְצְאוּ stand first in an absolute sense, and are strengthened or intensified by וְאִנִּי and more fully explained by בְּהִיּוֹתָם וְאִנִּי), I have not rejected them, to destroy them and break My covenant with them. For I am Jehovah their God, who, as the absolutely exist-

¹ Luther has translated עָנָן 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."

ing and unchangeably faithful One, keeps His promises and does not repent of His calling (Rom. xi. 29).—Ver. 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. Deut. xxx. 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.

Ver. 46 contains the close of the entire book, or rather of the whole of the covenant legislation from Ex. xxv. onwards, although the expression "in Mount Sinai" points back primarily to Lev. xxv. 1.

OF VOWS.—CHAP. XXVII.

The directions concerning vows follow the express termination of the Sinaitic lawgiving (chap. xxvi. 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 Deut. xxiii. 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. Prov. xx. 25, Eccl. v. 3-5), and the neglect to keep it to be atoned for with a sin-offering (chap. v. 4).—The objects of a vow might be persons (vers. 2-8), cattle (vers. 9-13), houses (vers. 14, 15), and land (vers. 16-25), all of which might be redeemed with the exception of sacrificial animals; but not the first-born (ver. 26), nor persons and things dedicated to the Lord by the ban (vers. 28, 29), nor tithes (vers. 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. xxx. 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 (Mark vii. 11); and therefore, that when it was redeemed, the money would also be paid to His sanctuary.—(On the vow, see my *Archæologie*, § 96; *Oehler* in *Herzog's Cycl.*)

Vers. 2–8. The vowing of *persons*.—"If any one make a special vow, souls shall be to the Lord according to thy valuation." נָדַב הַפְּלִיא נֶדֶר does not mean to dedicate or set apart a vow, but to make a special vow (see at chap. xxii. 21). The words בְּעֵרְבֶךָ, "according to thy (Moses') valuation," it is more simple to regard as an apodosis, so as to supply to לַיהוָה the substantive verb תִּהְיֶינָה, than as a fuller description of the protasis, in which case the apodosis would follow in ver. 3, and the verb יִקְרֶינָה 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.¹—Vers.

¹ *Saalschütz* adopts this explanation in common with the *Mishnah*. *Oehler* is wrong in citing 1 Sam. ii. 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

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 Ex. xxx. 15). The valuation price was regulated, therefore, according to capacity and vigour of life, and the female sex, as the weaker vessel (1 Pet. iii. 7), was only appraised at half the amount of the male.—Ver. 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 chap. v. 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.

Vers. 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 (vers. 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. ver. 33).—Vers. 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

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.

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 (בְּעֵרְכֶךָ הַפִּיחֵן) according to thy, the priest's, valuation), namely, when sold for the good of the sanctuary and its servants.—Ver. 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. chap. v. 16).

Vers. 14 and 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.

Vers. 16–25. With regard to the vowing of *land*, a difference was made between a field inherited and one that had been purchased.—Ver. 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 (Ezek. xlv. 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*.—Vers. 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. præteritum 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. ver. 21 and chap. xxv. 13, 23 sqq.); 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 (ver. 19, like vers. 13 and 15), that it might be left to him. —Vers. 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 chap. xxv. 28), it was to be holy to the Lord, like a field under the ban (see ver. 28), and to fall to the priests as their property. *Hinc colligere est, redimendum fuisse ante Jubilæum consecratum agrum, nisi quis vellet eum plane abalienari (Clericus)*. According to the distinct words of the text (observe the correspondence of $\text{דָּנִי} \dots \text{דָּנִי}$), 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 *מִכָּר* from that of the parallel *מָכַר*, viz. the priest.—Vers. 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 chap. xxv. 23–28.—Ver. 25. All valuations were to be made according to the shekel of the sanctuary.

Vers. 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. Ex. xiii. 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 (Ex. xiii. 13, xxxiv. 20), was modified in favour of the revenues of the sanctuary and its servants.—Vers. 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 chap. ii. 3). The man laid under the ban was to be put to death. According to the words of ver. 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. *הֲחָרִים* signifies to dedicate something to the Lord in an unredeemable manner, as *cherem*, *i.e.* ban, or banned. *חָרַם* (to devote, or ban), judging from the cognate words in the Arabic, signifying *prohibere*, *vetare*, *illicitum facere*, *illicitum*, *sacrum*, has the primary signi-

fication "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 (Deut. xiii. 13.sqq.). 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 (Ex. xxi. 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.

Vers. 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 (Deut. xiv. 22), the harvest reaped, or "corn of the threshing-floor," Num. xviii. 27—and also of the fruit of the tree, *i.e.* "the fulness of the press" (Num. xviii. 27), the wine and oil (Deut. xiv. 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.—Ver. 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. xxxiii. 13, Ezek. xx. 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. xxviii. 22), but Abraham gave a tenth of his booty to Melchizedek the priest (Gen. xiv. 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. xviii. 20-32 instructions are given in the proper place concerning their appropriation, and further directions are added in Deut. xii. 6, 11, xiv. 22 sqq. respecting a second tithe.—The laws contained in this chapter are brought to a close in ver. 34 with a new concluding formula (see chap. xxvi. 46), by which they are attached to the law given at Sinai.

END OF VOLUME II.

MURRAY AND GIBB, PRINTERS, EDINBURGH.

Now Complete, in Six Volumes, Demy 8vo, Price £1, 15s.,

THE LIFE
OF
THE LORD JESUS CHRIST:

A COMPLETE CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE ORIGIN, CONTENTS,
AND CONNECTION OF

THE GOSPELS.

Translated from the German of

J. P. LANGE, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF BONN.

EDITED, WITH ADDITIONAL NOTES,

BY

THE REV. MARCUS DODS, A.M.



THE object of this comprehensive and masterly work is at once to refute the views of the Life of our Lord which have been propagated by negative criticism, and to substitute that consistent history which a truly scientific, enlightened, and incontrovertible criticism educes from the Gospels.

EDINBURGH: T. AND T. CLARK, 38, GEORGE STREET.

LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

[Turn over.]

The work is divided into three Books. The First Book is introductory. In this the Author explodes the philosophical fallacies on which the negative criticism rests, and exposes its unsound and inconsistent principles of criticism, establishing, in opposition, the fundamental ideas of the Gospel History (especially that of an individual incarnation), and delivering the principles and method of a trustworthy criticism. The sources of the Life of Jesus are then also discussed, and the authenticity and credibility of the Gospels are vindicated, their origin unfolded, their unity exhibited, and their peculiarities illustrated with greater detail, and in a more interesting manner, than has elsewhere been done.

The Second Book, which is the bulk of the work, presents a detailed history of the Life of Jesus, drawn from the Gospels by a minute critical examination. This is given in what is technically called a pragmatistical narrative; that is to say, it is so narrated that it is explained; every character introduced is rendered distinct and intelligible; every word and action appears in connection with its motive and meaning, and the whole is set in a framework of careful, historical, chronological, and topographical research. It thus forms virtually a pregnant commentary on the Gospels, while the reader is not interrupted by discussions of controverted points, nor by verbal criticism. All this is relegated to the notes which accompany each section, and which further confirm or show the grounds of those views which are stated in the text.

While the Second Book presents the Life of Jesus in that unity which is formed by the four accounts taken together, the Third Book gives us that same life in its four different aspects, according to the four different Evangelists. In the Second Book *one* representation is given, formed from the four narratives: in the Third, these four representations are separately given in their individual integrity. This is not the least instructive portion of the work, bringing out, as it does very distinctly, the fine arrangement of each Gospel, and the propriety and harmony of its various material.

Dr Lange is well known as the author of the 'THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON ST MATTHEW'S GOSPEL,' etc. And in Bishop ELLIOTT'S Hulsean Lectures, where Lange's 'Life of Christ' is constantly quoted with approbation, it is spoken of thus:

'See especially the eloquent and thoughtful work of Dr Lange, already several times referred to—a work which, we sincerely hope, may ere long meet with a competent translator.'—Page 35.

THE BURKE LIBRARY



5 0343 056

1111
1111
11

	Keil, C. F. &	DK18
AUTHOR	Delitzsck, F.	K27 (2)
TITLE	Biblical commentary on the O.T.	148639

The Library of the
Union Theological Seminary
Broadway at 120th St.
New York 27, N. Y.

