THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE
FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

GENERAL EDITOR FOR THE OLD TESTAMENT :—
A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.
DEAN OF ELY

THE
BOOK OF LEVITICUS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
London: FETTER LANE, E.C.
Edinburgh: 100 PRINCES STREET

New York: G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND Co., LTD.
Toronto: J. M. DENT AND SONS, LTD.
Tokyo: THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

THE
BOOK OF LEVITICUS

In the Revised Version

With Introduction and Notes

by

A. T. CHAPMAN, M.A.
Late Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge

and

A. W. STREANE, D.D.
Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

Cambridge:
at the University Press
1914

Cambridge:
PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

PREFACE

BY THE

GENERAL EDITOR FOR THE OLD TESTAMENT

THE present General Editor for the Old Testament in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges desires to say that, in accordance with the policy of his predecessor the Bishop of Worcester, he does not hold himself responsible for the particular interpretations adopted or for the opinions expressed by the editors of the several Books, nor has he endeavoured to bring them into agreement with one another. It is inevitable that there should be differences of opinion in regard to many questions of criticism and interpretation, and it seems best that these differences should find free expression in different volumes. He has endeavoured to secure, as far as possible, that the general scope and character of the series should be observed, and that views which have a reasonable claim to consideration should not be ignored, but he has felt it best that the final responsibility should, in general, rest with the individual contributors.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

CAMBRIDGE.

PREFACE

AT the time of Mr Chapman's regretted death in December, 1913, the notes on chapters i—iv and §§ 1, 2 and 3, to the end of Division III, of the Introduction, were in print. The notes to the end of ch. xvi were found to be in a fairly complete form in MS.

Dr Streane kindly undertook at once to complete the work and be responsible for its final revision.

Thus §§ 1, 2, 3, I—III of the Introduction, a portion of § 4 of the same, the notes on chapters i—xvi and the introductory note on ch. xvii, together with Appendix I (*a*) (*b*) (*c*) (*d*) and Appendices II, IV, V are substantially Mr Chapman's work, although it has been carefully revised throughout by Dr Streane. For the remainder of the Introduction and Appendices and the notes on chapters xvii—xxvii, Dr Streane is directly responsible. Little available material for this part of the work was found among Mr Chapman's papers.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

July 1914.

CONTENTS

"Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet;
Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet."

ST AUGUSTINE.

INTRODUCTION

§ 1. NAME AND CONTENTS.

The Book of Leviticus derives its name through the Vulgate (*Leviticus*) from the LXX. Λευειτικὸν (sc. βιβλίον), i.e. the Levitical book, so called from the character of its contents. The Heb. title is *Wayyiḳra*, from the first word 'And he called,' in accordance with the common Jewish practice of naming a book from its opening word or words.

The contents of this Book, the third of the five Books of the Law, belong, according to the chronological system of the Pentateuch, to the first month of the second year of the Exodus (Exod. xl. 1, 17, cp. with Num. i. 1). The events recorded are few in number—the consecration of Aaron and his sons according to the directions given in Exod. xxix., the first offerings of Aaron for himself and the people, the death of Nadab and Abihu (chs. viii.—x.), and the punishment of the blasphemer (xxiv. 10 f.). The remainder of the book contains legislation. This, like the other legislation in the Pentateuch, has for its aim throughout the training up of the people in ways that shall commend themselves to the God who has chosen them to Himself, and who has for His preeminent characteristic ***holiness***. Much of the legislation in this Book concerns the priests, e.g. the ritual of sacrifice, the treatment of leprosy, and the ceremonial of purification. Because of the predominating priestly element the book has acquired its name of Leviticus, i.e. the Levitical book. Levitical has here the same significance as in Heb. vii. 11, where the priesthood of the first covenant is called 'The Levitical priesthood.'

Outline of contents:

I. i.—vii. The law of sacrifice.

1. i.—vi. 7. The different kinds of offerings. Regulations for priests and people, mainly addressed to the people.
2. vi. 8—vii. 38. Further regulations, chiefly referring to the priestly portions of the sacrifices, mainly, though not exclusively, addressed to the priests.

II. viii.—x. The inauguration of the worship.

1. viii. Consecration of Aaron and his sons.
2. ix. The first offerings of Aaron.
3. x. Death of Nadab and Abihu; and priestly regulations.

III. xi.—xvi. Rules of purification.

1. xi. Distinction between living things that may be eaten, and those which may not be eaten. Defilement caused by touching the carcase of beasts or of creeping (swarming) things.
2. xii. Purification after childbirth.
3. xiii.—xv. Rules for discerning leprosy, and for cleansing a leper. Treatment of leprous houses. Uncleanness of issues, and their cleansing.
4. xvi. The Day of Atonement.

IV. xvii.—xxvi. The law of holiness.

1. xvii. Of sacrifice. Eating of blood forbidden.
2. xviii.—xx. Of unlawful marriages, and sundry laws, moral and ceremonial.
3. xxi., xxii. Laws and ordinances, chiefly affecting the priests.
4. xxiii.—xxv. The feasts of the Lord. The lamps and the shewbread. The blasphemer stoned. The sabbatical year and year of jubile.
5. xxvi. Concluding exhortation.

V. xxvii. A supplementary chapter dealing with vows and their redemption.

§ 2. Sources and Literary Structure.

The Book Leviticus presents a marked contrast to the Books of the Pentateuch which immediately precede and follow it. Exodus and Numbers both contain two elements which can be separated from one another without difficulty: one, designated by the symbol P, contains a series of legislative and ceremonial enactments set in a historical framework; the other, which is composite in character and denoted by the symbol JE, contains the traditions of Judah and of the Northern Kingdom, with a small collection of laws[1]. Leviticus belongs entirely to the source P, and forms part of the legislation which is the distinguishing mark of the central or Sinaitic section of the Pentateuch (Exod. xix.—Num. x.). This section contains an account of the stay at Sinai, and of the legislation assigned to that period.

But though Leviticus is different in structure from other books of the Pentateuch, problems similar to those which confront the critic in Exodus and Numbers present themselves here also. The unity of *aim*, above referred to as characterizing this with the other Books of the Pentateuch, by no means indicates a *literary* unity. The labours of the priestly school in preparing the law book of Israel extended over more than a century and a half[2]; during this period some variation in thought and phraseology may be expected, and the student who consults the commentaries on Exodus and Numbers in this series will find that the source denoted by P is not homogeneous. Repetitions and divergences point to diversity of origin, and after the separation of P from JE has been accomplished, a further analysis of each source is necessary. This analysis, in the case of P, is often difficult, and though the evidence for successive redactions of the text is

[1] For further information about the sources P and JE, and for the conclusions of modern criticism with respect to the composition of the Hexateuch (the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua) the reader may consult Chapman's *Introduction to the Pentateuch* in this Series, and Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the O. T.* (*LOT.*[9]) pp. 1—159.

[2] The period from 597, the captivity of Jehoiachin, with Ezekiel and many priests, to 444, the date assigned to the reading of the law in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. viii.) is 153 years.

definite and conclusive, it is not always possible to trace the present text backwards to its original form. It seems reasonable to suppose that regulations concerning certain observances, such as the offering of sacrifice, combine elements of great antiquity with the practice of more recent date, but the attempt to trace the steps of their development must be in a measure tentative. In default of direct evidence, examination of the text may suggest inferences, but they fall short of rigorous demonstration.

One of these inferences, which is regarded by modern critics as conclusive, may be given here by way of illustration.

Four cases are enumerated in Lev. iv. for which a Sin-Offering is prescribed, and in the first two (iv. 2—21) a special application of the sacrificial blood is enjoined. The blood shall be brought into the tabernacle, and put upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense that is before the Lord (iv. 7, 18).

The injunctions contained in Exod. xxv.—xxix. make no mention of this altar, nor is there any reference to it in Lev. viii., ix., which describe very fully the inauguration of the worship. The chapters in Exodus contain a full, and apparently complete, account of all that is necessary to render the tabernacle a fit 'dwelling' (Exod. xxv. 9 R.V. mg.) for the glory of the Lord. According to xxv. 9 the pattern of *all* the furniture is shewed, and in the closing verses of ch. xxix., God's presence is solemnly promised on the completion of the work enjoined in chs. xxv.—xxix. (cp. xxix. 43—46). The writer of these chapters has no idea that additional furniture would be needed.

In the following chapter a command is given (Exod. xxx. 1—10) to make an *Altar of Incense*, with instructions concerning its situation, and its use. The thoughtful reader cannot fail to notice that this ordinance[1] appears to be supplementary to those in chs. xxv.—xxix. It is very remarkable that this altar, which is essential for completing the ritual of the Sin-Offering in Lev. iv. 1—21, should not be included in the furniture of the tabernacle specified in Exod. xxv.—xxix. If the writer of these chapters knew of the incense altar, he would surely have added it to the

[1] The same may be said of other injunctions in this chapter (see Wellh. *CH.*[3] p. 142 f.), but it will be sufficient to take note here of the altar of incense only.

list of things necessary for the service of the tabernacle as the writer of xxxv. 10—19 has done. The inference seems justified that

the writer of Exod. xxv.—xxix. does not mention the Altar of Incense, because he is unacquainted with it, and with the ritual for which such an altar is required.

In support of this inference it may be noted that in Lev. iv. 7, 18, 25, 30, 35 the altar for sacrifice is called 'the altar of burnt offering' to distinguish it from 'the altar (which is) before the LORD, that is in the tent of meeting' (*vv.* 7, 18), but in Lev. i.—iii. the altar for sacrifice is called 'the altar,' implying that the writer had only one altar in view.

The same difference of expression is found elsewhere. One group of passages—Exod. xxvii. 1—8, xxviii. 41, xxix.; Lev. v., vi., viii., ix., xvi.; Num. xvi. 46, like Lev. i.—iii.—refers to 'the altar.'

But in another group of passages—Exod. xxx. 28, xxxi. 9, xxxv. 16, xxxviii. 1, xl. 6, 10, 29—'the altar of burnt offering' occurs, as in Lev. iv., and 'the brasen (bronze) altar' in Exod. xxxviii. 30, xxxix. 39.

To the first group of passages may be added Lev. x. 1, xvi. 12, and many verses in Num. xvi., where reference is made to the use of incense in 'censers[1].' No altar of incense is needed when these censers or firepans are used; the action of Aaron as described in Lev. xvi. 12 f. implies a tabernacle without an incense altar, and is in accord, together with all the passages in the first group, with the description of the tabernacle and its furniture in Exod. xxv.—xxix.

It follows that *the passages in the second group, which* either mention the altar of incense, or by the use of the distinguishing title 'altar of burnt offering' *imply the existence of a second altar, belong to another and later stratum of P.* See Driver's Exodus (*C.B.*), introd. note on chs. xxx., xxxi.

[1] The Hebrew word is the same as that translated 'firepans' in Exod. xxvii. 3, xxxviii. 3; 2 Kgs xxv. 15[1] Jer. lii. 19 and 'snuffdishes' in Exod. xxv. 38, xxxvii. 23; Num. iv. 9. In Num. iv. 14; 1 Kgs vii. 50 2 Chr. iv. 22 R.V. has 'firepans,' A.V. 'censers.'

The book of Leviticus in its present form has been an important factor in moulding the religious thought and practice of Judaism. The Mishna and other rabbinic commentaries shew, as the notes from time to time point out, how it has been interpreted by Jewish teachers, and how its precepts were observed in the time of Christ. For further discussion, and for the treatment of the book by Christian commentators, patristic, mediaeval, and modern, reference must be made to works on the history of doctrine, and to articles in *HDB.* and *Enc. Bibl.* on ATONEMENT, MERCY-SEAT, PROPITIATION, SACRIFICE, etc.

In recent times, however, attention has been drawn to what may be called the preliminary history of the Book, and attempts have been made to trace it back to its probable sources. One investigation of this kind has just been laid before the reader in pp. xii f., and others of a similar character dealing with the whole Hexateuch will be found in the works referred to in the note on p. xi.

In the following section, a detailed analysis of the Book is given; the remarks appended in smaller type deal chiefly with questions of origin; indications of variety of authorship are noted, and reasons given for supposing that the collection of laws in its present form is the result of a gradual process of selection and development.

§ 3. ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK OF LEVITICUS.

I. THE LAW OF SACRIFICE, i.—vii.

This law is in two sections:

(*a*) i.—vi. 7, *given through Moses to the children of Israel with respect to the*

Burnt-Offering, i.;
Meal-Offering, ii.;
Peace-Offering, iii.;
Sin-Offering, iv.—v. 13;
Guilt- or Trespass-Offering, v. 14—vi. 7.

The material and place of sacrifice, the actions both of the offerer and of the priest, and, in the case of Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering, the occasions on which a sacrifice is to be brought are prescribed.

(*b*) vi. 8—vii. 38 [Heb. vi., vii.], *addressed through Moses chiefly to the priests* (vi. 9, 25), *but also* (vii. 23, 29) *partly to the children of Israel, and containing* 8 *parts:*

(1) the law of the Burnt-Offering, vi. 8—13;
(2) the law of the Meal-Offering, vi. 14—18;
(3) the oblation of Aaron and of his sons, vi. 19—23;
(4) the law of the Sin-Offering, vi. 24—30;
(5) the law of the Guilt-Offering, vii. 1—7; with a note on priestly portions, 8—10;
(6) the law of the Peace-Offering, vii. 11—21;
(7) prohibition of eating Fat and Blood, vii. 22—27;
(8) priests' portions of the Peace-Offering, vii. 28—36;

with a concluding summary, *vv.* 37, 38.

The regulations for each sacrifice are introduced with the words 'This is the law of...'; directions are given to the priests, and their portions are indicated; the various kinds of the Peace-Offering are specified, and rules for the disposal of the remainder are given; Fat and Blood are prohibited as in iii. 17 but with more detail; although there is some repetition, the second part is on the whole supplementary to the first.

The main distinction between the above sections (*a*) and (*b*) consists in this, that the laws in (*a*) on the whole deal with the method of offering *the sacrifice itself*, while those of (*b*) have to do with supplementary regulations concerning the dress of the priest when offering, the treatment of the fire on the altar, the disposal of the portions of flesh to be consumed by the priest or the worshipper, etc.

The second group is not by the same hand as the first; the order in which the sacrifices are enumerated is different, both in vi. 8—vii. 21 and in the subscription (vii. 37, 38), from that in i.—vi. 7, and the prescriptions for each sacrifice are introduced by the formula, *This is the law of...* (vi. 9, 14, 25, vii. 1, 11, 37). In i. 7 the priests are bidden to 'put fire upon the altar,' in vi. 12, 13 fire is to be 'kept burning upon the altar continually; it shall not go out.' (Cp. Num. iv. 13, 14

for what is to be done with the ashes when the camp sets forward.) The prohibitions of fat and blood in iii. 16, and vii. 22—27 are not in the same style, though it should be noted that both are in the 2nd person. The Sin-Offering is fully treated in iv.—v. 13, and briefly in vi. 24—30; details of the Guilt-Offering are given in vii. 1—7 which are not found in v. 14 f.

II. THE INAUGURATION OF THE WORSHIP, viii.—x.

(*a*) viii. *The consecration of Aaron and his sons according to the instructions given in Exod. xxix.*

(1) Introductory, viii. 1—5;
(2) washing, vesting, and anointing, 6—13;
(3) the sacrifices; Sin-Offering, Burnt-Offering, and the installation offering, 14—30;
(4) the process of consecration to last seven days, 31—36.

(*b*) ix. *The first sacrifices of Aaron.*

(1) Introductory, ix. 1—6;
(2) sacrifice for himself, Sin-Offering and Burnt-Offering, 7—14;
(3) for the people, Sin-Offering, Burnt-Offering, and Peace-Offering, 15—21;
(4) blessing, entrance into the tent, appearance of the 'glory of the LORD,' 22—24.

(*c*) x. *The first priestly transgression, and sundry ordinances.*

(1) Punishment of Nadab and Abihu, x. 1—5;
(2) Aaron and his sons forbidden to mourn, 6, 7;
(3) restriction on use of intoxicants for priests, 8—11;
(4) the law of eating the holy things, 12—15;
(5) case of transgression of ritual as to eating the Sin-Offering, 16—20.

Ch. ix. belongs to P. The last clause of *v.* 17 which assumes that the daily Burnt-Offering (Exod. xxix. 38—42) had already been offered may be a gloss (Dillm. *al.*), and doubts have been raised with respect to *v.* 19 and the last clause of *v.* 21; but these few sentences do not affect the general character of the chapter. The narrative is precise, but without the extreme redundancy which marks the later sections of the

priestly narrative; in the Sin-Offering both for Aaron and for the people, the ritual prescribed in iv. 3—21 is not observed; the blood is *not* brought into the tent of meeting, there is no mention of the altar of incense, and the narrative refers throughout to 'the altar' (see remarks on p. xii). Thus the chapter bears marks of the original legislation of P, as distinguished from subsequent strata.

Before Aaron could offer these sacrifices, it was necessary that the tent and its furniture, and the altar should be made and set up in accordance with the instructions of Exod. xxv.—xxvii., that the garments should be prepared as directed in Exod. xxviii., and that Aaron and his sons should be consecrated in the manner appointed in Exod. xxix. An account of all this work is found in Exod. xxxv.—xl. (cp. Lev. viii.). In these chapters the commands of Exod. xxv.—xxxi. are repeated *verbally*; only the verb in each sentence is changed—e.g. from 'and thou shalt make' to 'and he made.' This lengthened and formal manner of describing the execution of the commands given in Exod. xxv.—xxxi. is characteristic of the later portions of P, and there is further evidence pointing in the same direction.

III. THE LAW OF PURIFICATION.

On the position of these laws following the account of the inauguration of the priesthood see introductory note to chs. xi.—xv.: in all probability they contain ancient material reaching back to the beginnings of Israelite history. See Chapman's *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 186 ff.

Ch. xi. It is clear that Deut. xiv. 6—20 and Lev. xi. 2—20 are derived from a common source. The passage in Deut. is not in the

style of the Deuteronomic code, and is probably borrowed from some document on which *vv.* 2—20 of Lev. xi. are dependent.

The command in *v.* 43 'ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any swarming thing that swarmeth' is linked to a declaration in *vv.* 44, 45 which has the characteristic phrases of H. A very similar declaration occurs in xx. 24—26, where the *separation* between clean and unclean food is enjoined, because the Lord has *separated* Israel from other peoples. This passage seems an appropriate introduction to a law on forbidden meats (Driver and White, *SBOT.* p. 91); Baentsch considers it the conclusion of such a law (*HG.* p. 5. *HK.* p. 404), Berth. (*KHC.*) assigns *v.* 25 to RP.

Lev. xi. 2—23, 41—45, appears to be a continuous law on things that may and may not be eaten, which as far as *v.* 20 is very similar to Deut., and in the latter part resembles H.

A distinct feature of this law is the frequent use of *shéḳeṣ, detestation,* from *v.* 10 onwards, for unclean prohibited food, and the corresponding verb in the Piel form of the root *ye shall have in detestation.* The English reader fails to observe this because both A.V. and R.V. render *abomination,* the same word as that employed to translate the ordinary Heb. word *tō'ēbhāh* (see note on p. 38 and *HDB.* Art. *Abomination*). Deut. uses this latter word to describe things that must not be eaten, 'Thou shalt not eat any abominable thing' (xiv. 3), and in vii. 26 uses the other root in combination with it, 'thou shalt utterly detest it, and thou shalt utterly abhor it' (of the gold and silver of idols). Here *shiḳḳeṣ, detest,* is used to enhance the idea of abhorring or abominating the gold and silver of idols. The same root is used in Lev. xi. 11, 13, 43, xx. 25 in connexion with prohibited foods, and it is probable that a dietary law stood originally in connexion with xx. 24—26. (See on xx. 25 and p. 162.) May not that law have used this verb *shiḳḳeṣ* and possibly the noun also? and may not the reason for omitting the law be that the substance of it was incorporated in Lev. xi.? If, as seems probable, the frequent use of this root in Lev. xi. is due to RP, is not RP under the influence of H? The alternative seems to be that adopted by Bertholet (see above) to assign xx. 25 to RP.

Ch. xii. Other occasions on which purification is prescribed for women are specified in xv. 19—30; possibly that section and c. xii. may have been originally more closely connected, and the last clause of xii. 2 is generally considered to refer to xv. 19. But if such connexion originally existed, reasons may be suggested for giving this chapter a place by itself. The character and length of the purification are different from those enjoined in c. xv., and the sacrifices here prescribed

(xii. 6) are of higher value (cp. xii. 6 with xv. 29, 30). Regulations which concern the beginnings of life appropriately precede those which are necessary for persons of mature age; and a command to circumcise a child on the eighth day (xii. 3) would naturally be placed before regulations about leprosy.

Chs. xiii., xiv. These regulations about the treatment of leprosy contain four main sections: the first (xiii. 1—46) and third (xiv. 1—32) deal with the diagnosis of leprosy, the separation of the leper, and the law of his cleansing. The second (xiii. 47—59) and fourth (xiv. 33—53) deal with leprosy in a garment and in a house. In the opinion of many modern commentators the more suitable position of xiv. 33—53 would be immediately following xiii. 47—59, and hence they infer that xiv. 33—53 is a later addition.

But the order of the sections seems a natural one: in ch. xiii. tests for discovering the disease are prescribed, and the tests applied to the garment are similar to those applied to the leper; the theme of ch. xiv. is rehabilitation of one who has been pronounced unclean, and the remarkable ritual with the two birds is applied to the leper and to the house. It seems more suitable that this ceremonial should first be described in connexion with the leper, and afterwards applied to the house, than that the reverse order should be followed. In other words, a compiler with these four sections before him would probably have arranged them in the order in which they now stand. He might have put together the whole law of the leper, and added to it as a supplement the laws with respect to garments and houses, but that he would have inserted such a supplement between the laws for diagnosis and for re-admission does not seem so probable.

The idea of garments and houses being infected probably arose from appearances in them similar to those on the human body, and so the rules concerning their treatment were chronologically posterior to those for human beings: the fact, however, that primitive thought peopled the world around with demons, and regarded inanimate objects as means of transmitting their malignant activity, makes it quite possible that regulations about garments and houses may be nearly as old as those which refer to the human leper.

In ch. xiv. there appear to be two distinct rituals of purification:

One, contained in *vv.* 3—8*a* and concluding with the words 'and he shall be clean,' prescribes a ceremony, applied also to the leprous house, in which two birds are employed, one of which is killed over running (Heb. *living*) water, and the other is set free. This ceremony is decidedly antique in character, and similar to many others which

have been practised in different parts of the world (see p. 78). It might have been introduced as part of the law in Israel at any time.

The other, contained in *vv.* 9—20, enjoins a Guilt-Offering and a ceremonial based on that prescribed for the consecration of priests in ch. viii. As both these elements belong to the Priestly Code, their introduction, and consequently the final redaction of these chapters, must coincide with or be later than the acceptance of that code.

The law contained in these two chapters is, on the whole, uniform in style, and may have been drawn up by one redactor. It seems also probable that regulations concerning a disease which was prevalent during the whole history of Israel must have grown in course of time, as the result of experience and observation, and that the law in its present form is based on material gathered at different times from different sources. Beyond these general indications of date it does not seem possible to go with any degree of certainty.

Ch. xv. The remarks in the preceding paragraph may be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the contents of this chapter: the references to the Sin-Offering shew that its final redaction cannot be before the time when the Priestly Code was introduced.

Ch. xvi. Two important questions may be asked with reference to this chapter: Is it a unity or composite? and, Does it belong to the original groundwork of P or is it a later addition? For a discussion of these questions see Appendix I (*d*), pp. 163 ff.

It may be noted here, however, that three ideas are expressed in this service:

(1) atonement for sin through sacrifice;

(2) purification of places by application of blood;

(3) complete removal of sin symbolized by the scapegoat.

These ideas may be conceived in various stages of development; thus (1) the simplest expression of the first idea may be (*a*) a Burnt-Offering sacrificed by the priest for the people, on the introduction of special offerings for sin; (*b*) the Sin-Offering becomes the appointed means of atonement, but the Burnt-Offering is retained; and as a further addition, (*c*) a special atonement for the priests may be due, either to the growing importance of the priestly caste, or to the thought that the priests themselves should be purified before offering sacrifice for the people.

(2) Similarly the method of purifying places by the application of blood may be varied. The prophet Ezekiel (xlv. 18, 20) prescribes cleansing the sanctuary on the first day of the first month, and on the first day of the seventh month (according to R.V. mg. following the LXX.). The prophet's directions for putting the blood on the posts and corners

there enjoined seem simpler than those of Lev. xvi., where fuller details are given, and the cleansing of the holy place (*v.* 16) appears to be distinct from that necessary for the tent of meeting. The application of blood for purposes of purification, the act of bringing the blood within the veil, and the use of incense, may be regarded as extensions of the sacrificial ceremony, and as steps, either successive or simultaneous, in a process of development.

(3) The sending forth of the scapegoat is the most remarkable feature of this service. The idea of the removal of sin and evil in this manner is widely spread among nations in different stages of culture (see pp. 188 f). Such a rite may have been introduced at any time in the history of Israel, and it is not necessarily connected with sacrifice. The addition of the words 'for Azazel' probably points to a later period when the indistinct beliefs about malicious spirits had crystallized round definite shapes and names.

It will be seen, then, that there are many possible ways in which a simple ceremony may have gathered round it additional elements, and may gradually have expanded into the elaborate ceremonial prescribed for the Day of Atonement. But, in the absence of historical facts, the actual course of development cannot be traced with certainty.

IV. THE LAW OF HOLINESS.

(1) There is a general agreement among modern critics that these ten chapters are distinguished from those that precede, and from the ch. (xxvii.) which concludes the Book, and that they form a separate group, summarized in the last *v.* of xxvi. as 'statutes and judgements and laws.' The position of that summary also shews that xxvi. is an integral part of the collection, and marks it off from the concluding ch. of the Book.

(2) We find the style and phraseology of P clearly marked in these chs., especially in certain parts of xxiii., and in xxiv. 1—9, although the exact limits of P cannot always be determined with certainty. For details the reader is referred to the Appendix on P together with the notes in this volume on the several chapters.

(3) On setting aside the portions belonging to P, we find that there remain

(*a*) a code of laws containing prescriptions of varied character which do not exhibit affinity with P;

(*b*) hortatory passages, laying special stress on the idea of *holiness*, such as 'Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am holy' (xix. 2).

The point to be particularly noticed in this connexion is the *combination* of the two ideas of (*a*) God's holiness, and (*b*) the consequent necessity that Israel as the chosen people should be holy likewise. For illustrations of this feature see Chapman's *Intr. to Pent.* in this Series, p. 112.

Owing to this prominent feature, the section has been termed the 'Law of Holiness[1],' and for the sake of brevity is commonly referred to as H.

The editor who added (*b*) to (*a*), as described above, seems in the formation of the latter to have collected laws from different sources, instead of drawing up a code himself. For illustrations see *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 240 f.

Accordingly we infer the existence of the following two stages with regard to the framing of this section of the Book:

(1) That a reviser who combined hortatory and warning discourses with a collection of laws, drawn in the main from existing codes, further impressed on this combination the character of 'holiness' as above described. Hence that reviser may be called R^h.

(2) That another reviser, working probably at a time when this collection had been incorporated with the Priestly code (P), which forms the rest of the Book, introduced further elements from that code into the section. We may call him R^p.

That the document formed by R^h was antecedent in time to P appears from various indications: (*a*) its list of sacrifices is more limited. R^h makes no mention[2] of the Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering enjoined in P (iv. 1—vi. 7), (*b*) the hierarchical system is less developed. The high priest, although chief 'among his brethren' (xxi. 10) and anointed, and specially robed, evidently is not looked upon as possessed of the degree of Aaronic dignity which is conferred on him by P's description (Exod. xxviii. and xxix.). (*c*) In Num. xviii. (P) there is a

[1] *Das Heiligkeits-Gesetz*, Klostermann, 1877.

[2] xix. 21, 22 do not contravene this statement. These *vv.* are opposed to the general tenor of H, and are plainly an addition to harmonize with P's enactments.

distinction made between 'most holy things' which may be eaten only by priests (*v.* 10), and holy things, in which all ceremonially clean members, whether male or female, of the priestly families may share (*v.* 11). No such distinction is made in the portion attributed to R^h, unless it be in Lev. xxi. 22*b*, which, however, has quite the air of an interpolation suggested by P^s. (*d*) R^h insists (against P) that all occasions on which domestic animals are slain for food shall involve sacrificial rites at the central sanctuary (xvii. 1—9).

Accepting these as the stages in the formation of the Book as it now stands, and placing the Holiness Code at an earlier date than the Priestly Code, we next ask to what date we are to assign the former.

Here we must distinguish between its legal and hortatory elements. The age of the legal can only be arrived at by inferences drawn from a comparison of its enactments with those of other codes. That of the hortatory may be inferred by a comparison with similar elements in other parts of the Old Testament, and, in accordance with what has been said above, we may deduce the conclusion that the date of this latter element is identical with that of the compilation of H by the first redactor (R^h).

The first comparison (that of the *laws* in H with those of other codes) does not yield assured results. For (*a*) the sources from which those laws are taken may well be of very various ages, and (*b*) the amount of modification to which the original form has been subjected often cannot be ascertained with certainty. A simple example may serve to make this clear. The law in Lev. xvii. 1—7, enacting that there shall be a sacrificial element in all slaughter of animals for food, may have passed through stages of some kind before reaching its present form. According to it no slaughter, whether for sacrifice or food, is to take place except at the central sanctuary. This applies to the Israelite, but *vv.* 8, 9 insist that if a 'stranger' brings a sacrifice, it shall be brought to the same place. It would seem that the 'stranger' was free to kill animals intended merely for *food* wherever he pleased. The

[1] See Wellh. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, *u.s.w.* pp. 160 f.

section's phraseology in *v.* 3 is adapted to the wilderness 'camp,' but *v.* 5 speaks of the 'open field' as contrasted with the city, thus implying a settled life, and moreover it recognises the aliens ('strangers,' *v.* 8) who lived in the midst of Israel. In Deut. xii. 13—15, 20f. the rule is modified, and in Lev. vii. 22 ff. it is ignored; for there it is implied that an ox or sheep or goat may be freely eaten. Is then the law in which it appears in Lev. xvii. pre-exilic or otherwise? For it may be said on the one hand that the centralisation of worship prescribed by the Deuteronomic code, abolishing as it did the numerous local shrines at which, previous to Josiah's reforms, sacrifices had been offered, made the relaxation thus permitted a practical necessity; while on the other hand it may be urged (though with less force) that the rule had to do with times immediately following the Return from Babylon, when it could be easily obeyed, the returned exiles confining themselves to the territory in the vicinity of Jerusalem. (See further in the notes *ad loc.*)

We may add that the restriction laid down in ch. xvii., whatever may be its date, had for an object (see *v.* 7) to check the practice of heathen customs. Those who regarded the slaughter of animals for food, even apart from the service of the sanctuary, as *ipso facto* a sacrificial act, were inclined, in accordance with that view, to add ceremonies of a doubtful or idolatrous character.

In general, for similarities or divergences perceived on comparison of the legal element in H with corresponding enactments in JE and D, see *Intr. to Pent.*, pp. 243—245.

While this comparison of legislative elements fails, as has been said above, to yield conclusive evidence as to H's dependence on or priority to other codes, somewhat more satisfactory results, although still not of a demonstrative character, are obtained from a comparison of the hortatory sections of H with the prophecies of Ezekiel. For a detailed comparison see Appendix, *Comparison of the Holiness Code with Ezekiel*, in *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 240ff., and for a discussion of priority in date as between these two see App. III, pp. 177 ff. in this volume.

It will be seen there that the preponderance of critics favour the view that the Holiness Code preceded in order of time the

Book of Ezekiel. We have also seen reason to conclude (p. xxvi) that certain elements of the Priestly Code were embodied by a later reviser in the Holiness Code, in other words that H was revised, probably when it had been incorporated with the Priestly Code, by a writer acquainted with that document, and working in the spirit of it. For that priestly Reviser the symbol R^P has been adopted. See further in the Appendix II *On the Priestly Code*, pp. 174 ff.

V. VOWS AND TITHES, AND THEIR COMMUTATION, xxvii.

(*a*) laws relating to vows and their redemption ... ... xxvii. 2—29
(*b*) laws relating to tithes and their redemption ... ... 30—33
(*c*) conclusion 34

§ 4 SACRIFICE, ITS ORIGIN, MEANING, AND HISTORY AS PRACTISED BY ISRAEL. SYNOPSIS OF SACRIFICIAL REGULATIONS LAID DOWN IN THE PRIESTLY CODE.

No one can read the history of Israel as preserved in the O.T. records, without noting that all writers, historians, prophets, and psalmists alike are convinced that God had chosen Israel, and that the nation from the beginning had been and was still the object of His providential care. However imperfectly this belief was apprehended by the bulk of the nation, it influenced profoundly the better and more spiritually minded among them. In the development of their sacrificial system, as in all other matters, they had been specially guided by God. That conviction expressed itself in the reverent ascription of their ritual to the Divine word. But while acknowledging this testimony of Israel's religious consciousness, the thoughtful student of their history cannot disregard those facts which the history of all religion teaches. The details of ceremonial observance grow with a nation's growth, and are the result of traditions reverently and jealously guarded by those who felt that in the rules which directed their intercourse with the higher powers, nothing was lightly to be introduced or set aside.

The word 'sacrifice,' if we regard its derivation only, is a most general term. Any sacred action or ceremony performed on or near an object associated with deity, e.g. altar, pillar, image, any service connected with the gods, may be included in the term sacrifice. But, owing to the fact that offerings of some sort occupied from the earliest times of which we have cognisance a central place in worship, the word has always borne a more restricted meaning. The Latin *sacrificium* has been applied almost exclusively to offerings made on or at an altar, and the English word sacrifice derived from it has been generally further limited to offerings in which a life is taken. A more extended use of the word is made, corresponding to that of the Latin equivalent, when sacrifices are distinguished as 'bloody' and 'unbloody'; when Lev. i.—vii., where the Meal-Offering is treated along with animal offerings, is described as containing a 'law of sacrifice.' The word has been further applied in a figurative sense to any service prompted by motives similar to those which led to the offering of altar sacrifices (Rom. xii. 1; Phil. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 15, 16), and has thus acquired the wider signification which its derivation justifies.

It is well, however, to set aside at the outset the popular sense in which the word is sometimes used to denote an offering to God in the shape of some permanent gift, such as lands or buildings. For our present purpose we may confine the term to a gift which is *in some way consumed* in immediate connexion with its devotion to a religious purpose.

The essential idea of sacrifice is to place the worshipper *en rapport* with a Divine being, and so to enjoy the advantages accruing from a supernatural source.

The question whether sacrificial observances owed their existence to a Divine command or had a purely human origin came at the time of the Reformation to be the subject of warm debate. In support of the former view was adduced the acceptance of Abel's sacrifice as against that of Cain (Gen. iv. 4 f.), together with the reason assigned in the Ep. to the Hebrews (xi. 4), which was supposed to indicate that Abel was acting in obedience to Divine authority. But this assumption is without

any real justification, so far as it implies a positive Divine enactment. On the other hand the existence of sacrifice in some shape as a virtually universal custom of mankind in propitiating or seeking the favour of a superhuman being indicates that the expression of religious feeling in this form is an element of man's nature, and therefore is implanted in him by his Creator.

It being granted that the sacrificial instinct is an elementary one, we are faced by an enquiry what was the exact import of the sacrificial act in the mind of the worshipper. Two explanations of the theory of sacrifice are commonly given, viz.:

(*a*) It was an act of expiation. Conscious of sin, and recognising the penalty which that sin deserved, he sought to transfer that penalty from himself to a substituted victim slain at the altar in order to appease an offended deity.

(*b*) It was an act of homage. Man realised his dependence upon God as a Divine sovereign. Even as he would approach an earthly ruler with gifts to indicate a temper of submission and obedience, and thus to win his favour, so he adopted a similar course in order to express his feelings of reverence and devotion towards his all-powerful King. Cp. Maurice[1], 'To such men (Cain and Abel) there came thoughts of one who is ruling them as they rule the sheep, and in some strange way makes the seeds grow which they put into the ground....How shall they confess Him, and manifest their subjection? Speech, thanksgiving are not the most childlike way of testifying homage. Acts go before words.'

The second of these two hypotheses seems that which fits in better with the attitude of mind to be attributed to those who belonged to the childhood of the human race. The thought of sacrifice as an expiation or atonement for sin implies a realisation of spiritual infirmity not consonant with what we should expect at so early a period.

Now there is a general consensus of opinion that the earliest shape in which the religious sense of mankind developed itself took the direction of polytheism. Thus it is supposed that sacrifice arose from the offering of gifts to the object or objects

[1] *Sacrifice*, p. 6, quoted in Art. *Sacrifice*, *HDB.*

of worship (nature spirits, or spirits of ancestors, or fetishes such as stones, to which supernatural functions were attributed), after the analogy of presents made to obtain or secure the good will of a human authority. Herbert Spencer, e.g. says, 'The origin of the practice is to be found in the custom of leaving food and drink at the graves of the dead, and as the ancestral spirits rose to divine rank, the refreshments placed for the dead developed into sacrifices[1].'

This view is one which has a good deal to recommend it, and it is by no means a valid objection that offerings of a polytheistic origin could not be acceptable to Jehovah after He had revealed Himself to the Hebrew nation as claiming their sole worship.

Another view, which on the whole adapts itself better to all the facts of the case, is that the germ of sacrifice lay in the association of the worshippers with the deity by means of their partaking with him in a common meal, the interchange of the rites of hospitality thus constituting a bond which secured his favour and consequent assistance in their needs. According to this theory in its first form, the parties were knit together in bonds of unity through the gratification inspired by sharing in eating and drinking, as ordinary tokens of friendship, and as the usual rites observed by those who were engaging in covenants and leagues[2]. The aim of the offerer has been carried further by W.-Rob. Smith[3] beyond the mere gratification of the god, and so obtaining his aid, by his worshippers sharing a meal with him. He extends it to include the notion of a physical union between the parties arising from a joint participation in the same food. Moreover this brilliant writer, working on the same lines as Wellhausen[4], considered his theory of sacrifice as intimately associated in its origin with totemism. According to that doctrine certain animals were held to possess a specially divine character, which was therefore capable of being imparted by the reception of a portion of their substance into the human body. The lives of such animals

[1] *Principles of Sociology*, § 139 ff., quoted in the same Article.
[2] See Sykes, *Nature of Sacrifices*, p. 75.
[3] *Religion of the Semites*[2], pp. 269 ff.
[4] *Reste Arabischen Heidenthums*.

were held to be as a rule sacred, but on certain rarely recurrent occasions it was permitted to slay these and partake of the flesh in a kind of sacramental meal. By this physical union there was supposed also to be attained a share in the intellectual or moral qualities considered as inherent in the animal thus sacrificed. From this was developed the sacrificial feast, which became more frequent as the taste for animal flesh increased, while totemistic beliefs decayed, and the notion thus died out of a nature akin to deity pervading certain animals and introduced into man through the carrying out of such observances. Notwithstanding the learned character and brilliancy of the exposition of this theory, it is now commonly held that the view is irreconcilable with the primitive conceptions which must have dominated the mind of the race at a time when savagery was still prominent. The attempt in particular to explain on this principle those sacrifices where the victim was wholly consumed by fire demands a large amount of hypothesis of a speculative kind. It was held that on the disappearance of the belief that certain animals were possessed of a share in the divine nature, the only creature that could be sacrificed with the result of attaining to the communion desired was a human being. But the eating of human flesh presently became repulsive, and so there arose the consumption of the whole of the offering by fire. When at a further stage of refinement men shrank from human sacrifice, domestic animals were substituted, but the mode of offering consisting of a holocaust was retained.

Among other objections, however, to this account of the holocaust as a comparatively late development from the primitive sacrificial meal is the fact that the two forms of sacrifice are found existing from early times side by side as though of equal antiquity.

At an early period the flesh of the sacrificial meal was doubtless eaten raw, while the blood was partly lapped up by the worshippers and partly poured out beside the altar, or, as in later times, sprinkled upon it, being the portion belonging to the god, and considered, on its absorption into the ground, as accepted by him. At a later stage the fat and entrails were also assigned as his share, and were accordingly caused to

ascend consumed in flame and smoke, while his good will was secured by the sweet savour which arose therefrom[1]. The raw flesh of primitive times came in due course to be subjected to the processes of boiling or roasting, the latter method of preparing it being apparently subsequent to the former.

It is hoped that more definite results will be attained as to primitive ideas underlying sacrifice through researches into the earliest forms of Babylonian and Assyrian worship[2].

1. *Sacrifice in Israel to the end of the monarchy.* The earliest reference to sacrifice is in Gen. iv. 1—5. There offerings, both vegetable and animal, are called *minḥah*, a word meaning 'gift' or 'present' (note that the LXX. render once by δῶρον with reference to Abel's offering but twice by θυσία with reference to that of Cain). It is implied that offerings were brought to the Deity from the beginning, but as we have pointed out above nothing is said about a Divine command to bring sacrifice. The animal sacrifice of Abel is accepted, but it is very doubtful whether the narrator intends to indicate a preference for that kind of offering. Noah offers a Burnt-Offering in acknowledgment of the Lord's mercy to him and his family (Gen. viii. 20); Abraham builds altars, not only where the Lord appeared unto him as xii. 7, but also near Bethel (xii. 8) and at Hebron (xiii. 18); the narratives in ch. xv. and ch. xxii. give details concerning the manner of offering sacrifice. Isaac builds an altar at Beersheba where the Lord appears to him (xxvi. 25); Jacob offers a sacrifice on making a covenant with Laban, and he and his brethren take part in the sacrificial meal (xxxi. 54). Moses demands that Pharaoh should let the people go, that they may hold a sacrifice to the Lord (Exod. v. 1, viii. 25—28); after the defeat of Amalek he built an altar (xvii. 15). Sacrifices by those who are not of the seed of Israel are recorded: in Exod. xviii. 12, Jethro brings a Burnt-Offering and sacrifices, and Aaron and the elders came

[1] Cp. the survival of the expression 'sweet savour' in such passages as Lev. i. 9.

[2] A remarkable illustration of the survival of ancient ceremonial is recorded in *Notes and Queries*, Dec. 28, 1912. In 1858 a farmer in the Isle of Man offered a heifer up as a propitiatory sacrifice, so that no harm might befall him from the opening of a tumulus upon his land. The survival may be further illustrated by the case of a Yorkshire farmer, who, after a succession of bad seasons, is related to have sacrificed a heifer, with incantations.

to eat bread (i.e. to join in the sacrificial meal); Balak invites Balaam to curse the people, and builds altars, and sacrifices bullocks and rams (Num. xxiii.). Moses ratifies the covenant between God and the people by building an altar and twelve pillars, and sending young men to offer Burnt-Offerings and Peace-Offerings to the Lord (Exod. xxiv. 4—8).

The references to sacrifice before the erection of the tabernacle and the inauguration of the worship are all from the source JE; it is well known that P, in his brief sketch of patriarchal history, does not record any instance of sacrifice brought by the ancestors of the chosen people, while he presents Moses as issuing by God's command an elaborate code determining for all subsequent time 'the when, the where, the by whom, and in a very special manner the how' of sacrifice[1], a code which doubtless has an underlying Mosaic element, but in its elaborate character is clearly shewn by the historical and prophetic Books to be considerably later in its present form.

The subsequent references to sacrifice in the historical Books are here noted, before considering the sacrificial system of P.

Joshua built an altar on Mt Ebal, on which sacrifices were offered (Josh. viii. 30 f.), and assembled the people at Shechem, where was a sanctuary of the Lord (xxiv. 25 f.); the covenant made there was probably accompanied by sacrifice. In the time of the judges, sacrifices were offered at Bochim (Jud. ii. 5) and at Bethel (xx. 26 'the house of God' A.V., xxi. 4). The accounts of the sacrifices brought by Gideon (vi. 19—23) and Manoah (xiii. 15—20) are specially interesting, because they supply details about the ritual of sacrifice in ancient Israel. Both bring the same offering, a kid with unleavened cakes, called a *minḥah* in xiii. 19, 23. Gideon asks the angel to stay while he prepares a present (*minḥah*) and when he has brought it, the angel of the Lord touches the flesh and the cakes, and fire from the rock consumes them. Manoah's angel refuses to eat, but suggests a Burnt-Offering, and when it is brought, he ascends in the flame of the altar. Gideon's kid is boiled, for broth is prepared from it (vi. 19); it is not said how Manoah made ready the kid for a Burnt-Offering. After Gideon's present

[1] Wellh. *History of Israel*, p. 52.

has been consumed he builds an altar (vi. 24). Another sacrifice is enjoined (*vv.* 25—27) upon another altar. The writer records both these sacrifices by persons of non-priestly tribes (Manasseh and Dan) without any remark that such offerings were at all exceptional, or contrary to existing rules. Ordinary meal (*ḳemaḥ*) and not fine flour (*ṣoleth*) was the material of Gideon's offering as of Elkanah's who went up yearly to Shiloh with all his house (1 Sam. i. 21, 24, 25). Samuel offered a sucking lamb (1 Sam. vii. 9), built an altar at Ramah (vii. 17), and offered sacrifice (ix. 12) on the occasion when Saul found him, at Gilgal (x. 8; cp. xi. 15), and Bethlehem (xvi. 5). Saul offered sacrifice at Gilgal (xiii. 9) and was reproved by Samuel; the first altar which Saul built is referred to (xiv. 35) in a manner implying that other altars were subsequently erected by him. David attended a yearly sacrifice at Bethlehem (xx. 6, 29). When king, he offered sacrifice on the removal of the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (2 Sam. vi. 13, 17, 18), and blessed the people in the name of the Lord; he also reared an altar and offered sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite (xxiv. 18, 25).

From the time of Solomon onward frequent reference is made to worship at the high places. The reason given for offering sacrifice there is that there was no house built to the Lord in those days (1 Kgs iii. 2). This is the comment of a Deuteronomic writer, himself a faithful supporter of the worship at the one sanctuary in Jerusalem, who offers an explanation of the irregular worship practised by his forefathers. But this reason, if suitable at the commencement of Solomon's reign, does not explain the continuance of the worship on the high places under the kings of Judah until the time of Hezekiah. Asa's heart was perfect with the Lord. He removed idols, and opposed the idolatry even of his mother, but the high places were not removed (1 Kgs xv. 11—14). Similar references are made in the case of Jehoshaphat (xxii. 43), Jehoash (2 Kgs xii. 2, 3), Amaziah (xiv. 3, 4), Azariah (xv. 3, 4), Jotham (xv. 34, 35). In the northern kingdom an old altar of the Lord is repaired by Elijah, who offers sacrifice upon it (1 Kgs xviii. 30), and laments over other altars which had been thrown down (xix. 10, 14).

These instances of sacrifice offered in early times and during the monarchy exhibit a freedom of practice in accord with the law of Exod. xx. 24, but not in accord with the law which forbad sacrifice at any other place than Jerusalem, or the law which limited the priesthood to the sons of Aaron, prescribed the material of sacrifice, and carefully regulated the ritual to be observed both by priests and people. In the case of a theophany it might be allowed for ordinary men like Gideon and Manoah to bring sacrifice without the intervention of a priest, and to disregard the law of the one sanctuary, but the sacrifice itself would have been brought in accordance with Levitical rule, if that rule had been in force at the time. The history of sacrifice, as incidentally disclosed in the historical books[1], presents a picture of a people not acquainted with Levitical laws, or else living in habitual disregard of them. The reformation[2] under Josiah abolished the worship at the high places, but there is little trace of its influence during the short period that intervened before the fall of the kingdom.

Even Jeremiah addresses the people in terms which imply that he knew nothing of a ritual prescribed for sacrifice in the days of Moses. He looks forward to the time when sacrifices will be brought to the house of the Lord by an obedient people (xvii. 24—26). As a priest Jeremiah must have known the authority upon which the ritual of his time rested, but his words concerning sacrifices (vi. 19, 20, vii. 21—23) cannot be interpreted, if there was then in existence a code regulating sacrifice like that of Lev. i.—vii.[3]

2. *Sacrifice in the Priestly Code.* The following tables will be found useful for reference.

A. The ritual of the separate offerings based mainly on Lev. i.—vii.

B. The sacrificial calendar of the year, giving the sacrifices to be brought on each feast, and on the Day of Atonement,

[1] The prophets, in their teaching about sacrifice, illustrate and confirm the inferences drawn from the historical Books. See *OT/C.*[2], pp. 251, 294.

[2] Cp. *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 137 ff.

[3] Note that in his description of sacrifices there is no mention of Sin-Offering or Guilt-Offering.

based on Lev. xxiii. and Num. xxviii., xxix. The regulations of Ezekiel are compared with them.

C. Particulars of the sacrifices offered at the inauguration of the worship, the dedication of the altar, and of the Levites as prescribed in Exod. xxix.; Lev. viii., ix.; Num. vii., viii.; also sacrifices of purification for the Nazirite, the leper, after childbirth and issues.

(A) THE RITUAL OF THE OFFERINGS.

Material.

Burnt-Offering. herd, bullock; flock, sheep or goats; fowls, turtle doves or young pigeons. male without blemish.

Meal-Offering. fine flour, oil, frankincense, baken in (*a*) oven, (*b*) flat plate, (*c*) frying pan. first fruits, corn in the ear parched with fire, with oil, and frankincense.

Peace-Offering. herd, flock, lamb or goat, male or female without blemish.

Sin-Offering. (1) by the anointed priest, a young bullock; (2) by the whole congregation, a young bullock;

(3) a ruler, a goat, a male; (4) one of the common people, a goat, a female, or a lamb, a female; or, if his means suffice not, two turtle doves or two young pigeons, one for Sin-Offering, and the other for Burnt-Offering; or, $\frac{1}{10}$ ephah of fine flour, no oil, no frankincense.

Guilt-Offering. A ram without blemish.

Place. At the entrance to the tent of meeting before the LORD; he shall bring it to the priests [at the same place]

Laying on of hands.

Burnt-Offering. He shall lay his hands on the Burnt-Offering. This is enjoined for the bullock, not enjoined, but implied, for sheep or goats, not enjoined for fowls; bringing them in the hand is sufficient.

Meal-Offering. Not enjoined; brought in the hand.

Peace-Offering. Enjoined in all three cases.

Sin-Offering. (1) the priest lays his hand;
(2) the elders of the congregation lay their hands;
(3) the ruler, (4) one of the common people } shall lay his hand upon the head, except in case of the offering of fowls and fine flour.

Guilt-Offering. Not enjoined, but practised (vii. 7).

Killing.

Burnt-Offering. the bullock, sheep or goat, fowls, before the LORD; on the side of the altar northward; by the priest at the altar.

Peace-Offering. At the entrance to, or before, the tent of meeting;

Sin-Offering. (1) the priest shall kill;
(2) no person indicated;
(3) the ruler shall kill;
(4) one of the common people shall kill the goat or lamb, the priest shall wring off the head of the fowl, but shall not divide it.

Guilt-Offering. No instructions; to be killed where Burnt-Offering is killed.

Thus far the actions are performed in most cases by the offerer; the priest's function now begins.

Manipulation of the Blood.	Burnt-Offering.	The priests shall *throw* the blood *against* the altar in the case of animals from the herd or the flock; in the case of the fowl the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off its head: the blood is drained out on the side of the altar.			
	Peace-Offering.	The priests shall *throw* the blood *against* the altar.			
	Sin-Offering.	(1) and (2).	(3), (4) (See also v. 5, 6).	fowls (v. 7—10).	
		The anointed priest shall take of the blood and bring it to the tent of meeting, and sprinkle some of the blood 7 times before the Lord before the veil, and put of the blood on the horns of the altar of sweet incense, and all the blood shall he pour out at the base of the altar of Burnt-Offering.	The priest shall take of the blood with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of Burnt-Offering. and all the blood shall he pour out at the base of the altar of Burnt-Offering.	The priest shall wring off its head but shall not divide it; and he shall sprinkle of the blood upon the side of the altar; and the rest of the blood shall be drained out at the base of the altar. He shall offer the second for a Burnt-Offering.	
	Guilt-Offering.	And the blood thereof shall the priest *throw against* the altar round about (vii. 2).			
Offering by fire.	Burnt-Offering.	The animal is prepared for burning by flaying (stated with respect to bullock only) and cutting into pieces.			

The priest lays the pieces, the head, and the fat in order upon the wood.
The inwards and legs he washes with water.
The head of the fowl is wrung off and burned.
The crop with the filth (or feathers; see on i. 16) thereof is thrown in the place of the ashes.
He rends it by the wings thereof but does not divide it asunder.
In all 3 cases, the priest shall *burn* the whole upon the altar.

Meal-Offering. The priest shall *burn* the memorial thereof upon the altar.

Peace-Offering. The fat that covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the loins, and the *appendix* (see on iii. 4) upon the liver shall he take away. And the priest shall *burn* it upon the altar.

Sin-Offering. The same parts to be removed as in Peace-Offering;
and the priest shall *burn* them upon the altar of Burnt-Offering.

Guilt-Offering. As the Sin-Offering.

Disposal of the remainder.

Burnt-Offering. Nothing left; the hide is for the priest that offereth (vii. 8).

Meal-Offering. That which is left the priests shall eat in the court of the tent of meeting; but every Meal-Offering of a priest shall be *wholly burnt*.

Peace-Offering. The wave breast and the right thigh are the priestly portions; the remainder is to be eaten by the offerer and his friends.

Sin-Offering.

(1) and (2).	(3) and (4).	v. 7—10.	v. 11—13.
The whole bullock shall the priest carry forth to where the ashes are poured out and burn it with fire.	In a holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tent of meeting: every male among the priests shall eat thereof.	The second bird is offered as a Burnt-Offering; the first is for the priest.	As in the Meal-Offering, the memorial is burnt on the altar, and what is left is for the priests.

Guilt-Offering. After the fat parts have been offered, the remainder belongs to the priests. In Num. v. 5—10, if there is no next-of-kin to whom retribution should be made, it is made to the Lord, and shall be the priest's, besides the ram of atonement.

(B) THE OCCASIONS ON WHICH OFFERINGS WERE BROUGHT.

	Sin-Offering.	Burnt-Offering.	
	Num. xxviii., xxix. and Ezek.	Num. xxviii., xxix.	Lev. and Ezek.
Daily, called *Tāmīd*, i.e. continual,		Exod. xxix. 38—42; Num. xxviii. 3—8, 2 he-lambs of first year, one in morning, the other at even, with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering	1 he-lamb of first year morning by morning with Meal-Offering and oil, Ezek. xlvi. 13—15
Sabbath,		Num. xxviii. 9, 10, 2 he-lambs of first year with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering in addition to the *Tāmīd*	the prince shall offer 6 lambs and 1 ram, with Meal-Offering and oil, Ezek. xlvi. 4, 5
Beginnings of Months, New Moon, 1st Month,	1 he-goat a bullock, Ezek. xlv. 18	Num. xxviii. 11—15, 2 young bullocks, 1 ram, 7 he-lambs of first year with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering	1 young bullock, 6 lambs and 1 ram, with Meal-Offering and oil, Ezek. xlvi. 6, 7
14th day at even Passover,	a bullock, Ezek. xlv. 22		
15th day—7 days unleavened (bread),	1 he-goat on each of the 7 days, xlv. 23	Num. xxviii. 19—21, as on first of month, for 7 days	7 bullocks and 7 rams, with Meal-Offering and oil for 7 days, Ezek. xlv. 23—25

	Sin-Offering.	Burnt-Offering.	
The wave sheaf after 7 complete weeks,			Lev. xxiii. 9—14, a he-lamb of the first year with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering
Feast of Weeks, two wave loaves,	a he-goat, not in Ezek. but Lev. xxiii. 19	Num. xxviii. 26—30 (as on first of month)	Not in Ezek. Lev. xxiii. 15—17, 7 lambs, 1 young bullock, 2 rams, and 2 he-lambs of first year for Peace-Offering
7th Month, 1st day, Blowing of Trumpets,	1 he-goat a bullock, Ezek. xlv. 20	Num. xxix. 2, 1 young bullock, 1 ram and 7 he-lambs, besides the Burnt-Offering of the new moon	See Ezek. xlvi. 6, 7
10th day, Day of Atonement, See also on p. xlv	1 he-goat beside the Sin-Offering of atonement, Lev. xvi. 10	Num. xxix. 7—11, 1 young bullock, 1 ram, and 7 he-lambs	
15th day, Feast of Tabernacles (Heb. Booths), 7 days,	1 he-goat on each of the 7 days	Num. xxix. 12—34, 13 young bullocks, 2 rams, and 14 he-lambs with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering on first day. One bullock less each day, 7 bullocks on 7th day	[ye shall dwell in booths 7 days, Lev. xxiii. 42], 7 bullocks and 7 rams with Meal-Offering and oil for 7 days, Ezek. xlv. 25
22nd day, the 8th day of the feast, a solemn assembly,	1 he-goat, not in Ezek.	Num. xxix. 35—38, 1 bullock, 1 ram, 7 he-lambs of first year with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering	Not in Ezek.

(C) Sacrifices for special occasions.

	Sin-Offering.	Burnt-Offering.	Peace-Offering.
Consecration of Aaron and his sons, Lev. viii. 14—25	a bullock (for 7 days). Cp. Ezek. xliii. 19, on first day, a young bullock, on second and remaining 6 days, a he-goat	a ram (for 7 days). Ezek. xliii. 23—25, a young bullock and a ram (for 7 days)	installation offering a ram (for 7 days)
On the 8th day,			
Aaron's offering,	a bull calf	a ram	
for the people, Lev. ix. 3, 4	a he goat	a calf and a lamb	an ox and a ram
	No further ceremony appointed in Ezek. for the 8th day, xliii. 27.		
The prince of each tribe,	Num. vii. 12—28, a he-goat	1 young bullock, 1 ram, 1 he-lamb of first year	2 oxen, 5 he-goats, 5 rams, 5 he-lambs of first year
Dedication of the Levites,	Num. viii. 8—22, a young bullock	a young bullock with Meal-Offering	Levites offered for a Wave-Offering unto the LORD

The above describe the ritual and practice on **past occasions**, and serve as a model for the future. Sacrifices for special occasions follow:

Day of Atonement,	Lev. xvi. 5, 6, a young bullock, 2 he-goats, 1 for the LORD, and 1 for Azazel	a ram	(for Aaron and for his house)
a.		a ram	(for the children of Israel)

	Sin-Offering.	Burnt-Offering.	Peace-Offering.
Nazirite, Num. vi. 10 ff.			
if defiled during vow,	a turtle dove or young pigeon	a turtle dove or young pigeon	[a he-lamb of the first year for a Guilt-Offering]
after fulfilment,	ewe-lamb of first year	he-lamb of first year with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering	a ram with Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering with cakes and wafers
The Leper, Lev. xiv. 4 ff.			
on the day of his cleansing,	two birds	cedar wood, scarlet, and hyssop	
the 8th day,	ewe lamb of first year	a he-lamb with Meal-Offering	a he-lamb and log of oil for a Guilt-Offering
	The blood and oil of the Guilt-Offering applied as to priests, cp. Lev. viii. 30.		
if poor,	turtle dove or young pigeon	turtle dove or young pigeon	a he-lamb, with Meal-Offering and log of oil for a Guilt-Offering.
Childbirth, Lev. xii. 6 ff.	young pigeon or turtle dove	a lamb of the first year	
if poor,	turtle dove or young pigeon	turtle dove or young pigeon	
Issues, Lev. xv. 14.	turtle dove or young pigeon	turtle dove or young pigeon	

A Meal-Offering (*minḥah*) and Drink-Offering (*nések*) were brought with the Burnt-Offering and the Peace-Offering. These offerings were graduated according to the value of the animal which was sacrificed. The amounts are given in Num. xv. 1—16, and agree with those in chs. xxviii., xxix. The same kind of graduation is found in Ezek., but the amounts are different. In the following table the amounts fixed in Num. are in **thick type**, those in Ezek. and in Lev. are placed underneath for purposes of comparison.

For	the Meal-Offering shall be	Oil	Drink-Offering
each lamb,	$\frac{1}{10}$th of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin
Ezek. xlvi. 5,	as he is able		(wanting)
the lamb with the wave sheaf, Lev. xxiii. 12 f.,	$\frac{2}{10}$ths of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil	amount not given	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin
the lamb of the daily Burnt-Offering,	$\frac{1}{10}$th of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin	$\frac{1}{4}$ hin
Ezek. xlvi. 14,	$\frac{1}{6}$th of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil	$\frac{1}{3}$ hin	(wanting)
each ram,	$\frac{2}{10}$ths of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil	$\frac{1}{3}$ hin	$\frac{1}{3}$ hin
Ezek. xlvi. 5,	an ephah for a ram	1 hin	(wanting)
each bullock,	$\frac{3}{10}$ths of an ephah of fine flour mingled with oil	$\frac{1}{2}$ hin	$\frac{1}{2}$ hin
Ezek. xlv. 24, xlvi. 7,	an ephah for a bullock	1 hin	(wanting)

§ 5. Religious Value of the Book.

There are certain fundamental conceptions of God, alike Christian and Jewish, which find their expression here as in Old Testament literature generally, and are fraught with equal significance for us. We may enumerate them thus:

(1) The Unity of God. 'Monotheism was the basis of the religion....It was an inspiration, a passion[1].' This unity was marked according to the Priestly Code by the centralisation of worship in the midst of the camp, a centralisation which was meant to secure that Jehovah should preserve His supreme character as the sole object of the devotion of His chosen people. The sanctuary and the service are alike one.

(2) His holiness. This feature was rendered impressive by the careful way in which the central shrine was protected by successive rings of defence or grades of sacredness. Outside the tabernacle, in which the inmost shrine (Holy of Holies) was itself separated by a veil from the holy place, there was the court of the priests and of the Levites, and beyond, the encampments of the tribes on the four sides, three on each. Thus there were provided ascending degrees of sanctity. The priests alone were admitted to the holy place, and the limitation of even the high priest's right of entering the Holy of Holies to one day in the year conveyed similar teaching. The same idea of holiness was emphasized in the whole of the sacrificial system of ordinances, in the penalties attached to transgression, in the consecration of the priests, and in the laws concerning ceremonial purity. Jehovah as a necessary consequence of His supreme holiness (Lev. xix. 2 and elsewhere) could only be approached by those who were themselves 'holy.' (See p. xxvi.)

(3) The presence of God with man. Although from one standpoint God was far above man's reach, yet from another He was near and accessible. The 'tent of meeting' was His 'dwelling' (see on p. 88). Although 'tent' suggests what is transitory, 'dwelling' on the other hand points us forward to

[1] L. Abrahams, *Judaism*, p. 39.

the N.T. teaching, as given us specially in St John (xiv. 16, 17, xv. 4—10). This conviction that God was ever present with His people and was their Teacher throughout the ages, a conviction deeply and permanently impressed on the Jewish mind, is a higher testimony to the reality of Divine revelation than the belief once held that the Law was once for all given to the people at the birth of their race. The words 'I will set my tabernacle among you...and I will walk among you' (Lev. xxvi. 11, 12) accorded with the picture developed in Ezek. xl.—xlviii. and summarized by that prophet in the words (xxxvii. 26, 27) I 'will set my sanctuary in the midst of them for evermore. My tabernacle also shall be with them.' The 'tent of meeting' (see on i. 1) was the visible embodiment of this teaching concerning the presence of Jehovah among His people.

(4) His worship a spiritual one. Behind the elaborate ritual set forth in this Book there lies the acknowledgment that there was no presentation of the Godhead in a visible shape. Nothing suggestive of anthropomorphism appeared as an object of worship. Such teaching has its obvious Christian application, on which it is not necessary to dwell. On the other hand elaborate attempts have been made at various times to attach meanings, whether astrological, mystical, or directly Christian, to the minutest details of the Priestly Code, as in the works of Josephus[1], Philo[2], Origen[3]. Such expositions, whatever be the amount of ingenuity to which their unbridled fancy may fairly lay claim, have a fundamental defect, in that they fail to recognise the uncertainty and capriciousness which are inherent in their very nature. Their arbitrary character and the far-fetched parallelism which they often exhibit may serve as a sufficient condemnation of their fanciful treatment[4].

But the existence of fanciful interpretations is no proof that these details are all devoid of spiritual meaning! Taking the Levitical ordinances, the sacrifices, the priesthood, the legislation

[1] *Ant.* iii. 7. 7.
[2] *Vit. Mos.* iii. § 14. Cp. *De epist.* § 34.
[3] *In Lev. Hom.* i. iii. v. vi.
[4] For Josephus and Philo see Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 238f. A modern example of this method of treatment of the tabernacle and its arrangements is furnished by Baer, *Symbolik d. Mosaischen Cultus*, 2 vols. 1837—39 (2nd ed. of vol. ii. 1874).

as a whole, we gather much that yields valuable instruction to the Christian of the present day. Reserving for the moment comments upon the particular teaching conveyed by each type of offering, we may notice how the vestments of the high priest (Lev. viii. 7 ff.) indicated, as did the decorations of the tent (Exod. xxv.—xxxi.), the reverence due to the Almighty Creator of the universe. The pouring of anointing oil upon the contents of the tabernacle, on the altar and its vessels, upon the laver and its base, as well as upon the priests themselves (Lev. viii. 10 ff.) taught the same lesson, shewing that what was designed for any sacred purpose should be set apart, and treated with becoming reverence, as in a peculiar sense appertaining to the service of God. We may notice here the special rite used (cp. the case of the leper, xiv. 14) as indicating the character and duties of the priestly office. The blood of a ram was applied in the consecration of Aaron and his sons (viii. 23 f.) to the ear, the hand, and the foot, thus signifying, the ear attentive to the commands of God, the hand ready to do His will, the foot prepared to walk in His ways. Again the newly installed priest offered a triple sacrifice in which the Sin-Offering was a sign of the forgiveness of his sins, the Burnt-Offering of the entireness of his consecration, and the Peace-Offering of his oneness with the Master whom he served (Cave, *The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice etc.*, p. 125).

Doubtless many of these details of ritual as appearing in the Priestly Code were 'the final development and systematization of usages and ideas which were in themselves of great antiquity, and, in their original form, did not differ in principle from those current among Israel's Semitic neighbours...the really *distinctive* character which they exhibited in Israel consists in the new spirit with which they are infused, and in the higher principles of which they are made the exponent[1].'

The state of society at the present day may seem to present few points of contact with that indicated in this Book. There are, it is true, abundant differences in detail between things as there described and the circumstances of modern life. Yet it is not without profit for us to notice that such subjects as those

[1] Driver, *Exod.* (*C.B.*) pp. lxv f.

connected with the religious observance of a periodical rest from labour, with social purity, with marriage, with labour rights, with the tenure of land, with the connexion which should exist between religion and the ordering of national affairs, all have their place in the Book of Leviticus. Moreover this Book at its commencement sets before us the nation's relation to God, represented in the ritual of sacrifice, and in this way it introduces all that follows in the way of legislation.

But after all the most important feature of the Book as regards its religious value lies in the fact that the various forms of sacrifice which it includes express religious instincts or needs of man, which are met and fulfilled in our Lord's life on earth.

For our purpose we may classify sacrifice under two heads, that in which the whole victim was devoted to God (the Burnt-Offering), and that in which a portion was presented to Him, while the remainder was consumed by the worshippers.

The *Burnt-Offering* was a holocaust, the unreserved animal sacrifice, and it always contained an element of solemnity and awe, if not also of actual apprehension of evil to be averted by the offering. It was used on occasions of special gravity, e.g. deliverance from the Flood (Gen. viii. 20), but also it was prescribed by the Priests' Code for the daily morning and evening sacrifice. Its primary intention was either propitiatory or to prevent the Divine clemency from changing to hostility. As a gift to God it was reckoned the most valuable kind of sacrifice, but there is no clear indication that it represented the penalty due for sin on the part of the worshipper. The Burnt-Offering was the most perfect representation of the sacrificial idea. Its benefits have been described as threefold, viz. that it was 'the savour of rest' (i.e. what was acceptable) to God (i. 9), that it formed a 'covering'[1] for the worshipper (i. 4),

[1] The rendering of the Heb. root has, however, been challenged. The sense of 'cover' was supposed to be justified by that of a cognate Arabic root. But the word is now held to be connected with the Assyrian *kapparu*, which apparently means *to remove*, and *kupparu*, *to remove ritual impurity*, hence *to purge away sin*. The function of the Burnt-Offering was 'to make atonement' (the rendering given to this root), an office ascribed also by P to the Sin-Offering (iv. 20, 26, 31, 35) and Guilt-Offering (vi. 7), once only to the Peace-Offering (Exod. xxix. 33). See Driver, *Exod.* (*C.B.*) xxix. 33, xxx. 10. The English word 'atonement' formerly signified *reconciliation*, rather than making amends or reparation for a fault, and thus *propitiation* would now better represent the sense of the original word.

and that it was a cleansing from ceremonial defilement (xiv. 20). In the case of the Burnt-Offering the main stress was laid on the entirety of presentation which it typified, and thus it represents a complete consecration of body and spirit to the service of God. In this way it typifies for us the Saviour who in the full consecration of His Person in both life and death shewed the perfection of devotion to the will of the Father. Moreover, as a daily offering, it was 'a distant earthly shadow of the continual intercession of Christ, the Eternal High Priest[1].'

The *Sin-Offering* and the *Guilt-Offering*. The distinction between the two has given rise to some difficulty. See on v. 17—19. These offerings, as their names imply, involve the consciousness on the part of the offerer that expiation was needed for some violation of God's will whether through ignorance or intentionally. In the case of the Sin-Offering, ignorance meant either that the person was unaware of the law or that he was forgetful of it at the time of his transgression. The Guilt-Offering on the other hand was required where the man feared that he had infringed some Divine regulation but could not specify it definitely. The Sin-Offering always in P involves some more definite conception of wrongdoing. The sprinkling of the blood of the victim before the veil and upon the altar, and its pouring out at the base, point for the Christian reader to the Atonement made by our Saviour on the Cross, while the Ep. to the Hebrews (xiii. 10—12) applies the rite in which parts of the victim were burned 'without the camp' (Lev. xvi. 27) to the Sufferer at Calvary 'without the gate.' The outstanding feature of the Guilt-Offering was the reparation for the offence with the addition of one-fifth of the value. Hence we may say that in the former case the leading feature was that of *atonement*, while here it was *satisfaction* by the payment of a recompense with an addition, thus directing us to the thought that wrongdoing, when it consists in an invasion of the just claims of God or man, needs not only expiation, but some reparation for the wrong committed.

These two kinds of sacrifice, unlike the Burnt-Offering, had properly to do with *individual* transgressions. Guilt-Offering,

[1] Lanchester, *The Old Testament*, p. 239.

however, is the word used of the suffering servant in Is. liii. 10, who personifies, according to the most probable view, the faithful few in Israel.

Both Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering, absent from the earlier history, become conspicuous in Ezekiel and in P. This may be accounted for by the growing sense of national sin during the later monarchy, a period of successive calamities, terminating in overthrow and exile.

The laws relating to leprosy—its characteristics and the methods to be employed for its cure—contain symbolism into which we can easily read Christian significance. The disease, as something specially abhorrent and hurtful to the vitality of the victim, fitly represents a manifestation of the working and power of sin. Moreover, the primary insignificance and even imperceptibility of the ailment, its steadily progressive character, its gradual capture of the whole man, the belief that the disease, whatever its exact nature may have been[1], was incurable by human means, the exclusion from fellowship with God, all these features furnish us with obvious analogies to the Christian doctrine of sin. So too, we may point out[2], that deliverance from sin's guilt, and consequent renewal of spiritual vitality, has its type in the ritual appointed for the leper's cleansing, viz. the shedding of blood in the case of one of the birds, followed by the new life and freedom indicated by the liberation of the other bird from its captivity. Moreover, the application of the blood to the cleansed man's ear, hand, and foot yields the same teaching as the similar rite in the consecration of priests. (See pp. 48, 81.)

In the *Peace-Offering*, unlike those with which we have just dealt, there was inherent a feeling of joyousness, either as celebrating a happy occasion in the people's life (e.g. 1 Sam. xi. 15; 1 Kgs i. 19), or some important event in connexion with a family or individual (e.g. Gen. xxxi. 54; 1 Kgs xix. 21). It promoted the feeling of solidarity in the nation or family, and also pointed to dependence upon God for protection and for all the blessings of life. The original meaning of the Heb. word שלם (*Shĕlem*)

[1] See introd. note to ch. xiii.
[2] See also notes on ch. xiv. 1—15.

is obscure. The rendering in EVV comes through the LXX. (*θυσία εἰρηνική*) and Vulg. (*hostia pacificorum*). In that case it is the sacrifice offered when friendly relations, as opposed to estrangement, exist between God and the worshippers. But others take it as derived from a different sense of the same Heb. root, viz. 'to make whole,' hence 'to make restitution,' and so to offer vows or thanksgivings (R.V. mg. 'thank-offering') in consideration of Divine blessings looked for or received. The sharing of the feast with God gave it a festal or eucharistic character. It emphasized a communion with God, and so corresponds to the union of God with man through Christ in the Christian dispensation, and the sharing through spiritual oneness with Him in the gifts which He bestows upon His church. The sprinkling of the blood in this and the preceding sacrifices typifies for us the application of the Death of our Heavenly Priest in procuring for us remission of sin, and so entrance into the privileges belonging to God's children[1].

We may add that of the four kinds of sacrifice with which we have dealt hitherto the first and last were part of the ordinary public worship, while the second and third were more or less occasional, and indicated exceptional relations between God and the individual or community.

The *Meal-Offering*. No animal sacrifice was complete without this addition. For the meaning of the Heb. word *minḥah* see note at the beginning of ch. ii. As the Burnt-Offering represented the consecration of ourselves without reserve to God's service, so this offering, consisting as it did of the fruits of man's labour, contains the complementary teaching that all our works are to be dedicated in like manner, whether as regards directly religious or benevolent activities, or our secular employments, such as the procuring or preparing of food needful for our human needs. Incense, here (ii. 2) as elsewhere employed to add to sacrifice 'a sweet smell,' has its symbolism suggested for us, as for the Hebrews of old, by the words of the Psalm (cxli. 2), 'Let my prayer be set forth as incense before thee.' So in Luke i. 10 we read of the people being engaged in

[1] For the various kinds of Peace-Offerings see notes on vii. 11 ff., and for the ceremony of 'waving' see App. V, pp. 183 ff.

prayer, while Zacharias within the sanctuary offered incense. Cp. Rev. v. 8, 'golden bowls full of incense, which are the prayers of the saints.' The duty of exclusion of a corrupt element from all our works is indicated by the command that no leaven (cp. 1 Cor. v. 7) or honey should be used, which both contain the elements of fermentation and decay (ch. ii. 11), while the modification of this prohibition found in *v.* 12, may be taken as conveying to us the reminder that God 'is graciously pleased to accept even offerings in which sinful imperfection is found, provided only that, as in the offering of firstfruits, there be the hearty recognition of His rightful claim, before all others, to the first and best we have[1].'

The *shew-bread*, literally, bread of the presence, resembled the Meal-Offering in material, including the frankincense which formed part of the offering. Both therefore represent the consecration of employment, whether religious or secular, to God. But while the Meal-Offering teaches this lesson as regards the individual worshipper, the shew-bread, as presented by the people as a whole, emphasizes the national aspect of the same duty, as confessing the claims of God for collective recognition on the part of communities or states.

We have left to the end the teaching of the annual *Day of Atonement* (Lev. xvi.), the one day in the year on which every one was to 'afflict his soul' (xvi. 29, 31). Purity in approach to God was there symbolized by the high priest's bathing himself in water and wearing white garments. The sacrifices offered on that occasion, and the ceremonies connected with the goat sent into the wilderness 'for Azazel,' seem to shew that whether the idea of propitiation be veiled or absent as regards some other sacrifices, here at least it enters fully. The sacrificial system of P evidently includes much which was the result of earlier modes of thought, and the idea of transference of guilt may have been comparatively late in development. The notion of substitution of one victim for another was already familiar (Gen. xxii. 13).

The vicarious nature of the sufferings of the righteous servant of Jehovah (see above) is plainly expressed in Is. liii.

[1] Kellogg, *Leviticus*, p. 74.

A combination of this idea with an acknowledgment that sin deserved death, would suffice to bring out the full meaning of the rites and offerings made on the Day of Atonement. Accordingly, the Jewish observances of that Day, which has been appropriately called 'the Good Friday of the Law[1],' point to the 'better sacrifices than these,' viz. the one offering of Him who 'put away sin by the sacrifice of himself' (Heb. ix. 26). As the sins of the nation were in a figure borne away to the wilderness by the scapegoat, so the sins of mankind were borne by the Saviour 'in his body upon the tree' (1 Pet. ii. 24), the Lord 'laid on him the iniquity of us all' (see Is. liii. 5, 6). The goat that was slain was figuratively considered as identical with that which was sent away to be a sinbearer. Christ in His Person, dying and living again, combined the two functions of atonement for sin and removal of its burden. Lastly, the entrance of the high priest alone into the sanctuary within the veil with the blood of the people's Sin-Offering (Lev. xvi. 15 f.) represents for us (Heb. x. 19—22) the efficacy of Christ's atoning work in presenting perpetually before God His Blood, i.e. His life freed for eternal uses by death[2], and of His mediatorial work in opening to us access to the presence of God.

Other passages bearing on Leviticus in the N.T. are Matt. viii. 2 ff. (parallels Mark i. 40 ff.; Luke v. 12 ff.); Luke xvii. 12 ff. (leprosy); Heb. viii. 2, ix. 8—11 (the Tabernacle), ix. 24, 28 (a possible reference to Azazel). In Rev. iv. 5 the 'seven lamps' are an allusion to the lamps of Lev. xxiv. 2, 4.

Thus we see that the Book contributes no inconsiderable share to the development of the Messianic idea, which from faint beginnings became more definitely recognised in Jewish thought and expression as a heritage of the Jewish race.

[1] Archer-Shepherd, *The Ritual of the Tabernacle*, p. 107.
[2] See Art. *Day of Atonement* (M°Neile) in *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, vol. i.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Earlier Commentaries, such as those of C. F. Keil, 1870, or M. Kalisch, 1867, 1872, are now somewhat out of date. Those who read German may consult with advantage the Commentaries of A. Dillmann, edited by V. Ryssel, 1897, Baentsch (in Nowack's *Handkommentar*), 1900, and the same writer's *Heiligkeits-Gesetz* (on Lev. xvii—xxvi), 1893, A. Bertholet (in Marti's *Hand-Commentar*), 1901, C. H. Cornill, *Einleitung*, 1905[6] (translated by G. H. Box, 1907). For criticism on the text and discussion of its sources the following works will be found valuable: J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, etc., 1899[3] and *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 1895[7] (translated under the title *History of Israel*, 1885). Among English works deserving of notice are *Leviticus*, with critical and exegetical notes by S. R. Driver and H. A. White, in P. Haupt's Series of the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament* (Hebrew text with English notes), 1894; A. R. S. Kennedy, *Leviticus* (*Century Bible* Series), 1911. The student may also refer to the portions of the following works which relate to this Book: J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch* (referred to in the following notes as the *Oxford Hexateuch*), 2 vols., 1900. The different sources are distinguished typographically, with explanatory notes, while in vol. i. (also published separately under the title, *Composition of the Hexateuch*, 1902) the grounds on which the critical view rests are fully set forth; A. T. Chapman, *Introduction to the Pentateuch* (Camb. Bible Series), 1911; the Articles on Leviticus and on the Pentateuch in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, etc. (1898—1902) and the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (1899—1903).

The following books deal with the value of Leviticus in its application to religious thought and life: W. Sanday, *Priesthood and Sacrifice*, 1900; S. H. Kellogg, in the *Expositor's Bible* Series, 1891; E. H. Archer-Shepherd, *Ritual of the Tabernacle*, 1908; A. Cave, *Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice and Atonement*, 1890.

The following may also be consulted: S. A. Cook, *Laws of Moses, etc.*, 1903; C. H. W. Johns, *The Oldest Code of Laws in the World* (those of Ḥammurabi), 1905.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS VOLUME.

O.T. Old Testament.
N.T. New „
MS. (MSS.). Manuscript(s).
Heb. or MT. The original Hebrew text as edited by the Massoretes or Jewish scholars from about the 6th to the 10th century A.D.
LXX or Sept. The translation of the Old Testament into Greek; traditionally said to have been made by seventy persons. It was really made gradually, wholly or mostly during the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C.
Vulg. The Latin translation of the Bible made by St Jerome (latter part of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century A.D.).
Targ. A paraphrase or free translation into Aramaic, made for the use of those Jews who were no longer familiar with Hebrew. In its present form it dates from about the 5th century A.D.
Targ. Ps-Jon. A Targum dating not earlier than the 7th century A.D., and ascribed erroneously to Jonathan bar Uzziel, the reputed author of a Targum on the Prophets.
Syr. or Pesh. The Syriac translation known as the Peshiṭṭo.
Tal. Bab. The Babylonian Talmud. Its material (of varying date), consisting of Mishna (i.e. a commentary on the M.T.) and Gemara (i.e. a further commentary, or critical expansion of the Mishna), was brought to its present shape by Jewish scholars in the course of the 5th and 6th centuries A.D.
A.V. The Authorised Version (A.D. 1611).
R.V. The Revised Version (O.T. A.D. 1885; N.T. 1881).
R.V.mg. Revised Version, margin.
EVV. Used where the English Versions (Authorised and Revised) agree.
C.B. Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.
Vss. Versions (Sept., Vulgate, etc.).
HDB. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Enc. Bib. *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*
ICC. *International Critical Commentary.*

JBL. Journal of Biblical Literature.

LOT.[9] Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the O.T.*, 9th ed. 1913.

ZATW. Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.

ZDPV. Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palaestina-Vereins.

Bae. *HK.* B. Baentsch, in Nowack's *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament.* 1900.

Bae. *HG.* B. Baentsch, *Heiligkeits-Gesetz.* 1893.

Berth. *KHC.* A. Bertholet, in Marti's *Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament.* 1901.

Oxf. Hex. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *The Hexateuch* (2 vols.). 1900.

Dillm. A. Dillmann, *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament.* 1897.

Fr. *G.B.* Sir J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 2nd ed. 1900. 3rd ed. 1911.

Kue. *Hex.* A. Kuenen, *The Hexateuch* (Eng. transl.). 1886.

Rob.-Sm. *OTJC.* W. Robertson-Smith, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 2nd ed. 1892.

Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.* W. Robertson-Smith, *Religion of the Semites.* Revised ed. 1894.

SBOT. Driver and White in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament.* 1894.

Wellh. *Prol. H.I.* J. Wellhausen's *History of Israel* (Eng. transl.). 1885.

Wellh. *C.H.*[3] J. Wellhausen's *Die Composition des Hexateuchs etc.*, 3rd ed. 1899.

Intr. to Pent. A. T. Chapman's *Introduction to the Pentateuch* (Camb. Bible Series). 1911.

Cent. Bible. A. R. S. Kennedy, *Century Bible.* 1911.

† Marks a word or expression as not occurring in the O.T. except in the place or places mentioned.

SYMBOLS EMPLOYED IN THE CRITICISM OF THE PENTATEUCH.

JE The two sources, which, combined, form a large part of the material of the Pentateuch. They are so called from their strong preference respectively for the two names for God, Jehovah and Elohim. See p. xi, and books there referred to, and Driver, Exod. (*C. B.*) for a further account of them.

D Those portions of the Pent. which belong in style to that of the Book of Deuteronomy.

P The Priestly Code, containing as its *groundwork* (P^g) a

P^g narrative from the Creation till the nation of Israel received its promised inheritance. In this historical framework a series of legislative and ceremonial enactments came to be included.

P^t These have been called P^t (i.e. *tōrōth*) or directions for the guidance of the community in matters ceremonial, and

P^s P^s (*secondary* enactments) combined with the earlier strata. See further, pp. 174 ff.

H Sometimes applied to the separate group of laws, viz. chs. xvii.—xxvi., which lay special stress on the duty of holiness, hence called the 'Law of Holiness,' more properly to those laws embedded in these chs., which are distinct from the Priestly Code.

R^h A Reviser who combined laws taken mainly from existing codes with a hortatory and warning element.

R^p A Reviser, who, probably after that collection had been combined with the Priestly Code, introduced further elements from that Code.

THE THIRD BOOK OF MOSES,

COMMONLY CALLED

LEVITICUS

AND the LORD called unto Moses, and spake unto him 1
out of the tent of meeting, saying, Speak unto the 2
children of Israel, and say unto them, When any man of
you offereth an oblation unto the LORD, ye shall offer

CHS. I—VII. THE LAW OF SACRIFICE.

The first part of this law comprising chs. i.—vi. 7 [Heb. i.—v.] is addressed to the children of Israel. The first two verses are introductory.

1. *And the LORD called*] The tabernacle had been reared up, and the cloud had covered it (Exod. xl. 17—34); Moses, who was not able to enter into the tent of meeting (xl. 35), remains without, and receives the first ordinances issued from within the tent. The verse connects these ordinances about sacrifice (chs. i.—vii.) with Exod. xl. 35, and the erection of the tabernacle.

out of the tent of meeting] The place from which God issues His commands is more exactly described (Exod. xxv. 22; Num. vii. 89) as 'from above the mercy-seat, from between the two cherubim.' The tent ('tabernacle' A.V.) is called the 'tent of meeting' (Heb. *'Ohel Mō'ĕd*) because it is the *appointed place of meeting* where the Lord meets Moses (Exod. xxv. 22, xxx. 6, 36), and the children of Israel (xxix. 43). The account of the tent of meeting in Ex. xxxiii. 7—11 (E), though different in some points from that of P, describes it as the place where the Lord meets Moses ('the pillar of cloud descended, and stood at the door (opening) of the Tent: and *the* LORD spake with Moses'). See Driver's notes on Exod. xxvii. 21, and on the passages here quoted, and *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 84 f. The translation of A.V. *tabernacle of the congregation* renders *mō'ĕd* ('appointed meeting place') as if it were *'ēdāh* (congregation), and suggests that the tabernacle was the place where the children of Israel assembled. But they were not allowed to come near it (Num. xvii. 13); only priests and Levites were permitted to draw nigh.

2. *oblation*] Heb. *korban*, from a root signifying 'to come near'; a general term for anything brought near to God, whether sacrifice, or

your oblation of the cattle, *even* of the herd and of the flock.

3 If his oblation be a burnt offering of the herd, he shall offer it a male without blemish: he shall offer it at the door of the tent of meeting, that he may be accepted before the

other sacred gift. It occurs frequently in chs. i.—vii., also in ix. 7, 15, xvii. 4, xxii. 18, 27, xxiii. 14, xxvii. 9, 11 (in 11 'sacrifice' A.V.); Num. v. 15 (the meal offering of jealousy), vi. 14, 21 (the offerings of the Nazirite), vii. (the offerings of the princes, parts of which were not for sacrifice), ix. 7, 13 (the passover), xv. 4, 25, xviii. 9 ('oblation' A.V.), xxviii. 2, xxxi. 50 ('oblation' A.V., the spoil of Midian).

In the Pent., the word occurs only in Lev. and Num.; outside the Pent., it is found in Ezek. xx. 28, xl. 43; Neh. x. 35, xiii. 31. In Neh. the first syllable of the word has the vowel *ă*; both R.V. and A.V. translate *ḳurban hā'ĕẓim* by 'wood offering.' R.V. renders 'oblation' except in Ezek. xx. 28 and Neh.; A.V. generally has 'offering'; other renderings are noted in the list of passages given above. The verb from the same root is used in the Hiph.; it is applied to the action both of the layman and the priest, and is translated 'offer.'

The verse refers only to animal sacrifices, and serves as an introduction to the Burnt-Offering, and to the Peace-Offering of ch. iii.

of the herd and of the flock] i.e. large and small cattle. An offering of birds (*vv.* 14—17) is not mentioned here.

Ch. I. 3—17. The Burnt-Offering.

For general remarks on the Burnt-Offering see on vi. 9. Three varieties may be brought, viz. (*a*) Bullock (3—9), (*b*) Sheep or Goat (10—13), (*c*) Fowls (14—17).

(*a*) *Bullock* (3—9).

3. *a male without blemish*] In the sacrificial system of the Hebrews, the male animal is regarded as of more value than the female. It is prescribed for the Burnt-Offering, and for the principal feasts (Exod. xii. 5; Num. xxviii., xxix.), but for the Peace-Offering and some others (iii. 1, iv. 28—32) a female may be brought. In some countries females were spared for purposes of breeding, and for the value of their milk, and when offered were considered a more costly oblation; generally, however, males were preferred. For details, cp. Dillm. *in loc.* and Daremberg et Saglio, *Dict. des Antiq. Gr. et Rom.* Art. *Sacrificium.* The necessity for the victim being without blemish was recognised by nearly all nations who brought animal sacrifices. Cp. xxii. 20 and Deut. xv. 21, xvii. 1.

that he may be accepted] Here and in xix. 5, xxii. 19, 29 A.V. has translated *of* [*at*] *his* [*your*] *own* (*voluntary*) *will*, but xxii. 20, 21, xxiii. 11, Exod. xxviii. 38 are translated as in R.V. The rendering of

LORD. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the 4
burnt offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make

R.V. is the correct one in all these passages, the Heb. (*rāṣōn*) being the same in all. The word is used in connexion with the Burnt-Offering and the Peace-Offering but not in reference to the Sin-Offering. In *v.* 4 *and it shall be accepted for him*, the verb of the same Heb. root is used. Cp. Isai. lvi. 7, lx. 7; Jer. vi. 20.

4. *he shall lay his hand upon*] This ceremony is prescribed for animal sacrifices generally (1) for the Burnt-Offering here and viii. 18; Exod. xxix. 15; (2) for the Peace-Offering iii. 2, 8, 13; (3) for the Sin-Offering iv. 4, 15, 24, 29, 33, viii. 14; Exod. xxix. 10; 2 Chr. xxix. 23; (4) for both Burnt-Offering and Sin-Offering Num. viii. 12; (5) for the ram of consecration viii. 22; Exod. xxix. 19; (6) for the Levites when presented as a wave-offering Num. viii. 10. There is no mention of the ceremony in connexion with the Guilt-Offering, but from the statement in vii. 7 that there is one law for the Sin-Offering and the Guilt-Offering, and the absence of ritual detail in v. 14—vi. 7, it seems probable that the ceremony was not omitted when a Guilt-Offering was brought. On the Day of Atonement Aaron laid both his hands on the live goat which was sent away into the wilderness (Lev. xvi. 21); when a blasphemer was put to death by stoning, all those that heard him were to lay their hands upon him (xxiv. 14 and cp. the story of Susanna *v.* 34); Moses appointed his successor Joshua by laying his hands upon him (Num. xxvii. 18, 23; Deut. xxxiv. 9).

In all these passages the Heb. word for 'lay' is *ṣāmak*, and the action was called in post-Biblical Heb. *ṣĕmīkah*. Something more than a mere putting of the hand on the head is intended; the word implies pressure or leaning upon an object. Targ. Jon. translates i. 3 *he shall lay his right hand with firmness* and Tal. Bab. *Zebāhīm* 33*a* enjoins the exercise of 'all his strength.' Cp. *Chagīgah* 16*b*, where Rami bar Chama says, 'We require the laying on to be done with all one's strength.' According to Jewish tradition a confession of sin accompanied the laying on of hands. It does not seem probable that sacrificial acts were performed altogether in silence; special liturgical forms are prescribed in Deut. xxvi. for two occasions; and it may be that the offerer made some statement of his intention in bringing his oblation, and prayed that the sacrifice might be graciously accepted. The expression 'all his strength' might then refer to mental as well as physical energy.

The rabbinic opinion is that the *ṣĕmīkah* was performed with both hands, but Targ. Jon. quoted above shews that the tradition varied.

and it shall be accepted for him] See on *v.* 3.

to make atonement for him] Either the sacrifice will make atonement (xvii. 11; Exod. xxx. 15, 16), or the priest, by offering the sacrifice (iv. 20, 26, 31, 35). An atoning effect is attributed to the Burnt-Offering here and in xiv. 20, xvi. 24 (cp. Ezek. xlv. 15, 17; Mic.

5 atonement for him. And he shall kill the bullock before
the LORD: and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present the
blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar
6 that is at the door of the tent of meeting. And he shall
7 flay the burnt offering, and cut it into its pieces. And the
sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and
8 lay wood in order upon the fire: and Aaron's sons, the
priests, shall lay the pieces, the head, and the fat, in order
upon the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar:
9 but its inwards and its legs shall he wash with water: and
the priest shall burn the whole on the altar, for a burnt
offering, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto
the LORD.

vi. 6; Job i. 5, xlii. 8), but more often to the Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering.

5, 6. *And he shall kill...flay...and cut it into its pieces*] Many would not be able to flay and divide an animal without assistance; it seems probable that these parts of the ritual were performed by some one else. The plural verbs in LXX. and some other versions (*they shall kill... flay...*) may refer to existing practice, and it appears from 2 Chr. xxix. 34, 34, xxxv. 9—11 that priests and Levites performed these duties.

Aaron's sons, the priests, shall present] *bring* A.V., the same Heb. word as that translated 'offer' in *v.* 3. The priestly action commences here.

and sprinkle] Better, **throw** or **scatter**; the blood was caught in a bowl, and thrown against the sides of the altar twice, in such a manner that the blood touched all the four sides. The priest went to the N.E. corner, and threw the blood against the N. and E. sides, and then to the S.W. corner, where he threw the blood against the S. and W. sides. This is described in Mishna *Zebāhīm* 53*b* as 'two applications of the blood which are four' and quoted by Rashi in his commentary on this verse. For 'sprinkling' with the finger (iv. 6) another Heb. word is used.

door] **entrance**. There were no doors to the tent of meeting, but curtains.

7. *shall put fire upon the altar*] According to vi. 9—13 the fire is kept burning upon the altar.

lay wood in order] The verb 'lay in order' here and in *v.* 8 is different from 'lay' in *v.* 4. The wood was collected and brought by the people (Neh. x. 34).

9. *a sweet savour*] **a soothing odour** (McNeile on Exod. xxix. 18). The word 'savour' in old English is applied to the smell as well as the taste of a thing. See *HDB.* Art. *Savour* and Driver's note (*C.B.*) on Exod. xxix. 18.

And if his oblation be of the flock, of the sheep, or of the goats, for a burnt offering; he shall offer it a male without blemish. And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the LORD: and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall sprinkle its blood upon the altar round about. And he shall cut it into its pieces, with its head and its fat: and the priest shall lay them in order on the wood that is on the fire which is upon the altar: but the inwards and the legs shall he wash with water: and the priest shall offer the whole, and burn it upon the altar: it is a burnt offering, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

And if his oblation to the LORD be a burnt offering of fowls, then he shall offer his oblation of turtle-doves, or of young pigeons. And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and [1]wring off its head, and burn it on the altar; and the blood thereof shall be drained out on the side of the altar: and he shall take away its crop with the [2]filth thereof, and

[1] Or, *pinch* [2] Or, *feathers*

(*b*) *Sheep or Goat* (10—13).

The oblation from the flock was made in the same manner as that from the herd. The whole of the ceremonial is not repeated, but an additional detail is supplied; the Burnt-Offering is killed 'on the side of the altar northward' as also the Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering. By a slight transposition of words *v.* 12 will read thus: 'And he shall cut it into its pieces, and the priest shall lay them in order, and its head and its fat, on the wood...'

(*c*) *Fowls* (14—17).

This kind of offering is not included in the general introduction in *v.* 2. The ritual is slightly altered; the laying the hand on the victim is omitted, the bringing in the hand being equivalent; and the priest performs all the ceremonial.

15. *wring off*] Or, pinch off the head with the nail, as A.V. mg., a word used here and v. 8 only. The head is burnt after being removed, and the remainder of the bird is burnt afterwards. This burning of the parts separately is in marked contrast with the burning of the whole together in the two preceding sections (*v.* 9 and *v.* 13).

drained out on the side of the altar] The blood is too small in quantity to be treated as in the previous cases.

16. *take away its crop with the filth thereof*] i.e. the bird is drawn as when made ready for cooking. The rendering of R.V. mg. (and so

cast it beside the altar on the east part, in the place of the
17 ashes: and he shall rend it by the wings thereof, *but* shall
not divide it asunder: and the priest shall burn it upon the
altar, upon the wood that is upon the fire: it is a burnt
offering, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto
the LORD.

2 And when any one offereth an oblation of a meal offering
unto the LORD, his oblation shall be of fine flour; and he
2 shall pour oil upon it, and put frankincense thereon: and
he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests: and he shall
take thereout his handful of the fine flour thereof, and of

LXX. and Vulg.), as well as the Tal. Bab. (*Zebahim* 64 *b*), describes the removal of the feathers. It is probable that the bird was both cleaned and plucked.

on the east part, in the place of the ashes] The ashes to which the fire has reduced the Burnt-Offering (vi. 10).

17. *rend it by the wings thereof*] The action corresponds to that of dividing into parts (*v.* 6 and *v.* 12), but because of the small size of the bird the division is not completed.

a sweet savour] The offering of fowls is thus described, as well as the offerings of the herd and of the flock, to teach that, whether the offerer bring much or little, it is all one in the sight of God provided only that the heart be directed heavenwards. (Rashi, based on Talm. *Menāḥoth.*)

CH. II. THE MEAL-OFFERING.

The Heb. word *Minḥah* primarily denotes a gift or offering generally, e.g. the present made by Jacob to Esau (Gen. xxxiii. 10). It is also applied to tribute (e.g. Jud. iii. 15—18). When used in connexion with sacrifices, it bears either a wider or a narrower meaning, denoting sometimes an offering made to God whether of animals or grain (thus used of both Cain's and Abel's offering, Gen. iv. 3—5), but often (and in P always) restricted to the sense of grain or cereal offering. This offering consisted for the most part of fine flour mixed with oil and frankincense, to which was added salt. See further in notes on the following *vv.*

The Meal-Offering was generally brought as an accompaniment to an animal offering. The ritual here prescribed is applicable to such cases, and also to a Meal-Offering brought by itself. No quantities are here prescribed; they are given in Num. xv. 1—16 for the *minḥah* when brought with a Burnt-Offering or a Peace-Offering.

The variations between the 2nd persons sing. and pl. in *vv.* 4—15 probably indicate combination of two sources.

2. *and he shall take*] The personal pronoun in the English version refers to the person who brings the offering, but the subject of the verb 'take' is the priest mentioned in the following clause (cp. *v.* 9). Dillm.

the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof; and the priest shall burn *it as* the memorial thereof upon the altar, an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD: and that which is left of the meal offering shall be Aaron's 3 and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire.

And when thou offerest an oblation of a meal offering 4 baken in the oven, it shall be unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, or unleavened wafers anointed with oil. And if thy oblation be a meal offering of the [1]baking pan, 5 it shall be of fine flour unleavened, mingled with oil. Thou 6 shalt part it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it is a meal offering. And if thy oblation be a meal offering of the 7 frying pan, it shall be made of fine flour with oil. And 8

[1] Or, *flat plate*

suggests that the words from 'and he shall take' to 'all the frankincense thereof' may be an addition describing the material of the 'memorial' in the next clause.

the memorial] Heb. *'azkārah*, an expression applied to a part of the Meal-Offering in this ch. and vi. 15; elsewhere v. 12 (of the poor man's Sin-Offering), xxiv. 7 (of the frankincense offered with the shewbread), and Num. v. 26 only (cp. Ecclus. xxxviii. 11, xlv. 16). It is generally explained as an offering which puts God in remembrance (cp. 'memorial' in Acts x. 4, where the Gk. word is the same as in LXX. of these passages), and it has been suggested that Pss. xxxviii. and lxx., with their titles 'to bring to remembrance,' may be in some way connected with this ceremony (Berth. *Bibl. Theol. d. A.T.* ii. p. 67). Others prefer *sweet smelling offering*; cp. Dillm. note here, Isai. lxvi. 3 (see Skinner's note in *C.B.*), and Hos. xiv. 7.

3. *most holy*] See on vi. 12 (end).

4—10. After the general description of *vv.* 1—3, three methods of preparing the Meal-Offering are specified. It may be (1) baken in the oven (*v.* 4), or (2) on a flat plate (*v.* 5, mg. of R.V. and A.V.), or (3) in a frying pan (*v.* 7). In all cases the material is the same; fine flour and oil, and the priest is to treat it in the same way (*vv.* 9, 10 repeat the directions of *vv.* 2, 3).

4. The pouring and the mixing may be done by the ordinary Israelite; from the taking of the handful and onwards the priest officiates. (Rashi.)

The cakes or wafers must be 10 in number.

5. *of the baking pan*] The Heb. word occurs only here and in vi. 21 [Heb. 14], vii. 9, 1 Chr. xxiii. 29 in connexion with sacrifice, and in Ezek. iv. 3 (*pan*, mg. *flat plate*). See on *v.* 7.

7. *frying pan*] Only here and vii. 9. The Mishna (Tal. Bab.

thou shalt bring the meal offering that is made of these things unto the LORD: and it shall be presented unto the
9 priest, and he shall bring it unto the altar. And the priest shall take up from the meal offering the memorial thereof, and shall burn it upon the altar: an offering made by fire,
10 of a sweet savour unto the LORD. And that which is left of the meal offering shall be Aaron's and his sons': it is a thing most holy of the offerings of the LORD made by fire.
11 No meal offering, which ye shall offer unto the LORD, shall be made with leaven: for ye shall burn no leaven, nor any
12 honey, as an offering made by fire unto the LORD. As an oblation of first*fruits* ye shall offer them unto the LORD: but they shall not come up for a sweet savour on the altar.

Menahoth 63 *a*) describes this vessel as having a cover and deep; what is put into it is boiled and moist, while what is placed on the *baking pan* ('flat plate' mg. of R.V. and A.V.) is baked crisp and hard, and broken into pieces (*v.* 6). Cp. vii. 9, 10.

8. *that is made of these things*] of the things prepared as described in the preceding verses.

11. Leaven and honey are not to be mixed with any offering made by fire; they shall be offered as an oblation of *firstfruits* (Heb. *rêshîth*) but not on the altar (*v.* 12). See Driver (*C. B.*) on Am. iv. 5. By 'honey' is meant not only that prepared by bees, but a syrup made from grapes, called by the Arabs *dibs*, the same as Heb. *dĕbâsh*.

Both leaven and honey produce fermentation, a process which has been associated in thought with the working of unruly desires, and considered as a symbol of evil. The idea of corruption in connexion with leaven was familiar to the Romans. Plutarch (*Quaest. Rom.* 109) says: 'Leaven is born of corruption, and corrupts that with which it is mixed...all fermentation is a kind of putrefaction.' The Flamen Dialis, a priest of Jupiter in one of the oldest Roman cults, among many other restrictions of ancient date, was not allowed to touch leavened bread (Sir J. G. Frazer, *Golden Bough*[3], Pt II. 13 and his references on p. 14, note 3, to Aulus Gellius x. 15, Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* xxviii. 146, and other writers: see also Pauly's *Real Encyc.* (ed. G. Wissowa) vi. 2485 ff.). This idea is in the N.T., where 'leaven' is used figuratively of the corrupt doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees (Mt xvi. 16; Lu. xii. 1), and by St Paul as representing 'malice and wickedness' in contrast with 'the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (1 Cor. v. 7, 8). But there is no such contrast implied in the prohibition of leaven at the feast of the Passover (Exod. xii. 15, 19, xiii. 7). The unleavened bread is regarded as 'bread of affliction' (Deut. xvi. 3), less pleasant than ordinary leavened bread, reminding the Israelites of bondage as well as deliverance.

And every oblation of thy meal offering shalt thou season 13
with salt; neither shalt thou suffer the salt of the covenant
of thy God to be lacking from thy meal offering: with all
thine oblations thou shalt offer salt.

And if thou offer a meal offering of firstfruits unto the 14
LORD, thou shalt offer for the meal offering of thy firstfruits
corn in the ear parched with fire, bruised corn of the fresh
ear. And thou shalt put oil upon it, and lay frankincense 15
thereon: it is a meal offering. And the priest shall burn 16
the memorial of it, part of the bruised corn thereof, and
part of the oil thereof, with all the frankincense thereof: it
is an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

13. ***shalt thou season with salt***] Salt, which is necessary for those who eat farinaceous food and a pleasant condiment with flesh meat, was freely used by the Hebrews, Greeks, Romans, and other nations of antiquity. They brought it as an accompaniment of sacrifice, in accordance with the primitive view of sacrifice as the food of the gods (cp. ch. xxi. 22). It may have been an element in the Jewish ritual from the earliest times. The phrase 'salt of the covenant of thy God' indicates that a symbolical meaning was also attached to it. A covenant among ancient peoples was ratified by eating food together (Gen. xxxi. 54) with which salt was generally taken. 'There is salt between us' is in the mouth of the Arab a declaration of friendship and obligation; God's covenants with Levi and David are 'covenants of salt' (Num. xviii. 19; 2 Chr. xiii. 5); so here 'the salt of the covenant' implies that the Israelite, by reason of his covenant relation with God, was bound to bring with his sacrifice the offering of a willing heart (Pss. liv. 6, cxix. 108). Salt with sacrifice is enjoined in Ezek. xliii. 24, and referred to Mk ix. 49. For the remission of the tax on salt, cp. 1 Macc. x. 29, xi. 35, and Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3. 3. For the *mola salsa* of the Romans (Hor. *Sat.* ii. 3. 200) and other classical references to salt with sacrifice, see the Articles on *Salt* in *HDB.* and *Enc. Bib.*

14—16. Meal-Offering of firstfruits (Heb. ***bikkūrīm***). The ***rēshīth*** of *v.* 12 is not to be offered on the altar, while the 'memorial' of the ***bikkūrīm*** is offered (*v.* 16) as 'an offering made by fire unto the *LORD*.'

14. ***corn in the ear***] Heb. *Ābīb*, from which the Passover month is named.

parched with fire] Cp. Ruth ii. 14.

bruised corn of the fresh ear] Heb. ***gēres karmel.*** The first word occurs only here and in *v.* 16; *karmel* is found xxiii. 14 and 2 Kgs iv. 42. The bruised corn is treated as the fine flour of *v.* 1; a memorial of it is burnt, and the remainder would be for the priests. Cp. *vv.* 1—3 and *v.* 10.

3 And if his oblation be a sacrifice of [1]peace offerings; if
he offer of the herd, whether male or female, he shall offer
2 it without blemish before the LORD. And he shall lay his
hand upon the head of his oblation, and kill it at the door
of the tent of meeting: and Aaron's sons the priests shall
3 sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. And he
shall offer of the sacrifice of peace offerings an offering
made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that covereth the
4 inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and
the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which
is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver, [2]with the

[1] Or, *thank offerings*
[2] Or, *which he shall take away by the kidneys*

CH. III. THE PEACE-OFFERING.

1. *And if his oblation*] This clause introducing the Peace-Offering corresponds to i. 3 which stands at the beginning of the regulations for the Burnt-Offering.

The Peace-Offering may be either male or female, (*a*) of the herd (1—5) or of the flock either (*b*) a lamb (7—11), or (*c*) a goat (12—16). The age is not specified. The procedure should be carefully compared with that for the Burnt-Offering in ch. i. There is nothing corresponding to the last clauses of i. 3, 4 referring to acceptance and atonement.

3. The portions of the Peace-Offering taken for sacrifice are described in *vv.* 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 15 in almost identical words. In the case of the lamb the *fat tail entire* was also burnt (*v.* 9). The sheep of Palestine have a broad fatty excrescence on the tail, used now in cooking instead of butter. This was not to be eaten but taken away hard by the backbone and offered. The Heb. word (*'alyah*) occurs *v.* 9 (see note), and vii. 3, viii. 25, ix. 19; Exod. xxix. 22 only in MT. But (see on *v.* 9) it should also be read in 1 Sam. ix. 24. The A.V. has *rump* in all these places. As the parts sacrificed were different for the lamb and the goat, it was necessary to treat each case separately; hence the subdivision is not exactly the same as in ch. i.

the fat that covereth the inwards] By this is probably meant the membrane which covers the intestines, and is called the *great omentum*. Thick pieces of fat are found adhering to it, if the animal is healthy and well fed. Pieces of fat are also found on the intestines, and these are described as *the fat that is upon the inwards*.

4. *the two kidneys, and the fat...by the loins*] Between the kidneys and the backbone are thick layers of fat. These may be seen in the carcases of sheep and lambs in butchers' shops; the *omentum* and the liver are generally removed before they are exposed for sale.

the caul upon the liver] Here and in *vv.* 10, 15, iv. 9, vii. 4; Exod. xxix. 13; *the caul of the liver* Exod. xxix. 22; Lev. viii. 16, 25,

kidneys, shall he take away. And Aaron's sons shall burn 5

ix. 19; *the caul from the liver* ix. 10. The Heb. word translated 'caul' occurs only in these passages, and A.V. has the preposition 'above' in all of them. By 'caul' is here meant the membrane known as the *small omentum*, which covers the liver, the *reticulum jecoris* of Vulg. Jerome probably obtained the meaning from his Hebrew teachers. Mediaeval Jewish commentators interpret in the same way, or, as A.V. mg. renders, 'midriff.'

But Moore in *Enc. Bib.* iv. p. 4206 had expressed his opinion that the *lobus caudatus* of the liver is the part indicated by the Heb. text. In an Article contributed to *Orient. Studien Th. Nöldeke gewidmet* (1906) ii. 761 ff. he examined fully the renderings of the LXX. and other versions, quotations from the Mishna and other Jewish authorities, and shewed that the oldest tradition supported this interpretation. The Heb. literally translated is *the redundance upon the liver which he shall take away along with the kidneys*. Something connected with the liver, but in the nature of an appendage, which can be removed when the kidneys with the fat enclosing them are taken away, is indicated. From the right lobe of the liver of a sheep projects upwards an excrescence like a finger lying close to the right kidney fat, reaching about halfway up the kidney, which can easily be separated from the liver when the kidney with its surrounding fat is removed according to the directions in *vv.* 3, 4. It is called (Tal. Bab. *Tamid* 31*a*) 'the finger of the liver,' a more descriptive title than 'the nut,' given to it by the modern butcher. Anatomists call it *lobus caudatus*, and it appears to be clearly indicated by the Heb. *yōthéreth*, *redundance*, and the directions which imply its proximity to the kidney.

The LXX. translate, ὁ λοβός, and as there are several lobes in the liver, this was by some interpreted to mean the great upper lobe. But Greek writers who refer to divination by means of the liver (Eurip. *Electra*, 827 f., Aesch. *Eumen.* 155 f., *Prom. Vinc.* 509 f., and other references in Moore's Article) employ λοβός to denote *lobus caudatus*, which was observed with special care by the haruspex. Latin writers employ the phrase *caput jecoris*, and Cicero, *de Divin.* ii. 13 says that it is regarded as a most unfavourable omen if this part of the liver is not found. When Agesilaus (Xen. *Hellenica*, iii. 4. 15) desired to know whether the omens were favourable to an advance with his army, the animal's liver was found defective in this respect; whereupon he retreated to the coast. The renderings of Targ. and Peshitto (for which see Moore) confirm the conclusions already drawn.

For the significance of the parts reserved for sacrifice, as the seat of life and passions, see *Rel. Sem.*[2] pp. 379 f. The agreement between Semite, Greek, and the aboriginal Australian as there shewn should be particularly noted.

The description given above applies to the carcase of a sheep as exposed in the shops with the head downwards. The liver with the *lobus caudatus* has been removed, but the place where it rested against

it on the altar upon the burnt offering, which is upon the wood that is on the fire: it is an offering made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD.

6 And if his oblation for a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD be of the flock; male or female, he shall offer it
7 without blemish. If he offer a lamb for his oblation, then
8 shall he offer it before the LORD: and he shall lay his hand upon the head of his oblation, and kill it before the tent of meeting: and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle the blood thereof
9 upon the altar round about. And he shall offer of the sacrifice of peace offerings an offering made by fire unto the LORD; the fat thereof, the fat tail entire, he shall take it away hard by the backbone; and the fat that covereth the
10 inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver, with the kidneys, shall
11 he take away. And the priest shall burn it upon the altar: it is the [1]food of the offering made by fire unto the LORD.

[1] Heb. *bread.*

the right kidney can be seen. The 'right' is that opposite to the right hand of the person looking at it, and is the right side of the sheep when alive and on its legs; 'upwards' would then be 'horizontally.'

It is interesting to note that earlier English versions observe the distinction of prepositions as in R.V. and though in Exod. xxix. they render 'the kal of the lyver,' they have the word 'ab(o)unda(u)nce,' with variation of spelling, instead of 'kal' in Lev. The Bishops' Bible (1568) has 'kall' throughout.

5. *on the altar upon the burnt offering*] The remains of the daily Burnt-Offering were not removed till the following morning, when a fresh Burnt-Offering was placed on wood kindled from the fire of yesterday. The fat parts of the Peace-Offering were placed upon the Burnt-Offering of the day. Cp. vi. 12.

9. The fat tail here reserved for sacrifice was regarded as a delicacy, and set before Saul. In 1 Sam. ix. 24 for 'that which was upon it' should be read 'the fat tail'; see Driver *in loc.*, and note on Exod. xxix. 22.

the backbone] The Heb. word occurs here only.

11. *the food of the offering made by fire*] *bread*, R.V. mg. So in *v.* 16.

It is to be noted that in chs. i.—iii. *how* the sacrifices are to be offered is prescribed but not *when*. Further regulations are found in ch. vii. and Num. xv. about the *minḥah* and Drink-Offering.

And if his oblation be a goat, then he shall offer it before 12
the LORD: and he shall lay his hand upon the head of it, 13
and kill it before the tent of meeting: and the sons of
Aaron shall sprinkle the blood thereof upon the altar round
about. And he shall offer thereof his oblation, *even* an 14
offering made by fire unto the LORD; the fat that covereth
the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the inwards, and 15
the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by
the loins, and the caul upon the liver, with the kidneys,
shall he take away. And the priest shall burn them upon 16
the altar: it is the food of the offering made by fire, for
a sweet savour: all the fat is the LORD'S. It shall be a 17
perpetual statute throughout your generations in all your
dwellings, that ye shall eat neither fat nor blood.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the $\frac{4}{2}$
children of Israel, saying, If any one shall sin [1]unwittingly,
in any of the things which the LORD hath commanded not

[1] Or, *through error*

17 *Fat and blood forbidden.*

The prohibition is repeated more fully in vii. 23—27; cp. xvii. 10 f. Note the 2nd pers. plur., and for the expression 'a perpetual statute, etc.' cp. xxiii. 14, 21, 31; Exod. xii. 14, 17, 24.

CHS. IV. 1—V. 13. THE SIN-OFFERING.

iv. 1, 2. A general introduction like that in i. 1, 2. From here to vi. 7 a new class of sacrifices are prescribed, the Sin-Offerings and Guilt-Offerings, and the *occasions* on which they are to be brought are specified, while in chs. i.—iii. nothing is said about *when* the sacrifices are to be brought; their ceremonial only is regulated. The Sin-Offering is for sins committed *unwittingly* (*through ignorance* A.V.); for sins committed presumptuously (Heb. *with an high hand*, Num. xv. 30) the punishment is 'that soul shall be cut off from among his people.' The same distinction is drawn in Ps. xix. where 'hidden ('secret' A.V.) *faults*' (*v.* 12) are contrasted with 'presumptuous *sins*' (*v.* 13). After this general statement, the material and manner of the offering are prescribed for four different classes: (*a*) the anointed priest (3—12), (*b*) the congregation (13—21), (*c*) a ruler (22—26), (*d*) any one of the common people (27—35). Cp. Num. xv. 22—29.

We may observe that the directions for disposal of the Sin-Offering,

3 to be done, and shall do any one of them: if the anointed
priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people; then let
him offer for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock
4 without blemish unto the LORD for a sin offering. And he
shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tent of meeting
before the LORD; and he shall lay his hand upon the head
5 of the bullock, and kill the bullock before the LORD. And
the anointed priest shall take of the blood of the bullock,
6 and bring it to the tent of meeting: and the priest shall dip
his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven
times before the LORD, before the veil of the sanctuary.

though very similar in all four cases, are not absolutely identical. In (*a*) and (*b*) some of the blood is to be put upon the horns of the *altar of incense* inside the tent of meeting; all the rest of the blood is to be poured out at the foot of the *altar of burnt offering* at the door of the tent of meeting; the fat is to be burnt upon the altar of Burnt-Offering; the whole bullock is to be burnt without the camp: in (*c*) and (*d*) some of the blood is to be put upon the horns of the *altar of burnt offering*; all the rest is to be poured out at the foot of that altar; the fat is to be burnt upon the altar; there is no command given as to the remainder.

We notice that on no occasion is the *whole* burnt upon the altar, as in the case of the Burnt-Offering.

3—12. *The high priest's Sin-Offering, a bullock*

3. *the anointed priest*] So called here and in *vv.* 5, 16, vi. 22; 'the high priest' in xxi. 10; Num. xxxv. 25, 28; 'the chief priest' 2 Kgs xxv. 18; 2 Chr. xix. 11, xxiv. 11, xxvi. 20, xxxi. 10; Ezr. vii. 5.

shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people] If the anointed priest, as the representative of the community towards God, bring guilt on the people, his offering must be the same as that for the community (13—21), 'a young bullock without blemish' (*v.* 3, cp. *v.* 14). 'Young' is interpreted traditionally 'in his third year,' or, according to some, older.

4—7. Cp. 14—18. The first part of the ceremonial is like that of the Burnt-Offering. The disposal of the blood is different: the priest dips his finger into the blood, which has been caught in a bowl, and sprinkles it seven times before the veil of the sanctuary, i.e. the veil between the Holy of Holies and the Holy Place. He then puts some of the blood on the horns of the altar of incense with the finger (for each sprinkling and each touching the horns of the altar, tradition prescribes a separate dipping of the finger into the bowl), and, going outside the tent of meeting and back again to the west side of the altar, pours the rest (*all the blood*, *vv.* 7, 18) at the base of the altar of Burnt-Offering.

And the priest shall put of the blood upon the horns of the 7
altar of sweet incense before the LORD, which is in the tent
of meeting; and all the blood of the bullock shall he pour
out at the base of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the
door of the tent of meeting. And all the fat of the bullock 8
of the sin offering he shall take off from it; the fat that
covereth the inwards, and all the fat that is upon the
inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon 9
them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver,
with the kidneys, shall he take away, as it is taken off from 10
the ox of the sacrifice of peace offerings: and the priest
shall burn them upon the altar of burnt offering. And the 11
skin of the bullock, and all its flesh, with its head, and with
its legs, and its inwards, and its dung, even the whole 12
bullock shall he carry forth without the camp unto a clean
place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn it on
wood with fire: where the ashes are poured out shall it be
burnt.

The sprinkling of the blood before the veil, here ordered, is a later development of the ritual of Ex. xxix. 12, where it was merely to be put upon the horns of the altar. Thus we have here an example of P^s. Cp. expressions in next *v.* and see App. on P.

7. The 'altar of sweet incense' does not appear in Ex. xxvii.—xxix. (P^g). It must therefore be ascribed to a secondary addition (P^s) to the groundwork of the Priestly Code. See App. on P, pp. 174 f.

before the LORD] The cloud was on the mercy-seat upon the ark in the Holy of Holies; the sprinkling before the veil of the sanctuary was a sprinkling 'before the LORD.' The two phrases describe the same action.

at the base of the altar] The *base* (*bottom* A.V.) is mentioned only in connexion with pouring out the blood of the Sin-Offering in this ch., and in v. 9, viii. 15 (= Exod. xxix. 12), ix. 9.

the altar of burnt offering] A designation which marks P^s. In the legislation of P^g (see last note) there was no need for this distinction. There, accordingly, it was simply called 'the altar' (ix. 7, 8 etc.) and so in P^t (ancient *tôrôth*; see App. on P, pp. 174 f.), e.g. in i. 7 ff., ii. 2, iii. 2 ff. etc.

8—12. Cp. 19—21. The fat parts (the same as those reserved for the altar in the Peace-Offering) are then removed from the bullock, and burnt upon the altar of Burnt-Offering. All the remainder (*even the whole bullock shall he carry forth* in *v.* 12 is traditionally interpreted as directing that the carcase should be carried out whole, and afterwards divided into pieces) shall be taken to a clean place (i.e. one free from

13 And if the whole congregation of Israel shall err, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the assembly, and they have done any of the things which the LORD hath commanded
14 not to be done, and are guilty; when the sin wherein they have sinned is known, then the assembly shall offer a young bullock for a sin offering, and bring it before the tent of
15 meeting. And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the LORD: and
16 the bullock shall be killed before the LORD. And the anointed priest shall bring of the blood of the bullock to
17 the tent of meeting: and the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle it seven times before the LORD,
18 before the veil. And he shall put of the blood upon the horns of the altar which is before the LORD, that is in the tent of meeting, and all the blood shall he pour out at the base of the altar of burnt offering, which is at the door of
19 the tent of meeting. And all the fat thereof shall he take

ritual impurity) where the ashes (i.e. the ashes to which the Burnt-Offering, and other sacrifices burnt on the altar have been reduced by burning) are poured out (cp. i. 16 and vi. 11) and there burnt on wood with fire (cp. Heb. xiii. 11, 12).

The traditional view of the sacrifice prescribed in iv. 3—12 is that it was necessary whenever the high priest had committed any offence in the discharge of his official duty as representative of the nation. In his ordinary life the high priest stands in the same relation to God's law as any other member of the community, and may offer the same sacrifice as the ordinary Israelite. According to some commentators the 'sin' of *v.* 3 refers to any offence whatever of the high priest committed in ignorance. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews points to the ideal high priest who is undefiled, separate from sinners (vii. 26), as distinguished from the high priest under the law, who, by reason of his infirmity, must offer sacrifice for his own sins, and then for the sins of the people (vii. 27, v. 3).

13—21. *The Sin-Offering for the congregation, a bullock.*

14. *the assembly shall offer*] The same Heb. word as that translated 'assembly' in *v.* 13. See on *v.* 20.

15. *the elders*] This expression, common in JE and Deut., occurs in P here and in ix. 1, Josh. xx. 4 only.

18. *the altar which is before the* LORD] The altar of sweet incense, see *v.* 7.

19. *all the fat thereof*] described fully in *vv.* 8—10; the parts which were offered in the Peace-Offering.

off from it, and burn it upon the altar. Thus shall he 20
do with the bullock; as he did with the bullock of the sin
offering, so shall he do with this: and the priest shall make
atonement for them, and they shall be forgiven. And he 21
shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn it
as he burned the first bullock: it is the sin offering for the
assembly.

When a ruler sinneth, and doeth unwittingly any one of 22
all the things which the LORD his God hath commanded not
to be done, and is guilty; if his sin, wherein he hath sinned, 23
be made known to him, he shall bring for his oblation
a goat, a male without blemish; and he shall lay his hand 24
upon the head of the goat, and kill it in the place where

20. *the bullock of the sin offering*] i.e. the bullock referred to in *vv.* 3—12; called 'the first bullock' in *v.* 21.

Another law in Num. xv. 22—26 prescribes an offering to be brought by the whole congregation which differs from that here enjoined, viz. a young bullock for a Burnt-Offering with the accompanying Meal-Offering and Drink-Offering, and a he-goat for a Sin-Offering. The most probable explanation of the divergence is that the laws are from different sources.

Jewish tradition interprets 'the congregation' in this section as referring to the Sanhedrin, and 'the assembly' as meaning the children of Israel. If the Sanhedrin were to give a wrong decision on some point of observance, thereby causing the people who followed such decision to transgress, then the sacrifice enjoined in this section would be necessary. A short treatise of the Mishna (*Horaioth*) discusses decisions of this kind, and the circumstances under which the sacrifice of *vv.* 13—21 should be brought. This interpretation was probably prompted by a desire to reconcile this law with that of Num. xv. 22—26. But in *vv.* 13—21 the words 'assembly' and 'congregation' denote the same thing, the whole community. Note that in *vv.* 14 and 21 the rendering 'congregation' of A.V. is corrected in R.V. to 'assembly,' the Heb. word *kāhāl* being the same as in *v.* 13 where both R.V. and A.V. translate 'assembly.'

22—26. *The Sin-Offering for the ruler, a he-goat.*

The blood in this case is not brought into the tent of meeting but put upon the horns of the altar of Burnt-Offering, and poured out at the base of the altar. The fat and inwards are removed and burnt on the altar as in the two preceding cases. An ordinary priest officiates.

23. *a goat*] lit. a shaggy one of goats, i.e. a hairy goat, an expression used of female goats (*v.* 28) as well as males. The phrase occurs, with

they kill the burnt offering before the LORD: it is a sin
25 offering. And the priest shall take of the blood of the sin offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and the blood thereof shall he pour
26 out at the base of the altar of burnt offering. And all the fat thereof shall he burn upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace offerings: and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin, and he shall be forgiven.
27 And if any one of the [1]common people sin unwittingly, in doing any of the things which the LORD hath commanded
28 not to be done, and be guilty; if his sin, which he hath sinned, be made known to him, then he shall bring for his oblation a goat, a female without blemish, for his sin which
29 he hath sinned. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and kill the sin offering in the place of
30 burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood

[1] Heb. *people of the land.*

the exception of Gen. xxxvii. 31, exclusively in Lev. and Ezek. of the animal brought as a Sin-Offering. Whether a particular breed with long hair is meant, or whether the long hair is due to age, seems doubtful, but the rendering of A.V. 'kid of the goats' is misleading.

24. *where they kill the burnt offering*] Cp. i. 5 and 11; on the side of the altar northward.

The Heb. word for 'ruler' is *nāsī'*, and is used of the princes of the tribes in Num. i. 16, ii. 3, 5 etc., vii., xxxiv. 18. Each of the spies sent in Num. xiii. was a *nāsī'*. The same word is used of the heads of the Gershonites, Kohathites, and Merarites, Num. iii. 24, 30, 35. A.V. has 'captain' in ch. ii., 'chief' in ch. iii., 'prince' in chs. i., vii. and xxxiv., 'ruler' in ch. xiii. R.V. has 'prince' throughout. The word denotes one in authority over a tribe or over a portion of it. Comparing Ezek. xxxiv. 24 'my servant David prince' (*nāsī'* Heb.) with xxxvii. 24 'my servant David shall be king,' Jewish tradition infers that a king is meant in this passage.

27—35. *The Sin-Offering for one of the common people* (Heb. 'people of the land'), *a she-goat or a lamb.*

The she-goat (*v.* 28), according to Num. xv. 27, was to be of the first year. The lamb (*v.* 32) was also to be a female. The ritual is the same for both animals, and like that of the offering of the ruler. The reason for treating the two in separate paragraphs is the same as in the case of the Peace-Offering.

thereof with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and all the blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar. And all the fat thereof 31
shall he take away, as the fat is taken away from off the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the LORD; and the priest shall make atonement for him, and he shall be forgiven.

And if he bring a lamb as his oblation for a sin offering, 32
he shall bring it a female without blemish. And he shall 33
lay his hand upon the head of the sin offering, and kill it for a sin offering in the place where they kill the burnt offering. And the priest shall take of the blood of the 34
sin offering with his finger, and put it upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, and all the blood thereof shall he pour out at the base of the altar: and all the fat thereof 35
shall he take away, as the fat of the lamb is taken away from the sacrifice of peace offerings; and the priest shall burn them on the altar, [1]upon the offerings of the LORD made by fire: and the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven.

And if any one sin, in that he heareth the voice of 5

[1] Or, *after the manner of*

31. *for a sweet savour unto the* LORD] This expression occurs only here in connexion with Sin-Offerings.

35. *upon the offerings*] 'after the manner of' R.V. mg. Either the portions are to be burnt upon the remains of sacrifices already offered, or in the same way as other fire-offerings.

V. 1—13[1]. *Three cases in which a Sin-Offering must be brought.*

1. The first case. A man who has either seen a crime perpetrated (e.g. one stealing another's property), or heard something that would assist in detecting the criminal, is bound to declare what he knows when a solemn appeal is made in his hearing (*he heareth the voice of adjuration*). *If he do not utter it* (i.e. if he remain silent though capable of bearing witness) then he is guilty and a Sin-Offering is necessary. Note the reply of Jesus to the high priest's adjuration after having remained silent (Matt. xxvi. 63).

[1] For the reasons which have led critics to assign *vv.* 1—6 to a source other than that of iv. see App. 1 (*a*).

adjuration, he being a witness, whether he hath seen or known, if he do not utter *it*, then he shall bear his iniquity:
2 or if any one touch any unclean thing, whether it be the carcase of an unclean beast, or the carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things, and it be hidden from him, and he be unclean, then he shall be
3 guilty: or if he touch the uncleanness of man, whatsoever

bear his iniquity] incur the punishment due to such transgression.

The mother of Micah (Judg. xvii. 2 R.V. mg.) uttered an adjuration when eleven hundred pieces of silver were stolen from her. She lifted up her voice (according to the custom of those times which was for a long time preserved among the Arabs) calling in the name of God on anyone who knew anything about the matter to reveal it. This appeal her son heard, and in response acknowledged himself to be the thief. The appeal might be made by the person wronged to the bystanders, or if an appeal were made to a judge, he might utter an adjuration. According to the traditional interpretation, the text refers to a case brought into court. In Prov. xxix. 24 reference is made to one who is silent when thus appealed to: the words of A.V. 'he heareth cursing, and bewrayeth *it* not' should be rendered 'he heareth the adjuration and uttereth nothing' (as R.V. with marg. ref. to Lev. v. 1).

This is different from the previous and following cases in which the sin is committed unwittingly.

2, 3. The second case—when anyone unwittingly touches an unclean thing. By 'beast' is meant a wild animal, by 'cattle' one of the herd or of the flock (i. 2).

unclean creeping things] **swarming** things; cp. xi. 29, 31. On the distinction between 'creeping' and 'swarming' things, and the confusion in the renderings of EVV, see *Intr. to Pent.* App. II, pp. 209 f., and *HDB.* i. 518.

the uncleanness of man] Particular cases are specified in chs. xii.—xv. For all contact with uncleanness, washing the clothes and bathing the body in water are prescribed in the chapters referred to and also in xi. 24—40. The same purification is ordered for eating unclean food in xvii. 15, and in the following verse is added—if he does not wash and bathe, he shall bear his iniquity, i.e. if the proper purification is omitted he is liable to punishment. The cases supposed in *vv.* 2, 3 are those where, through ignorance, the purification has been omitted, and a sacrifice is necessary to avert punishment. The traditional explanation is that a Sin-Offering is necessary if, while unclean, a person has done something which may be done only by those who are clean, such as eating of the holy things etc., but there is nothing in the text to support this view. The Sin-Offering seems to be required from anyone in the condition described in xvii. 16, of whom it may be said 'he shall bear his iniquity.'

his uncleanness be wherewith he is unclean, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth of it, then he shall be guilty: or if any one swear rashly with his lips to do 4
evil, or to do good, whatsoever it be that a man shall utter rashly with an oath, and it be hid from him; when he knoweth of it, then he shall be guilty in one of these *things*: and it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these 5
things, that he shall confess that wherein he hath sinned: and he shall bring [1]his guilt offering unto the LORD for his 6

[1] Or, *for his guilt* Or, *his trespass offering*

4. The third case—when anyone utters a rash oath or vow.

swear rashly] The Heb. verb occurs in the Pi'el form (*baṭṭē*) only here and Ps. cvi. 33; in sound it resembles the first part of βαττολογήσητε in Matt. vi. 7. To take an oath or vow lightly, without considering its purport, is a breach of the 3rd commandment, and *when he knoweth of it* (i.e. reflects on, or is reminded of, what he has thoughtlessly uttered), he will acknowledge his guilt, and bring a Sin-Offering. It is not clear whether the offering not only makes atonement for the sin of rash swearing but also procures release from the obligation incurred by the rash oath.

to do evil, or to do good] i.e. to perform any act whatever.

Each of the four verses forms a complete sentence with protasis and apodosis in the text of R.V. and A.V., but all four verses should be taken as forming one long protasis to which *v.* 5 is the apodosis. The translation would then be as follows: [1]If anyone sin...if he do not utter it, but bears his iniquity; [2]or if anyone touch...things, [and it be hidden from him, and he be unclean and guilty;] [3]or if he touch the uncleanness...wherewith he is unclean, and it be hid from him, and he knoweth of it, and is guilty; [4]or if anyone swear...oath, and it be hid from him, and he knoweth of it, and is guilty in one of these things: [5]then it shall be, when he shall be guilty in one of these things, that.... The words in brackets are omitted in LXX.; 'in one of these *things*' at the end of *v.* 4 seems strange, and may be a repetition of the phrase in *v.* 5.

5. The LXX. omit the first clause of *v.* 5 as far as 'these *things*' (this *may* be due to confusion of the phrase with the identical one at the end of *v.* 4 'one of these *things*'). The confession is to be made when he lays his hand on the Sin-Offering (cp. note on i. 4).

6. *his guilt offering*] The Heb. word *'āshām, guilt*, here and in *v.* 7 is also translated *guilt* (*trespass* A.V.) *offering* in *vv.* 15, 16, 18, vi. 6 (for the attitude of the Heb. mind which led to this ambiguity in the sense of *'āshām* see Kennett, etc. *Conceptions of Righteousness and Sin*, p. 8). But the offering here brought is described as a Sin-Offering, and the two birds of *v.* 7 are intended the one for a Sin-

sin which he hath sinned, a female from the flock, a lamb
or a goat, for a sin offering; and the priest shall make
7 atonement for him as concerning his sin. And if his means
suffice not for a lamb, then he shall bring [1]his guilt offering
for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtledoves, or two
young pigeons, unto the LORD; one for a sin offering, and
8 the other for a burnt offering. And he shall bring them
unto the priest, who shall offer that which is for the sin
offering first, and [2]wring off its head from its neck, but shall
9 not divide it asunder: and he shall sprinkle of the blood
of the sin offering upon the side of the altar; and the
rest of the blood shall be drained out at the base of the
10 altar: it is a sin offering. And he shall [3]offer the second

[1] Or, *for his guilt* Or, *his trespass offering* [2] Or, *pinch*
[3] Or, *prepare*

Offering, and the other for a Burnt-Offering. Moreover the substitute for the offering of *vv.* 7—10 (*vv.* 11—13) is twice called a Sin-Offering. In the regulations for the Sin-Offering (iv. 13, 22, 27, v. 2, 3, 4) the bringer of a Sin-Offering is described as guilty (*'āshēm*), and from 2 Kgs xii. 16 ('money for the guilt offerings,' A.V. 'trespass money,' Heb. *kèseph 'āshām*) it appears that Guilt-Offerings were sometimes brought in money. It seems that in these verses the Sin-Offering is regarded as a *fine* due from one who is guilty, and the clause might be translated 'and he shall bring as his **guilt-fine** unto the LORD,' and similarly in *v.* 7. From the LXX. rendering in *v.* 7 it is possible, but by no means certain, that they read 'he shall bring his Sin-Offering for that wherein he hath sinned.' If this reading be adopted, the unusual meaning of *'āshām* will be confined to *v.* 6.

for his sin which he hath sinned] more literally, *as his penalty which he has incurred by sin.*

7. The similarity between this alternative offering for a poor man and that of i. 14—17 is obvious.

8. *and wring off*] as in i. 15. It has been thought that the last clause of the *v.* refers still to the neck, indicating that in this case the head of the bird was not to be wholly separated from the body. But it seems better to take that clause to have the same reference as in i. 17, and to mean that *the body* was not to be divided.

9. *he shall sprinkle*] The same word as in iv. 6, 17, but the sprinkling is not done with the finger, nor is the blood put on the horns of the altar, but upon the side of it. Two birds are brought; the one that is burnt represents the part of the Sin-Offering offered to the LORD, the other the remainder which was the priest's portion.

for a burnt offering, according to the ordinance: and the priest shall make atonement for him as concerning his sin which he hath sinned, and he shall be forgiven.

But if his means suffice not for two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, then he shall bring his oblation for that wherein he hath sinned, the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin offering; he shall put no oil upon it, neither shall he put any frankincense thereon: for it is a sin offering. And he shall bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take his handful of it as the memorial thereof, and burn it on the altar, [1]upon the offerings of the LORD made by fire: it is a sin offering. And the priest shall make atonement for him as touching his sin that he hath sinned in any of these things, and he shall be forgiven: and *the remnant* shall be the priest's, as the meal offering.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, If any one commit a trespass, and sin unwittingly, in the holy things

[1] Or, *after the manner of*

10. *according to the ordinance*] i.e. as prescribed in i. 14—17.

11—13. A further concession in the case of extreme poverty: $\frac{1}{10}$th of an ephah of fine flour is allowed as a substitute for the animal sacrifice. This is treated as a Meal-Offering but described as a Sin-Offering (*vv.* 11, 12). See Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.*[2] p. 242, note 3, with a reference by Frazer to an instance where an offering of rice is called 'eating the soul of the rice,' so that the rice is viewed as a living creature. For approximate amount of an ephah see on vi. 20.

11. *he shall put no oil upon it*] as in the jealousy offering (Num. v. 15).

12. *upon the offerings*] 'after the manner of' R.V. mg. Either it is placed upon the offerings which have been brought during the day, or it is burnt in the same way as other fire-offerings. Cp. iv. 35.

13. the remnant *shall be the priest's*] 'the remnant' is not expressed in Heb. but is supplied by the LXX. It might be supposed that a priest would not be so extremely poor as to bring this offering; tradition however provided that if he did, the whole was to be burnt on the altar, according to vi. 23.

CHS. V. 14—VI. 7. THE GUILT-OFFERING.

Three cases where a Guilt-Offering should be brought are here specified:

(*a*) **15, 16**; if part of what is due to the Lord has been withheld.

15. *commit a trespass*] The Heb. word (*mā'al*) here and in vi. 2

of the LORD; then he shall bring his guilt offering unto the LORD, a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation in silver by shekels, after the shekel of the
16 sanctuary, for a guilt offering: and he shall make restitution for that which he hath done amiss in the holy thing, and shall add the fifth part thereto, and give it unto the priest: and the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the guilt offering, and he shall be forgiven.
17 And if any one sin, and do any of the things which the LORD hath commanded not to be done; though he knew
18 it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity. And he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation, for a guilt offering, unto the priest:

is different from that which is rendered 'be guilty,' 'bring guilt,' and 'guilt offering' (*trespass offering* A.V.) in iv. 3—v. 7 (*'āshām*). It means 'to deal deceitfully.'

in the holy things of the LORD] i.e. by keeping back what is His due (e.g. tithes or firstfruits). The offender shall make restitution of what he has kept back unwittingly, adding a fifth part, and shall also bring as a Guilt-Offering a ram of sufficient value estimated after the shekel of the sanctuary. According to tradition this shekel was double the value of the ordinary shekel, but see A. R. S. Kennedy's Art. *Money*, in *HDB.* iii. 422, or *Lev.* (*Cent. Bible*) p. 58, where he makes it to be 'the so-called Phœnician silver shekel of 224 grains, and its value about 2*s.* 9*d.*' It thus would weigh but little more than the Jewish shekels now extant.

according to thy estimation] also in *v.* 18 and vi. 6.

in silver by shekels] i.e. the ram must be worth at the least two shekels. According to Tal. Bab. (*Zebāḥīm* 90 *b*) it must be two years old.

(*b*) **17—19.** *if any one sin, and do any of the things which the LORD hath commanded not to be done*] The description of the sin in this case is the same as that in iv. 2, 13, 22, 27. In what respect do these sins (which here require a Guilt-Offering) differ from those in ch. iv. for which a Sin-Offering is prescribed? The difference is indicated in the words 'though he knew ('wist' A.V.) *it* not.' They are not the same as the Heb. expression rendered *unwittingly* (*concerning his ignorance* A.V.), for in *v.* 18 they occur as a further qualification of a thing done 'unwittingly.' The sins of ch. iv. are those of which a person *becomes conscious* (iv. 14, 23, 28). In such case he must offer a Sin-Offering. But the case here supposed is that of one who fears that he has been guilty of some infringement of the Divine commands, but *cannot specify it.*

He brings a ram as Guilt-Offering (in the same manner as in the

and the priest shall make atonement for him concerning the thing wherein he erred unwittingly and knew it not, and he shall be forgiven. It is a guilt offering: he is certainly 19
guilty before the LORD.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, If any one sin, 6 2
and commit a trespass against the LORD, and deal falsely with his neighbour in a matter of deposit, or of [1]bargain, or of robbery, or have oppressed his neighbour; or have found 3

[1] Or, *pledge*

preceding case (15, 16)), but no restitution is demanded as the amount cannot be estimated, since the offence remains unknown. This sacrifice was called by the Jews (*'āshām tāluy*), lit. a suspended Guilt- or Trespass-Offering. It was a voluntary offering, and relieved a troubled conscience. It is recorded of one pious Jew that he brought a sacrifice of this kind every day except on the day following the Great Day of Atonement.

(*c*) VI. 1—7 [Heb. v. 20—26]. *Damage done to the property of another by fraud or violence.*

This section of the laws regulating the Guilt-Offering has a special heading like that in v. 14, introducing those laws, whereas the whole of the legislation with respect to the Sin-Offering has but one introductory heading in iv. 1. Many of these offences are dealt with in Exod. xxii. 7—13 where the legal procedure is set forth; here they are regarded as a trespass against the Lord, and a sacrifice is demanded. It is thought that the cases treated here are those which are disclosed by the evil doer voluntarily because he has repented of his sin. The actions in question are not done 'unwittingly' and if discovered are liable to be punished by the judges (Exod. xxii.). Hence it is supposed that the cases here referred to are those which would not have been discovered but for the offender's own confession.

2. *a matter of deposit*] if he has taken anything which was delivered him to keep. In ancient times when there were no banks or safe places where a man might deposit his private property, he was obliged to conceal anything of value which he possessed; sometimes he entrusted it to a friend for safe custody. Cp. Ecclus. xlii. 7 with note (*C. B.*).

or of bargain] lit. something placed in the hand, *pledge* R.V. mg. The difference between this and the preceding is slight, and this latter expression is omitted in the recapitulation of *v.* 4. The rendering of A.V., *fellowship*, is supported by LXX. and Syr., and means partnership in any transaction agreed to by placing the hand in that of another.

The next two offences are direct attacks on a neighbour's goods.

that which was lost, and deal falsely therein, and swear to a lie; in any of all these that a man doeth, sinning therein:
4 then it shall be, if he hath sinned, and is guilty, that he shall restore that which he took by robbery, or the thing which he hath gotten by oppression, or the deposit which was committed to him, or the lost thing which he found,
5 or any thing about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in full, and shall add the fifth part more thereto: unto him to whom it appertaineth shall he give it,
6 in the day of his being found guilty. And he shall bring his guilt offering unto the LORD, a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation, for a guilt offering,
7 unto the priest: and the priest shall make atonement for him before the LORD, and he shall be forgiven; concerning whatsoever he doeth so as to be guilty thereby.

8 9 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Command Aaron and his sons, saying, This is the law of the burnt offering: the burnt offering shall be [1]on the hearth upon

[1] Or, *on its firewood*

8. *that which was lost*] See Exod. xxii. 8, 9.

The two characteristics of the Guilt-Offering are (1) the sacrifice is the same for all classes, (2) restitution is required in full, together with a fifth part more.

CHS. VI. 8—VII. 38 [Heb. vi. 1—20, vii.]. THE SECOND PART OF THE LAW OF OFFERINGS.

See the analysis of this portion in Appendix I (*a*) where are given reasons for concluding that this group of laws is not by the same hand as the first, and that they have been collected by one who may or may not be identical with the compiler of P, in order to supplement i. 1—vi. 7. In the main they are concerned with *priestly* duties and dues.

9. The instructions under eight heads are given through Moses to Aaron and his sons, here and in *v.* 25. The commands in vii. 23, 29 are addressed to the children of Israel.

This is the law of] here and *vv.* 14, 25, vii. 1, 11. The regulations for each sacrifice are introduced by this formula. Note that in this section the Peace-Offering comes last in order.

(1) *The Burnt-Offering* (8—13).

9. *the burnt offering shall be on the hearth*] It is clear that the Burnt-Offering must rest on the wood that is kindled in order to consume it, and

the altar all night unto the morning; and the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereon. And the priest shall 10
put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh; and he shall take up the ashes whereto

that some further support for both is needed. In the description of the altar in Exod. xxvii. 1—8 no provision is made for a top on which the sacrifices can be placed, but an altar hearth (i.e. a place whereon the sacrifices are burnt) is mentioned in the description of Ezek. xliii. 13—17. A 'hearth' is a 'place of burning'; if the Heb. word be so translated, or the rendering of R.V. mg., 'on its firewood,' be adopted, the passage adds nothing to the incomplete description of the altar in Exod. xxvii.

and the fire of the altar shall be kept burning thereon] i.e. on the hearth; for 'thereon' A.V. has 'in it,' referring to the altar, but the fire burns *upon* the altar (*v.* 13); it is perhaps better to render by it, i.e. by that which is burnt. The meaning of the verse is: the Burnt-Offering shall remain in the place where it is burnt all night, and the fire of the altar shall be kept up by the wood and the material of the sacrifice.

The sacrifice is that enjoined in Exod. xxix. 38—42, Num. xxviii. 3—8, which consisted of two lambs, the one offered in the morning, the other in the evening. It is here provided that the daily evening burnt sacrifice should be kept burning during the night until the priest kindled from it the wood for the morning burnt sacrifice. Thus by means of the two daily sacrifices (described in the singular as 'a continual burnt offering,' Num. xxviii. 6) a perpetual fire was kept burning on the altar. This double daily sacrifice is always described by Jewish tradition as the *Tamid*, i.e. the *continual* offering, and is the subject of a special section of the Mishna. Before the exile, as appears from 2 Kings xvi. 15, a Burnt-Offering was brought only in the morning, and a *minhah* or Meal-Offering in the evening; for the restored temple Ezek. prescribes a lamb with a Meal-Offering each morning but makes no provision for an evening sacrifice; even in Ezra's time the pre-exilic custom of offering a *minhah* for the evening oblation appears to be continued (Ezr. ix. 4, 5). The *Tamid*, as prescribed Exod. xxix. and Num. xxviii., with the law for the maintenance of a continuous fire on the altar as here enjoined in *vv.* 9, 12, is part of the Priestly Code, and was observed in the second temple from the time that the law which Ezra 'brought before the congregation' (Neh. viii. 2) was accepted by the people.

10. *the priest shall put on*] in the morning.

his linen garment] Perhaps the 'coat of (in) chequer work' mentioned Exod. xxviii. 4, 39.

his linen breeches] Exod. xxviii. 42.

and he shall take up] The removal of the ashes was regarded as the completion of the sacrifice of the preceding day, and for it priestly

the fire hath consumed the burnt offering on the altar, and
11 he shall put them beside the altar. And he shall put off his
garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the
12 ashes without the camp unto a clean place. And the fire
upon the altar shall be kept burning thereon, it shall not go
out; and the priest shall burn wood on it every morning: and
he shall lay the burnt offering in order upon it, and shall
13 burn thereon the fat of the peace offerings. Fire shall be
kept burning upon the altar continually; it shall not go out.
14 And this is the law of the meal offering: the sons of
15 Aaron shall offer it before the LORD, before the altar. And

garments were necessary: the Heb. verb is *hērīm* (see note on vii. 14). The Jewish commentators, taking the word as implying a heave offering, have based on this word a ceremony observed in the second temple. The priest took a handful of the ashes as in the Meal-Offering (ii. 2) and laid it aside as a memorial of the preceding day's service. This was called *tĕrūmath haddéshēn, the heave offering of the ashes*, and was part of the daily ritual. But this action would be described by 'he shall take up *from*' as in ii. 9.

11. *beside the altar*] on the east part (i. 16, there called the place of the ashes).

put off his garments] Cp. Ezek. xliv. 19 for the reason. For the danger to unconsecrated persons arising from what has been called 'contagious holiness' as a feature of early religions see Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.*[2] pp. 46 ff. See further on *v.* 18.

put on other garments] The priestly garments were worn only at the altar and in the tabernacle. On going without the sacred precincts they were removed. Cp. Ezek. xliv. 19.

without the camp] to the place whither parts of the Sin-Offering for 'the anointed priest' and for 'the whole congregation' were taken (iv. 12, 21).

12. Further directions for keeping the fire continually burning. The first clause repeats the last of *v.* 9 (see note there). The wood for the Burnt-Offering of the morning is kindled from the fire which has been kept in all night. It is clear that this instruction refers to the daily Burnt-Offering, and not to those brought by private persons (cp. ch. i.).

A continuous fire was maintained on certain heathen altars. See Dillm. *ad loc.* who adduces among others that of Demeter (Ceres) at Mantinea.

(2) *The Meal-Offering* (14—18).

The injunctions of ii. 2, 3 are repeated, almost in the same words in *vv.* 15, 16 (as far as 'his sons eat'): in what follows, the place of eating is fixed—the court of the tent of meeting. In *v.* 17 note the

he shall take up therefrom his handful, of the fine flour of the meal offering, and of the oil thereof, and all the frankincense which is upon the meal offering, and shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour, as the memorial thereof, unto the LORD. And that which is left thereof shall Aaron 16
and his sons eat: it shall be eaten without leaven in a holy place; in the court of the tent of meeting they shall eat it. It shall not be baken with leaven. I have given it as 17
their portion of my offerings made by fire; it is most holy, as the sin offering, and as the guilt offering. Every male 18
among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, as a due for ever throughout your generations, from the offerings of the LORD made by fire: whosoever toucheth them shall be holy.

use of the first person, and the reference to the Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering.

The Meal-Offering was 'most holy,' and could be eaten only by the male descendants of Aaron.

18. *whosoever toucheth them shall be holy*] This does not mean that only priests who have properly purified themselves may touch the most holy things, but that anyone, priest or layman, who inadvertently comes in contact with anything that is 'most holy,' **becomes** holy (i.e. dedicated to God, and put at His disposal), cp. Josh. vi. 18, vii. 15. No rule is given here about the treatment of such persons; for inanimate things which are brought into contact with the 'most holy,' see *vv.* 27, 28. According to Hag. ii. 12, the garment in which 'holy flesh' is carried, does not communicate holiness to the food which it may happen to touch.

Holiness is here regarded as a contagious quality; contact with holy things must be avoided, just as contact with things that are considered unclean is forbidden. This similarity in the treatment of things which from the levitical standpoint are so widely separated as the holy and the unclean is a survival of primitive modes of expression, due to imperfect conception of the gods, and of their relations to men. For further discussion of this subject see Driver (*C. B.*) on Exod. xxix. 37, with quotation from Frazer, *G. B.*, G. B. Gray on Num. (*Intern. Crit. Comm.*) pp. 209—211, Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.*[2] p. 152, and the note B, pp. 446 f., and *HDB.* Art. *Uncleanness*, iv. 816 f. Cp. notes on ch. xi.

(3) *The Meal-Offering of the high priest* (19—23)[1].

These verses differ from the other precepts with reference to sacrifice in vi. 7—vii. 21. They are not introduced by the words 'This is the

[1] This section is omitted by the Alexandrine MS. of the LXX. The omission is probably accidental, and caused by the fact that sections 19—23 and 24—30 begin with the same words.

19 20 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, This is the oblation of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer unto the LORD in the day when he is anointed; the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a meal offering perpetually, half of it in the morning, and half thereof in the evening.
21 On a baking pan it shall be made with oil; when it is soaked, thou shalt bring it in: in [1]baken pieces shalt thou offer the meal offering for a sweet savour unto the LORD.

[1] The meaning of the Hebrew word is uncertain.

law of...,' and addressed through Moses to Aaron and his sons, but are spoken directly to Moses (note the verbs in the 2nd person in *v.* 21). The command to present the Meal-Offering implies that Moses was officiating as priest, and he is represented as discharging this function during the seven days in which Aaron and his sons were consecrated; after that period all sacrificial acts were performed by Aaron and his sons (cp. chs. viii. and ix.). The words 'in the day when he [Aaron] is anointed' (19) also connect the offering with the ceremony of consecration, and with the first of the seven days, or, if the words 'in the day when' be taken as 'at the time when' (cp. Gen. ii. 4), with the period of seven days. Neither in the detailed account of this consecration given in ch. viii. nor in the directions contained in Exod. xxix. is there any reference to the offering enjoined in *v.* 21.

20. *the oblation of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer*] Heb. *bring near* as in i. 2; not a priestly action, for that is assigned to Moses in the next verse.

in the day when he is anointed] See above, and in the additional note on *vv.* 19—23.

the tenth part of an ephah] See v. 11. An ephah was about a bushel.

fine flour] See introd. note on ch. ii.

perpetually] Heb. *tāmīd*, a term applied to the daily Burnt-Offering (Exod. xxix. 38—42 where it is translated *continually* in *v.* 38, *continual* in *v.* 42) and to the lamp (xxiv. 2, 3 *continually*), though how the epithet is suitable for an offering brought on one occasion is not made clear. Accordingly Dillm. suggests that either 'in the day when he is anointed' or 'perpetually' is a later addition. Cp. add. note, p. 31.

21. *a baking pan*] See note on ii. 5.

when it is soaked] *baken* A.V. The Heb. word occurs only here and in vii. 12 (where see note), 1 Chr. xxiii. 29 (*fried* A.V.), and means something mixed.

in baken pieces shalt thou offer the meal offering] lit. —— **a meal offering in pieces** (cp. ii. 6 'Thou shalt part it in pieces') *shalt thou offer*. The first word is uncertain, and is left blank. The Oxf. Lex. suggests, with a slight change of letters and vocalisation, to render '*thou shalt break*' (it into a Meal-Offering of pieces and offer etc.), thus making the word a verb, and the root from which the following

And the anointed priest that shall be in his stead from among his sons shall offer it: by a statute for ever it shall be wholly burnt unto the LORD. And every meal offering of the priest shall be wholly burnt: it shall not be eaten. 22 23

substantive 'pieces' is formed. If the description of Josephus and the Mishna (see additional note) be accepted as determining the meaning, then the word (? slightly amended) might be translated 'baken pieces.' The word is in appearance similar to that immediately preceding; perhaps it should be omitted as due to a scribal error. That the offering is baked is already indicated in the first part of the verse.

22. *the anointed priest that shall be in his stead*] The successors of Aaron in the high priestly office are to be anointed. In the ceremonial of viii. 12 f. (Exod. xxix. 7 f.) Aaron only is anointed; 'the high priest among his brethren' is distinguished as the one 'upon whose head the anointing oil is poured' (xxi. 10); 'the anointed priest' officiates in the first and second of the four Sin-Offerings prescribed in iv. 3—21 (*vv.* 3, 16). Other passages (Exod. xxviii. 41, xxx. 30, xl. 15; Lev. vii. 36, x. 7; Num. iii. 3) either contain instructions to anoint the sons of Aaron, as well as their father, or refer to them as anointed.

NOTE ON *vv.* 19—23.

According to Jewish practice in the second temple, the high priest offered a *minḥah* every day during his tenure of office (Ecclus. xlv. 14) at his own expense (Jos. *Ant.* iii. 10. 7). He brought the whole tenth part in the morning and divided it into two portions for the morning and evening. If the high priest after offering the morning portion were to die the remaining evening portion was not to be offered, but a fresh whole tenth part was to be brought, from which the half for the evening was taken, and the two unused halves were to be destroyed (Tal. Bab. *Menaḥoth* 50 *b*). This offering of the high priest was regarded as made, not on his behalf alone, but for himself and the priesthood. It was called *minḥath ḥăbiltīm*, 'the minchah of baked pieces.' The word *ḥăbittīm* occurs once in 1 Chr. ix. 31, and is from the same root as *maḥăbath*, the 'baking pan' of ii. 5, vi. 21 [Heb. 14], and vii. 9, used for the Meal-Offering.

Beside this daily offering of the high priest, every priest, at the commencement of his ministry, used to offer a Meal-Offering like that of the high priest, but instead of dividing it into two parts, to be offered in the morning and in the evening, it was offered all at one time. This oblation was called *minḥath ḥinnūḵ*, 'meal offering of initiation.'

In the present state of the text, reference is made to two offerings:

(1) An offering to be brought by Moses (cp. *vv.* 19, 21).

(2) An offering to be brought by Aaron's successors in the high priestly office (*v.* 22).

If two such offerings are enjoined, it seems probable that some further

24 25 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron and to his sons, saying, This is the law of the sin offering: in the place where the burnt offering is killed shall the sin offering be killed before the LORD: it is most 26 holy. The priest that offereth it for sin shall eat it: in a holy place shall it be eaten, in the court of the tent of

discrimination between them would have been made. Two suggestions may be offered, each involving a slight modification of the text:

(*a*) The introductory sentence in *v.* 19 may have contained the additional clause 'Speak unto' or 'Command Aaron and his sons, saying,' as in *vv.* 9, 25. The instructions in *v.* 21 would then be addressed to Aaron, and the change of person in the verbs, though abrupt, is not without parallels in other parts of the legislation.

(*b*) The verbs in *v.* 21 may have been originally in the third person, and the verse would then refer to an offering by Aaron.

In either case, the whole passage would be interpreted with reference to an offering brought by Aaron and his successors, such as that described in Josephus and in the Mishna. Whether in *v.* 22 (the general rule about the Meal-Offering of the priest) there is any reference to the *minḥath ḥinnūḵ* is a question to which no definite answer can be given.

The difficulty raised by the words 'in the day when he is anointed' (see note introducing these four verses) is increased if the text be amended as suggested above. It is very doubtful whether these words can be considered as equivalent to 'at the commencement of his ministry,' and even if such an interpretation (admitted by some commentators) be allowed, the account of Aaron's first sacrifices as recorded in ch. ix. makes no mention of an offering such as that here described. Moreover the words imply an offering brought *once* rather than *perpetually* (*v.* 20 and see note there). Most modern commentators reject the words, considering them as a later gloss, and inconsistent with the description of the offering as perpetual. Some who retain them interpret 'in the day when' as 'from the time that,' i.e. in the day when and after.

(4) *The Sin-Offering* (24—30).

25. The Sin-Offering must be killed in the same place as the Burnt-Offering (cp. i. 11). This precept has already been given in iv. 24, 29, 33, and is here extended to all Sin-Offerings.

26. What remains after the sacrifice has been offered (except in the cases specified in *v.* 30 and iv. 3—21) is 'most holy'—to be eaten in the same place and manner as the Meal-Offering (*vv.* 16—18).

in a holy place] Here and in *v.* 16 further designated as 'the court of the tent of meeting' and prescribed for the Guilt-Offering in vii. 6. Cp. the command to eat the flesh of the ram of consecration at 'the

meeting. [1]Whatsoever shall touch the flesh thereof shall 27
be holy: and when there is sprinkled of the blood thereof
upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon it was
sprinkled in a holy place. But the earthen vessel wherein 28
it is sodden shall be broken: and if it be sodden in a
brasen vessel, it shall be scoured, and rinsed in water.
Every male among the priests shall eat thereof: it is most 29
holy. And no sin offering, whereof any of the blood is 30
brought into the tent of meeting to make atonement in the
holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt with fire.

And this is the law of the guilt offering: it is most holy. 7

[1] Or, *Whosoever*

door of the tent of meeting' (Exod. xxix. 32). The remainder belongs to the priest who officiates, but any male among the priests may join in eating it (*v.* 29).

The passages which assign a portion of the sacrifice to the officiating priest are vi. 26 *a*, vii. 7—10, 33. May these be parts of a law of sacrifice which has been combined with rest of vi. 8—vii. 38? If on a particular occasion the priestly dues of a sacrifice fell to any one priest, he might invite his fellow priests to share in the meal, and the custom of eating these portions of the sacrifice together would be embodied in a law which asserted the right of all priests to partake of the sacrificial meal.

27. *Whatsoever*] As rules for contact with a garment or vessels follow, the clause should probably be rendered as R.V. mg. *Whosoever*. So the LXX.

shall be holy] *shall* become *holy*, as in *v.* 18, where see note.

28. The reason for breaking the earthen vessel was that, not being glazed as in modern fashion, it was absorbent; a brazen pot could be scoured, and all trace of the substance with which it had been in contact removed (cp. xi. 33, xv. 12). The remains of the broken earthen vessels were buried.

29. *Every male*] Even those disqualified by reason of a blemish from offering sacrifice might eat of it (cp. xxi. 22, 23).

30. The rule here laid down applies to: (1) the first two cases of the Sin-Offering in iv. 3—21, where the place and manner of burning are specified in *vv.* 11, 12, 21; (2) the Sin-Offering on the Day of Atonement (xvi. 27, 28). See note on x. 16—20.

(5) *The Guilt-Offering. Priestly portions of other offerings* (vii. 1—10).

The similarity between the Guilt-Offering and the Sin-Offering is very close (see *v.* 7). Both are 'most holy' and to be killed in the same place (vi. 25, cp. vii. 1, 2). The parts to be burned on the altar are the same (iii. 4, 9—11, iv. 31, 35, cp. vii. 3—5), but note that the word

2 In the place where they kill the burnt offering shall they
kill the guilt offering: and the blood thereof shall he
3 sprinkle upon the altar round about. And he shall offer of
it all the fat thereof; the fat tail, and the fat that covereth
4 the inwards, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is on
them, which is by the loins, and the caul upon the liver,
5 with the kidneys, shall he take away: and the priest shall
burn them upon the altar for an offering made by fire unto
6 the LORD: it is a guilt offering. Every male among the
priests shall eat thereof: it shall be eaten in a holy place:
7 it is most holy. As is the sin offering, so is the guilt
offering: there is one law for them: the priest that maketh
8 atonement therewith, he shall have it. And the priest that
offereth any man's burnt offering, even the priest shall have
to himself the skin of the burnt offering which he hath
9 offered. And every meal offering that is baken in the oven,

'food,' Heb. *léhem*, of iii. 11, 16 is not applied to the Guilt-Offering, and the remainder is to be eaten in the same manner (vi. 26, 29, cp. vii. 6, 7).

2. *shall he sprinkle*] or **scatter**, as in the Burnt-Offering. See note on i. 5.

3. *the fat tail*] See note on iii. 9.

7. *there is one law for them*] It is doubtful whether these words, and those immediately preceding them, can be taken as *enjoining* the *sĕmîkah* or laying on of hands (see on i. 4). But according to tradition, that ceremony was applied in the case of Guilt-Offerings, and this passage was quoted in support of the practice.

the priest...shall have it] Cp. 2 Kgs xii. 16, where both Guilt- and Sin-Offerings are assigned to the priest. At the close of the injunctions concerning the 'most holy' sacrifices, a short summary (8—10) of the priests' dues from such sacrifices is given. Most of them have been mentioned before; the priests' due from the Guilt-Offering is settled in *v.* 7; their dues from the Burnt-Offering and Meal-Offering are assigned in *vv.* 8—10.

8. The rule that the skin of the Burnt-Offering belongs to the priest who offers it is extended in the Mishna to the skins of the 'most holy,' i.e. the Sin- and Guilt-Offerings. Perhaps this is implied in *v.* 7. We gather from *Zebahim* 103 *b* (Tal. Bab.) that the skin of the Peace-Offering belonged to the offerer. It is doubtful whether the skin of a priest's Burnt-Offering is here included: after the analogy of the priestly *minhah* (vi. 23) the whole of a priest's sacrifice must be burnt.

9. The three methods of preparing the Meal-Offering specified in this verse are also enumerated in ii. 4—7 (see notes there). Many commentators distinguish between these *cooked* forms of the Meal-

and all that is dressed in the frying pan, and on the baking pan, shall be the priest's that offereth it. And every meal 10
offering, mingled with oil, or dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have, one as well as another.

And this is the law of the sacrifice of peace offerings, 11

Offering (here assigned to the priest who offereth it) and the other Meal-Offerings 'mingled with oil' described in ii. 1—3 and 14—16, and 'dry' Meal-Offerings, such as the Sin-Offering of the poor man (v. 11) and the jealousy-offering (Num. v. 15). These belong to 'all the sons of Aaron one as well as another' (*v.* 10). No reason is here given for this different assignment of the Meal-Offerings. All the Meal-Offerings of ch. ii. are mingled with oil, and according to the Jewish traditional interpretation 'the meal-offering mingled with oil' includes all the offerings of ch. ii., and the 'dry' offering refers to the Sin-Offering of the poor man, and the jealousy-offering. In ii. 3, 10 and vi. 16, 18 that which is left of the Meal-Offering, whether cooked or not, is assigned to 'Aaron and his sons.'

(6) *The Peace-Offering* (11—21).

11. ***which one shall offer***] i.e. anyone who desires to bring this kind of offering; where there is no emphasis on the subject, the passive is generally employed in English, '*which may be offered.*'

The Peace-Offering comes in this collection of *toroth* after the Sin- and Guilt-Offerings, either because the 'most holy' things are placed first, or because the Peace-Offering is treated at greater length than the others. The text is not above suspicion; the omission by the LXX. in *v.* 12 is noticed below, and the frequent occurrences of the Heb. prep. '*al*, translated 'for' and 'with' in *v.* 12, and 'with' twice in *v.* 13, are noted by Wellh., who remarks (*Hist. of Isr.* p. 69, note 1): 'the suspicion very readily occurs that *v.* 12 is an authentic interpretation prefixed, to obviate beforehand the difficulty presented by *v.* 13, and that similarly the first '*al* in *v.* 13 is also a later correction which does not harmonize well by any means with the second.' This criticism is endorsed by Berth. *KHC Lev.* p. 22, and *Bibl. Theol. d. A. T.* ii. p. 350.

The Peace-Offering may be brought for three reasons:

(*a*) For thanksgiving (*v.* 12), to commemorate deliverance from sickness or danger. In Ps. cvii., after mentioning perils out of which the Lord delivers man, the Psalmist says 'let them offer the sacrifices of thanksgiving' (*v.* 22). These are quoted in Tal. Bab. *Berâchoth* 54 *b* as occasions on which the Lord must be openly praised (cf. *vv.* 22, 32 of the Ps., and Ps. lvi. 12).

(*b*) In fulfilment of a vow (*v.* 16, cp. Ps. lvi. 12, lxvi. 13, 14, cxvi. 12—19), when a man promises to bring an offering to the Lord, if He deliver him out of his distress.

12 which one shall offer unto the LORD. If he offer it for a thanksgiving, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of thanksgiving unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and cakes mingled with oil, of fine
13 flour soaked. With cakes of leavened bread he shall offer

(*c*) As a freewill offering (*v.* 16, cp. Ps. liv. 6) when the heart is moved by the remembrance of God's tender mercies (Ps. xcv. 1, 2, ciii. 1—5) to bring an oblation. Offerings for vows and freewill offerings are mentioned in xxii. 18, 21, 23; Num. xv. 3; a sacrifice of thanksgiving in xxii. 29. On the distinction between the three kinds see note on xxii. 23.

12. If the Peace-Offering be for thanksgiving, three kinds of cakes are to be brought with it; the difference between the first and third is not clearly indicated. On the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Exod. xxix. 2, 23; Lev. viii. 26) three kinds of cakes are ordered to be brought with the ram of consecration; the second and third of these are identical with the first and second of those here prescribed. This is shewn below in tabular form:

Lev. vii. 12	Exod. xxix. 2, 23 and Lev. viii. 26.	
	unleavened bread	(1) [1]one unleavened cake,
(*a*) unleavened cakes	mingled with oil	(2) one cake of oiled bread,
(*b*) ,, wafers	anointed with oil	(3) one wafer,
(*c*) fine flour **mixed [into cakes mingled]** with oil.	of fine wheaten flour shalt thou make them.	

Now if the three kinds of cakes are the same on both occasions (which seems probable and is the traditional interpretation) then (*c*) will be equivalent to (1) of Exod. xxix. and Lev. viii. Cp. the offering of the Nazirite (Num. vi. 15, 19).

The Heb. word *murbeketh* (here, vi. 21 and 1 Chr. xxiii. 29 only) is rendered '*soaked*' ('*fried*' A.V.), but probably means that the flour is well stirred together, as is done in making bread or pastry. The words which are in brackets in (*c*) are not found in the LXX., and it may be that they have been accidentally repeated from (*a*). The description of (*c*) does not clearly distinguish it from (*a*) whether the words be retained in the text or not.

13. *With cakes of leavened bread he shall offer his oblation*] The cakes described in *v.* 12 form the oblation; besides these he is to bring leavened cakes, which are not intended for the altar (see ii. 11) but are similar in character to the offering mentioned in ii. 12. According to Amos iv. 5, leaven was brought with a thanksgiving offering, and the two wave loaves offered at the Feast of Weeks (xxiii. 17) were 'baken

[1] Exod. xxix. 23 has 'one loaf of bread' but as it is further described as 'taken out of the basket of *unleavened* bread' it is clear that the loaf is unleavened.

his oblation with the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving. And of it he shall offer one out of each 14
oblation for an heave offering unto the LORD; it shall be the priest's that sprinkleth the blood of the peace offerings. And the flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offerings for 15
thanksgiving shall be eaten on the day of his oblation; he shall not leave any of it until the morning. But if the 16
sacrifice of his oblation be a vow, or a freewill offering, it shall be eaten on the day that he offereth his sacrifice: and on the morrow that which remaineth of it shall be eaten: but that which remaineth of the flesh of the sacrifice on 17
the third day shall be burnt with fire. And if any of the 18

with leaven.' If 'with' (i.e. the first '*al* of *v.* 13 in the passage from Wellh. quoted above), be omitted, then the rendering would be '*cakes of leavened bread shall he bring as his oblation in addition to the sacrifice of his peace offerings for thanksgiving*,' and 'his oblation' would then refer to the leavened cakes of *v.* 13. The same reference is made in the rendering of A.V., but it is doubtful whether 'besides the cakes' can be taken as a translation of the existing Mass. text.

14. *one out of each oblation*] According to the practice in the second temple, ten of each of the three kinds of unleavened cakes and ten leavened cakes were brought. The priest took one out of each ten, and the remainder belonged to the bringer of the sacrifice, to be eaten along with his share of the flesh of the Peace-Offering. These cakes were not treated as Meal-Offerings, for the priests claimed the whole of such offerings (ii. 3, 10), but as an accompaniment of the Peace-Offering. Thus four of them were given as '*Terūmah*' to the Lord for the priest that threw the blood against the altar (see note on i. 5). '*Terūmah*,' 'heave-offering,' does not, however, indicate throwing, as the English word suggests, but something *lifted* or 'taken off from a larger mass, and so separated from it for sacred purposes,' and hence dedicated to God through His ministers. Driver on Exod. xxv. 2, where see his full note. See also App. IV, WAVE-OFFERING (end).

15—18. Limits of time within which the Peace-Offerings must be consumed. When they are for thanksgiving, the whole of the flesh must be eaten on the day they are offered; before midnight is the traditional rule. A similar condition is prescribed in Exod. xxiii. 18, which is taken by some as referring to the festivals mentioned in *vv.* 14—17; another view limits the injunction to the passover, as in xxxiv. 25. In many ancient heathen rites, the flesh of the victim was consumed as soon as possible (*Rel. Sem.*[2], p. 387). When the offering is made in fulfilment of a vow, or as a freewill offering (*v.* 16), two days are allowed for consuming the remainder. In no case may the flesh be eaten on the third day (*vv.* 17, 18). Such eating rendered

flesh of the sacrifice of his peace offerings be eaten on the third day, it shall not be accepted, neither shall it be imputed unto him that offereth it: it shall be an abomination, and the soul that eateth of it shall bear his iniquity.
19 And the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire. And as for the flesh,
20 every one that is clean shall eat thereof: but the soul that eateth of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace offerings, that pertain unto the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him,
21 that soul shall be cut off from his people. And when any one shall touch any unclean thing, the uncleanness of man, or an unclean beast, or any unclean abomination, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of peace offerings, which pertain unto the LORD, that soul shall be cut off from his people.

the sacrifice unacceptable, and the offerer had to bring a fresh sacrifice, while anyone so eating incurred punishment (xix. 6—8). The words following 'the morrow' in *v.* 16 are omitted in the LXX.; with this omission the passage more closely resembles xix. 6 f. In xxii. 17—25 further rules are given concerning those animals which may be offered for a vow or as a freewill-offering, and in xxii. 29 a sacrifice of thanksgiving, though not called a Peace-Offering, is described as one of which the flesh must be consumed on the same day that it is offered (see note there).

18. ***it shall be an abomination***] Heb. *piggūl*, a word which occurs here and in xix. 7 of the flesh of the Peace-Offering which is eaten on the third day, and elsewhere only in Is. lxv. 4, *broth of abominable things* (Heb. *piggūlim*); Ezek. iv. 14, *abominable flesh* (Heb. flesh of *piggūl*). In both these passages food of an unclean character, perhaps mixed with blood, is referred to (cp. *Rel. Sem.*[2], 343, note 3). The word is a common technical term in the Mishna. It is unfortunate that both here and in *v.* 21 'abomination,' which is generally the translation of *tō'ēbhah*, should be employed as the English equivalent of two other Heb. words, but it is difficult to find a good English word for *piggūl*.

19—21. The sacrificial flesh must not be brought into contact with anything that is unclean, nor eaten by anyone that is unclean. Special cases of ritual impurity are enumerated in chs. xi.—xv.

21. *abomination*] **detestation**, Heb. *shéqeṣ*: the word is used in ch. xi. 10—12 of things without fins and scales that move in the waters, and in *vv.* 13, 20, 23, 41, 42 of birds of prey and creeping (**swarming**) things. See notes there. Some prefer to read *sheres* (*swarming thing*) following Sam. Targ. Pesh.

shall be cut off] It has been debated whether this expression means

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the 22
children of Israel, saying, Ye shall eat no fat, of ox, or sheep, 23
or goat. And the fat of that which dieth of itself, and the 24
fat of that which is torn of beasts, may be used for any other
service: but ye shall in no wise eat of it. For whosoever 25
eateth the fat of the beast, of which men offer an offering
made by fire unto the LORD, even the soul that eateth it
shall be cut off from his people. And ye shall eat no 26
manner of blood, whether it be of fowl or of beast, in any
of your dwellings. Whosoever it be that eateth any blood, 27
that soul shall be cut off from his people.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the 28
children of Israel, saying, He that offereth the sacrifice of 29

death or outlawry. Probably the latter penalty is intended. Cp. *Code of Hammurabi* (Johns) §§ 154, 158.

Fat and Blood prohibited (22—27).

The Peace-Offering being the only sacrifice which was partly consumed by the offerer, any rule as to portions of the animal that were not to be eaten would appropriately be added to the regulations concerning this sacrifice. Accordingly, in ch. iii., which treats of the Peace-Offering, the prohibition of fat and blood occurs in a short form (*v.* 17). It is repeated here in connexion with the preceding regulations about Peace-Offerings. The fat which is prohibited is that contained in the portions reserved as an offering made by fire unto the Lord, described at length in chs. iii., iv. and vii. 3—5. They were the same in the Peace-, Guilt-, and Sin-Offerings. The ordinary fat found with the flesh was not forbidden. Ver. 25 explains that the portions which in a sacrifice are set apart for the Lord must not be consumed as food by man, even when the animals were not suitable to be offered on the altar, as in the case of that which dieth of itself, or is torn of beasts. If the animal were fit to be offered, according to xvii. 4, 5, it must when killed be brought before the Lord, and these portions would be burnt on the altar by the priest. The prohibition extends only to the ox, sheep, or goat, i.e. to the animals which were brought for sacrifice, but the prohibition of blood (*v.* 26) is more general. No manner of blood may be eaten, whether of fowl or beast. It is of permanent obligation (iii. 17).

The command is given to Noah, Gen. ix. 4 (P), and is repeated in this book, xvii. 10—14. Cp. 1 Sam. xiv. 32—34. The prohibition of blood was enforced among the Arabs by Mohammed. See J. M. Rodwell's *Koran*[2], *Sur.* 2. [xci. *The Cow*] 168.

his peace offerings unto the LORD shall bring his oblation unto the LORD out of the sacrifice of his peace offerings:
30 his own hands shall bring the offerings of the LORD made by fire; the fat with the breast shall he bring, that the breast
31 may be waved for a wave offering before the LORD. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar: but the breast
32 shall be Aaron's and his sons'. And the right [1]thigh shall ye give unto the priest for an heave offering out of the
33 sacrifices of your peace offerings. He among the sons of Aaron, that offereth the blood of the peace offerings, and
34 the fat, shall have the right [1]thigh for a portion. For the wave breast and the heave [1]thigh have I taken of the children of Israel out of the sacrifices of their peace offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the priest and unto his sons as a due for ever from the children of Israel.

[1] Or, *shoulder*

Priestly Portions of the Peace-Offering (28—34).

29. ***his oblation***] The word does not refer to the whole sacrifice as in other places, but to that portion which was offered by fire, i.e. the fat portions specially reserved for the Lord as (*v.* 30) 'the offerings of the Lord made by fire' (described in iii. 3—5, 9, 10, 14, 15), together with the breast to be waved as a Wave-Offering before the Lord, which is not burned with the fat (i.e. the fat portions of iii. 3—5, etc.) but reserved as a portion for 'Aaron and his sons.'

30. ***wave offering***] The offering was waved towards the altar and back, apparently to express symbolically that it was first given to God and then restored by Him to the priest for his use. See Appendix IV, pp. 183 ff.

32. ***the right thigh***] not 'shoulder' as mg. The plural 'ye' indicates the composite character of this section. The right thigh was a further due of the priests, given to the officiating priest, as well as the breast, which was given to Aaron and his sons for ever (*v.* 34).

The priestly dues seem to have gradually increased. According to 1 Sam. ii. 13 ff. the worshipper was apparently allowed to decide for himself how much to give. The priestly portion assigned in 1 Sam. ix. 24 to Saul as a mark of honour was 'the thigh, and the fat tail.' (See note on p. 12.) The legislation of Deut. (xviii. 3) gives the priest 'the shoulder, and the two cheeks, and the maw.' But here (cp. x. 14 f.; Exod. xxix. 27 f.) he was still better off with the wave breast and right thigh.

Conclusion (35—38).

The summary in *vv.* 35, 36 refers to the priestly dues, either to those just mentioned in *vv.* 31—34, or more generally to those prescribed in the section vi. 8—vii. 34.

This is the [1]anointing-portion of Aaron, and the anointing- 35
portion of his sons, out of the offerings of the LORD made
by fire, in the day when he presented them to minister unto
the LORD in the priest's office; which the LORD commanded 36
to be given them of the children of Israel, in the day that
he anointed them. It is a due for ever throughout their
generations. This is the law of the burnt offering, of the 37
meal offering, and of the sin offering, and of the guilt
offering, and of the consecration, and of the sacrifice of
peace offerings; which the LORD commanded Moses in 38
mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of
Israel to offer their oblations unto the LORD, in the wilder-
ness of Sinai.

[1] Or, *portion*

35. ***anointing-portion***] R.V. mg. *portion*. The Heb. root which means to anoint is found in Aramaic and Assyrian in the sense to measure. The word here and the similar word in Num. xviii. 8 (*by reason of the anointing*, 'for a portion,' R.V. mg.) probably indicate an assigned or 'measured portion,' without excluding a play on the other sense of the root.

36. ***in the day that he anointed them***] According to Exod. xxix. 7; Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16, vi. 20, 22, viii. 12, xxi. 10, 12; Num. xxxv. 25, only one priest (the high priest) was anointed, but according to Exod. vii. 29, xxviii. 41, xxx. 30, xl. 15; Lev. vii. 36, x. 7; Num. iii. 3, all priests were anointed.

37, 38. These verses seem at first sight to form a general conclusion to chs. i.—vii., but as the order in which the sacrifices are mentioned is closely connected with that in vi. 8—viii. 34, it must be regarded as a conclusion to that section[1]. The words '*and of the consecration*' probably are intended as a reference to vi. 19—23; whether it is to be regarded as an addition depends upon the view taken of that section, and of the words 'in the day when he is anointed' in vi. 20 (see pp. 30 ff.).

NOTE. The priests' portions as prescribed under the separate offerings are as follows:

(*a*) That which remains of the Meal-Offerings, Lev. ii. 3, 10, vi. 16—18, vii. 9, 10, 14 (brought as part of the Peace-Offering); xxiv. 9, the shewbread.

(*b*) The remainder of the Sin-Offerings, except of those whereof any of the blood is brought into the tent of meeting; v. 13, vi. 26, 29, 30.

(*c*) The remainder of the Guilt-Offerings, vii. 6, 7; and the 'restitution for guilt' where there is no kinsman to whom restitution may be made, Num. v. 8.

[1] It is possible that the last clause of v. 38 may refer to chs. i.—vi. 7.

8 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Take Aaron
and his sons with him, and the garments, and the anointing
oil, and the bullock of the sin offering, and the two rams,
3 and the basket of unleavened bread; and assemble thou all
4 the congregation at the door of the tent of meeting. And
Moses did as the LORD commanded him; and the congre-
gation was assembled at the door of the tent of meeting.
5 And Moses said unto the congregation, This is the thing
6 which the LORD hath commanded to be done. And Moses
brought Aaron and his sons, and washed them with water.

(*d*) The skin of the Burnt-Offering, vii. 7.

(*e*) Of the Peace-Offerings, the wave breast for Aaron and his sons, and the heave thigh for the priest who offers the blood and the fat, vii. 29—34.

CHS. VIII.—X. THE INAUGURATION OF THE WORSHIP.

The Consecration of Aaron and his sons (viii. 1—17)

1. See critical note on these chapters in App. I (*b*), pp. 159 ff.

Instructions to consecrate Aaron and his sons have already been given, Exod. xxix. 1—37. The account given in this chapter follows very closely the words of Exod. xxix., with which it should be carefully compared.

The ceremonies connected with the consecration were: (*a*) washing (*v.* 6), (*b*) vesting (*vv.* 7—9, 13), (*c*) anointing (*vv.* 10—12), (*d*) offering sacrifices, which were of three kinds; (1) a Sin-Offering (*vv.* 14—17), (2) a Burnt-Offering (*vv.* 18—21), (3) the ram of consecration (*vv.* 22—32), which was treated as a Peace-Offering, but with additional ritual appropriate to the special occasion.

2. *the bullock of the sin offering, and the two rams, and the basket*...] As all the objects to be brought have already been prescribed in Exod. xxix., they occur in this chapter with the definite article. The garments are described Exod. xxviii. and xxxix. The anointing oil was made by Bezalel (xxxvii. 29) according to the prescription in xxx. 23—33.

of unleavened bread] *unleavened* **cakes**. The Heb. word is plural, and denotes thin biscuits. See Driver (*C. B.*) on Exod. xii. 8. This introductory verse does not describe the contents of the basket in full, as does Exod. xxix. 2, but defers the mention of them till *v.* 26, when the contents are used. On the other hand, it mentions the anointing oil, which in Exod. xxix. first occurs in *v.* 7, where the directions for its use are given.

4. *the congregation*] A.V. by rendering 'assembly' obscures the fact that the Heb. word is the same as in the preceding verse.

6. (*a*) **washing**; cp. Exod. xxix. 4.

And he put upon him the coat, and girded him with the 7
girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod
upon him, and he girded him with the cunningly woven
band of the ephod, and bound it unto him therewith. And 8

7—9. (*b*) vesting; cp. Exod. xxix. 5, 6. The garments are mentioned in a different order in Exod. xxviii. 4, and some of them are there described more fully in *vv.* 6 ff. The reader may refer to the notes in Driver's commentary. The 'linen breeches' (Exod. xxviii. 42) are not mentioned here.

the coat] the **tunic**, Heb. *kuttoneth* or *kĕthoneth*. A long tunic with sleeves, secured by a girdle, or sash, somewhat like a dressing gown. It was the principal garment of ordinary life, and made of cotton, linen, or wool. The high priest's coat, or tunic, was made of fine linen (*shēsh*) and ornamented with a pattern. Cp. Exod. xxviii. 4, where it is described as 'a coat of chequer work' (*a broidered coat*, A.V.), and in *v.* 39 as woven 'in chequer work of fine linen'; the exact meaning of the Heb. is uncertain, but it not improbably denotes something of the nature of a check.

the girdle] **sash**, the work of the embroiderer (Exod. xxviii. 39), made in the same way as the screen (*hanging* A.V.) for the entrance to the Tent (Exod. xxvi. 36) and to the Court (xxvii. 16). It was of considerable length (according to the Talmud about 48 ft.) and was passed round the body several times (Jos. *Ant.* iii. 7. 2). It seems to have been accidentally omitted in Exod. xxix. 5. It must be distinguished from the 'cunningly woven band of the ephod' (cp. Exod. xxviii. 8, etc.), translated in A.V. 'curious girdle.'

the robe] called 'the robe of the ephod,' Exod. xxviii. 31, xxix. 5, xxxix. 22 f. A garment all blue with a hole for the head, and a binding of woven work round the whole to prevent its being rent. The Heb. word *mĕ'īl* is applied to the robe (A.V. *coat*) made by Hannah for her son Samuel (1 Sam. ii. 19), and to the robe (A.V. *mantle*) of Samuel which was rent by Saul (1 Sam. xv. 27). The clothing of the High Priest, though of costly material, is so far like that of other people, and similar to that worn by the Arabs of the present day; an under garment bound with a sash, and an outer robe reaching nearly to the ground, but this outer garment is now worn open in front. According to Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 7. 4, *B.J.* v. 5. 7) the robe of the ephod reached to the feet, but some writers describe it as shorter than the tunic. Its fringe of pomegranates and bells is described Exod. xxviii. 33—35, xxxix. 24—26 note the addition of 'pure' to 'gold' in the second passage), but being a part of the robe is not mentioned here or in Exod. xxix.

the ephod] This garment (described Exod. xxviii. 6 ff., xxxix. 2—5) was made of fine twined linen with blue purple and scarlet threads, and fine gold wire. Its exact shape cannot be determined. There were two shoulder straps, on each of which was an engraved onyx stone, and a band made of the same material as the ephod and woven with it in

he placed the breastplate upon him: and in the breastplate
9 he put [1]the Urim and the Thummim. And he set the [2]mitre upon his head; and upon the [2]mitre, in front, did he set

[1] That is, *the Lights and the Perfections.* [2] Or, *turban*

one piece, which served to gird the ephod over the other garments. This band is called 'the cunningly woven band' (*the curious girdle* A.V.) of the ephod; the Heb. *hēsheb* denotes textile work of the highest grade, employed only for the curtains of the Dwelling, the veil, the ephod, and the pouch for the Urim and Thummim. See note on Exod. xxvi. 1, where terms used for the different kinds of woven work are distinguished. The words 'cunning,' 'cunningly' were in Old English used to denote what is now termed 'skilful,' 'skilfully.' If the ephod consisted of front and back pieces, then the whole garment with its band would form a kind of waistcoat; if it consisted of a front piece only, it would resemble an apron. See Driver on Exod. xxviii. 5—12 and p. 312.

8. *And he placed the breastplate upon him*] The breastplate of Judgement, described Exod. xxviii. 15—30, xxxix. 8—21, was made of the same material as the ephod, and being twice as long as it was broad, became when folded a square of which each side was a span long, and served as a pocket to contain the Urim and the Thummim. It was fastened to the ephod by means of rings of gold, golden cords, and 'a lace of blue' or ribbon, though the exact manner of its attachment is not clear. The meaning of the word 'breastplate' (Heb. *hōshen*) is uncertain; either 'ornament,' referring to the richness of its material, or 'pocket,' indicating the purpose for which it was used. Cp. Exod. xxviii. 13—30 and the notes on the passage.

the Urim and the Thummim] That is, *the Lights and the Perfections*, as R.V. mg. Neither here nor in any other place where Urim and Thummim are mentioned is any further description of these objects given, nor of the manner in which they were employed. See Driver on *Exod.* pp. 313 f.

9. *the mitre*] **turban** as R.V. mg. Heb. *miṣnéphеth* in Lev. here and xvi. 4 (the linen mitre) only: in Exod. (in the cognate passages) xxviii. 4, 37, 39, xxix. 6, xxxix. 28, 31. It was made of fine linen; tradition describes it as 24 ft. long, so it was probably wound round the head like a turban. Besides the passages quoted, where it denotes the headdress of the high priest, it occurs only in Ezek. xxi. 26 (Heb. 31) (*mitre* R.V., *diadem* A.V.). Another word (*gānīph*) from the same root occurs Is. lxii. 3 (K'ri), translated 'diadem,' in parallelism with the common Heb. word for 'crown'; and in Zech. iii. 5 with reference to the high priest Joshua. It is strange that *gānīph* should be used in the Zechariah passage to denote a mitre for the high priest, if *miṣnéphеth* were already the technical term used for that portion of his attire.

Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 7. 6) says that the high priest's mitre was like that of all the other priests, but another word is used (see *v.* 13) for the

the golden plate, the holy crown; as the LORD commanded Moses. And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed 10
the tabernacle and all that was therein, and sanctified them.
And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and 11
anointed the altar and all its vessels, and the laver and its
base, to sanctify them. And he poured of the anointing 12
oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him.

head-dress of Aaron's sons. He describes fully another mitre with a triple golden crown. This was probably an ornament added in later times. Alexander Balas sent a purple robe and a crown of gold to Jonathan which he wore at the Feast of Tabernacles B.C. 153 (1 Macc. x. 20). This may be the crown described by Josephus.

upon the mitre, in front] In A.V. 'upon his forefront,' 'his' refers to the mitre and in modern English would be 'its.'

the golden plate, the holy crown] The golden plate is described Exod. xxviii. 36, 37. The Heb. word (*ṣîṣ*), translated 'plate,' implies something bright and glittering, and is elsewhere used of a flower. The plate was fastened by its lace of blue to the turban (xxviii. 37, xxxix. 31) and would appear as an ornament or diadem in the head-gear of the high priest. It is called 'the holy crown' in xxix. 6, and here both names are given to it. The same combination occurs in xxxix. 30 where the English 'the plate of the holy crown of pure gold' conveys the impression that the 'plate' and the 'crown' are different instead of synonymous.

10. Probably an interpolation, as (1) there is no parallel for it in Ex. xxix., and (2) the LXX. places *v.* 10*b* after *v.* 11.

10—12. (*c*) anointing. The first definite variation from Exod. xxix. is found in these verses. Exod. xxix. 7 contains the command: 'Then shalt thou take the anointing oil, and pour it upon his head, and anoint him.' To this correspond the opening words of *v.* 10, 'And Moses took the anointing oil...' and *v.* 12, 'And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him.' The clauses of *vv.* 10 and 11 which intervene, record the anointing of the tabernacle, the altar, and the laver, in words closely parallel to those of Exod. xl. 9—11. Other passages which refer to the ceremony of anointing are: Exod. xxix. 7 (referring to Aaron only), xxix. 36 (to the altar), xxx. 26—29 (a full list of things to be anointed) and xl. 9—11 (a shorter list). It will be seen that the verbal coincidences in *vv.* 10—12 are with Exod. xxix. 7 and xl. 9—11. But it should be noticed that whereas in Exod. xl. 12—15 mention is made of anointing Aaron's sons as well as Aaron himself, there is no account of such a ceremony in Lev. viii.

11. *upon the altar seven times*] The sprinkling seven times is not enjoined in Exod. xxix., but in *v.* 36 of that ch. the sanctification of the altar is appointed for seven days, on each of which the altar is to be anointed.

13 And Moses brought Aaron's sons, and clothed them with
coats, and girded them with girdles, and bound headtires
14 upon them; as the LORD commanded Moses. And he
brought the bullock of the sin offering: and Aaron and
his sons laid their hands upon the head of the bullock of
15 the sin offering. And he slew it; and Moses took the
blood, and put it upon the horns of the altar round about
with his finger, and purified the altar, and poured out the
blood at the base of the altar, and sanctified it, to make

13. Aaron's sons are clothed with **tunics, sashes, and caps.** The tunics and sashes are not described; whether they were less elaborate than those of the high priest does not appear, but is probable. The caps (*headtires* R.V., *bonnets* A.V.) were of fine linen (Exod. xxxix. 28), and the Heb. word is used only of the head-gear of the ordinary priests. The description of Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 7. 3) is not very clear. See on *v.* 9, and the note on Exod. xxviii. 40.

14—30. (*d*) the sacrificial part of the rite, consisting of:

(i) *The Sin-Offering* (*vv.* 14—17, cp. Exod. xxix. 10—14).

A bullock, the most costly animal, appointed for 'the anointed priest,' or for 'the whole congregation' (iv. 3, 14), on which Aaron and his sons laid their hands (see on i. 4). It appears that the selection of the animal indicates the sacred office to which Aaron and his sons are to be admitted, but until they are consecrated, the ritual of the offering is the same as that prescribed in the case of private individuals (cp. iv. 30, 34). Some of the blood is put on the horns of the altar, and the rest is poured out at the base of the altar.

15. *And he slew it*] Comparison with Exod. xxix. 11 shews that Moses slew it, but the text here might be interpreted, and he (Aaron) slew it, especially as it is followed by 'and Moses took....' The same remark applies to *v.* 19 and *v.* 23; cp. Exod. xxix. 16, 20. In all the verses here cited, the Heb. verb is the same, but is rendered by both 'kill' and 'slay.'

at the base of the altar] see on iv. 7.

and purified the altar...and sanctified it **by making atonement** *for it*] These clauses are not found in Exod. xxix. 12, but occur in *vv.* 36, 37 of that ch. The altar had already been anointed (*v.* 11); it is now further sanctified by the blood of the Sin-Offering.

The words 'purify' here, and 'cleanse' (*purge* R.V. mg.) in Exod. xxix. 36 are translations of the same Heb. verb. As in English 'to stone plums' means to remove the stones, so in Heb. a verb corresponding to a noun is sometimes used in the same way. Here the Heb. verb corresponds to the noun 'sin,' and means to 'remove sin'; it occurs also in xiv. 49, 52 (of a leprous house), and Ezek. xliii. 20—23 with reference to the altar (see note on Exod. xxix. 36). The rendering 'by making atonement' is like R.V. mg. of the passage in Exod. xxix. 36.

atonement for it. And he took all the fat that was upon 16
the inwards, and the caul of the liver, and the two kidneys,
and their fat, and Moses burned it upon the altar. But the 17
bullock, and its skin, and its flesh, and its dung, he burnt
with fire without the camp; as the LORD commanded Moses.
And he presented the ram of the burnt offering: and Aaron 18
and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram.
And he killed it: and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the 19
altar round about. And he cut the ram into its pieces; 20
and Moses burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat.
And he washed the inwards and the legs with water; and 21
Moses burnt the whole ram upon the altar: it was a burnt
offering for a sweet savour: it was an offering made by fire
unto the LORD; as the LORD commanded Moses. And 22
he presented the other ram, the ram of consecration: and

16, 17. The Heb. words for 'burned,' 'burnt' in these verses are different. That in *v.* 16 means to make into sweet smelling smoke, and is cognate to the Heb. word for 'incense'; it is used always of burning sacrificial victims as in *vv.* 20, 21, 28. The burning that is done outside the camp is expressed by the ordinary Heb. word for burning.

The same difference is to be noted in ix. 10, 11 See Driver on Exod. xxix. 13.

(ii) *The Burnt-Offering* (18—21).

The Burnt-Offering indicating complete surrender on the part of Aaron and his sons follows the sacrifice of atonement and purification. The ram is offered here by Moses, by Aaron for himself (ix. 2, 12, 13, xvi. 3), for the people (xvi. 5), for the princes of the tribes at the dedication of the altar (Num. vii. 15 etc. where the ram is one of three animals constituting the Burnt-Offering) and on the occasions enumerated in Num. xxviii. and xxix. Balak's offering prescribed by Balaam consisted of seven bullocks and seven rams (Num. xxiii. 1, 2, 14, 29, 30).

20. *and the fat*] a different Heb. word from that in *vv.* 16, 25, used here and in i. 8, 12 only. The fat of the intestines is probably indicated.

19. *sprinkled*] See note on i. 5; **threw against.**

21. *for a sweet savour*] See on i. 9.

an offering made by fire] See on xxiii. 8.

(iii) *The ram of consecration* (22—36), cp. Exod. xxix. 19—26.

The last sacrifice is that of the ram of consecration. As some portions are consumed by the officers (*v.* 31) it resembles the Peace-

Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the
23 ram. And he slew it; and Moses took of the blood
thereof, and put it upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and
upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of
24 his right foot. And he brought Aaron's sons, and Moses
put of the blood upon the tip of their right ear, and upon
the thumb of their right hand, and upon the great toe of
their right foot: and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the
25 altar round about. And he took the fat, and the fat tail,
and all the fat that was upon the inwards, and the caul of
the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right
26 [1]thigh: and out of the basket of unleavened bread, that
was before the LORD, he took one unleavened cake, and
one cake of oiled bread, and one wafer, and placed them on

[1] Or, *shoulder*

Offerings, but special rites are added, indicating the character and duties of the priestly office. The blood of the ram is applied to the ear, hand, and foot of Aaron and his sons. The ear attentive to the commands of God, the hand ready to do His will, the foot prepared to walk in His ways are thus signified. The blood is also thrown (as enjoined in iii. 2) against the altar round about.

In *vv.* 23, 24 the blood is put first on Aaron and afterwards on his sons; cp. Exod. xxix. 20, where a separate bringing near of the sons is not enjoined.

25. Moses then puts on the hands of Aaron and his sons (1) the fat and other parts of the sacrifice which were always burnt upon the altar (cp. iii. 9, 10), (2) the right thigh (not *shoulder* R.V. mg. and A.V.) and (3) one of each of the oblations that were in the basket brought in accordance with the injunctions of Exod. xxix. 3, 23 (cp. Lev. vii. 12—14, and the note there). The whole is waved as a Wave-Offering before the Lord and burnt upon the altar. Parts (2) and (3) are priestly portions (vii. 14, 32), but as on this occasion Aaron and his sons were not entitled to them (for their consecration was not yet complete) they are offered to the Lord.

The act of placing these portions on the hands of Aaron and his sons seems to indicate that they were assigned to the priests for certain purposes; those portions which were reserved for the altar were to be offered by them upon it, those which were priestly dues were to be retained by themselves.

The name of the sacrifice—the ram of consecration—is connected with this action of Moses. The usual term for appointing a priest is to 'fill his hand' (Jud. xvii. 5, 12), where the word consecrate is rendered in the margin 'filled the hand of.'

Moses here fills the hands of Aaron and his sons with materials for

the fat, and upon the right thigh: and he put the whole 27
upon the hands of Aaron, and upon the hands of his sons,
and waved them for a wave offering before the LORD. And 28
Moses took them from off their hands, and burnt them on
the altar upon the burnt offering: they were a consecration
for a sweet savour: it was an offering made by fire unto the
LORD. And Moses took the breast, and waved it for a 29
wave offering before the LORD: it was Moses' portion of
the ram of consecration; as the LORD commanded Moses.
And Moses took of the anointing oil, and of the blood which 30
was upon the altar, and sprinkled it upon Aaron, upon his
garments, and upon his sons, and upon his sons' garments
with him; and sanctified Aaron, his garments, and his

an offering and the word 'consecration' may be rendered 'fillings' [of the hand].

29. The sacrifice having been offered Moses waves the breast and it is reserved as his portion. It has been asked Why, if Moses receives the breast as a priestly due, does he not also receive the right thigh and cakes? In answer it may be said that the whole ceremony is twofold in character. It is an inauguration of the priesthood and at the same time an instruction to the future priests how they should discharge their functions. The ceremony of waving the breast being prescribed for all Peace-Offerings is observed by Moses. The inauguration of the priests, both as offerers of sacrifice and receivers of priestly dues, is indicated by the composite character of that which is placed in their hands, and the first Wave-Offering is given entirely to the Lord to shew that all belongs to Him and that He is the real giver of the priestly dues or, as it is said, He 'is their inheritance.' (Deut. xviii. 2.)

30. *And Moses took of the anointing oil*] In Exod. xxix. 21 this ceremony is enjoined *before* the offering of *vv.* 25—29 = Exod. xxix. 22—26. It is not clear whether the oil and the blood are mingled together for one sprinkling (here the word is a correct rendering of the Heb.), or whether each is sprinkled separately. The difference of order in Exod. xxix. 21, where the blood is mentioned before the oil, is easily explained on the first hypothesis, but a separate sprinkling seems required if the ceremonial described in this verse is regarded as carrying out the injunctions of Exod. xxviii. 41 to anoint Aaron and his sons. See note on *v.* 13. The reason for sprinkling Aaron with oil after the anointing of *v.* 12 is not apparent. The absence of the conjunction after Aaron twice in the Heb. text of this verse (note *and* A.V., twice in italics, omitted in R.V.), may indicate a doubt whether any further unction of Aaron was necessary. But the injunction in Exod. xxix. 21 is definite, including the person of Aaron as well as his garments.

31 sons, and his sons' garments with him. And Moses said
unto Aaron and to his sons, Boil the flesh at the door of
the tent of meeting: and there eat it and the bread that
is in the basket of consecration, [1]as I commanded, saying,
32 Aaron and his sons shall eat it. And that which remaineth
33 of the flesh and of the bread shall ye burn with fire. And
ye shall not go out from the door of the tent of meeting
seven days, until the days of your consecration be fulfilled:
34 for he shall [2]consecrate you seven days. As hath been done
this day, so the LORD hath commanded to do, to make
35 atonement for you. And at the door of the tent of meeting
shall ye abide day and night seven days, and keep the
charge of the LORD, that ye die not: for so I am com-
36 manded. And Aaron and his sons did all the things which
the LORD commanded by the hand of Moses.

9 And it came to pass on the eighth day, that Moses called

[1] The Sept., Onkelos and Syr. read, *as I am commanded.* See ver. 35, ch. x. 13. [2] Heb. *fill your hand.*

31. Anyone who was not unclean might eat the portions of the Peace-Offering which remained when the parts for sacrifice and for the priests were taken. On this occasion the flesh is eaten by Aaron and his sons only, and at the door of the tent of meeting. The ceremonies of the first day are repeated on each of the following six days. What remains from the sacrifice of each day must be burnt, as ordered in vii. 15.

as I commanded] See R.V.'s marginal note above.

33. *shall consecrate you*] See R.V. mg. for Heb. idiom, meaning to institute to a priestly office. The reference apparently is to filling the hand (see on *v.* 25) with the joint sacrifices, which they were to offer.

35. *shall ye abide day and night*] an additional command not given in Exod. xxix.

CH. IX. (1) *The first sacrifices of Aaron* (1—14).

On the eighth day (the consecration of Aaron and his sons being complete) Aaron begins to offer sacrifice for himself and for the people, and his sons assist.

The sacrifices are:

for himself	for the people
Sin-Offering. A bull calf	A he-goat
Burnt-Offering. A ram	A calf and a lamb
Peace-Offering }	An ox and a ram and a meal-
Meal-Offering }	offering mingled with oil.

Aaron and his sons, and the elders of Israel; and he said 2
unto Aaron, Take thee a bull calf for a sin offering, and a
ram for a burnt offering, without blemish, and offer them
before the LORD. And unto the children of Israel thou 3
shalt speak, saying, Take ye a he-goat for a sin offering;
and a calf and a lamb, both of the first year, without
blemish, for a burnt offering; and an ox and a ram for 4
peace offerings, to sacrifice before the LORD; and a meal
offering mingled with oil: for to-day the LORD appeareth
unto you. And they brought that which Moses commanded 5
before the tent of meeting: and all the congregation drew
near and stood before the LORD. And Moses said, This is 6
the thing which the LORD commanded that ye should do:
and the glory of the LORD shall appear unto you. And 7
Moses said unto Aaron, Draw near unto the altar, and offer
thy sin offering, and thy burnt offering, and make atone-
ment for thyself, and for the people: and offer the oblation
of the people, and make atonement for them; as the LORD
commanded. So Aaron drew near unto the altar, and slew 8
the calf of the sin offering, which was for himself. And the 9
sons of Aaron presented the blood unto him: and he dipped
his finger in the blood, and put it upon the horns of the
altar, and poured out the blood at the base of the altar: but 10
the fat, and the kidneys, and the caul from the liver of the

A complete sequence of sacrifice is prescribed, and the whole offering is moderate in amount compared with those prescribed for the great festivals in Num. xxviii. and xxix.

1. *elders*] perhaps a late correction (Dillm.). Cp. 'children' in *v.* 3, where Sam. and LXX. again introduce 'elders.'

2. *a bull calf*] Only here is a calf appointed for a Sin-Offering. According to Jewish tradition, expressed in Targ. Jon., it was to remind Aaron of his sin in making the golden calf at Horeb (Exod. xxxii.).

3. *And unto the children*] LXX. and Sam. have 'elders' as in *v.* 1.

6. *This is the thing*] as in viii. 5. To bring the sacrifices prescribed in *vv.* 2—4 is the thing which the Lord commanded.

7. *and for the people*] LXX. has 'and for thy house' as in xvi. 11, 17. This seems right, as atonement for the people comes in the next clause.

8—11. The Sin-Offering is offered with the same ritual as in viii. 14—17. The blood is not brought into the holy place, but what is not burnt on the altar is consumed without the camp.

sin offering, he burnt upon the altar; as the LORD com-
11 manded Moses. And the flesh and the skin he burnt with
12 fire without the camp. And he slew the burnt offering;
and Aaron's sons delivered unto him the blood, and he
13 sprinkled it upon the altar round about. And they delivered
the burnt offering unto him, piece by piece, and the head:
14 and he burnt them upon the altar. And he washed the
inwards and the legs, and burnt them upon the burnt
15 offering on the altar. And he presented the people's obla-
tion, and took the goat of the sin offering which was for the
16 people, and slew it, and offered it for sin, as the first. And
he presented the burnt offering, and offered it according to
17 the ordinance. And he presented the meal offering, and
filled his hand therefrom, and burnt it upon the altar,
18 besides the burnt offering of the morning. He slew also
the ox and the ram, the sacrifice of peace offerings, which
was for the people: and Aaron's sons delivered unto him
the blood, and he sprinkled it upon the altar round about,
19 and the fat of the ox; and of the ram, the fat tail, and that
which covereth *the inwards*, and the kidneys, and the caul

12—14. The Burnt-Offering is offered as in viii. 18—21.

12. *delivered*] *presented* A.V. a different Heb. verb here and in *vv.* 13, 18 from that in viii. 18, 22.

sprinkled] **threw** as in viii. 19. So in *v.* 18.

(2) *The offerings for the people* (15—21)

15. The Sin-Offering for the people is offered 'as the first' i.e. in the same way as Aaron's Sin-Offering; the blood is not brought into the tabernacle, and the sacrifice is wholly consumed. This treatment gives rise to the question of x. 16.

16. The Burnt-Offering offered 'according to the ordinance' as prescribed in ch. i., or as in *vv.* 12—14. Cp. *v.* 10.

17. The Meal-Offering. The Heb. for taking a handful from the Meal-Offering in this verse is different from that in ii. 2.

besides the burnt offering of the morning] The same words in Num. xxviii. 23 refer to the continual Burnt-Offering enjoined in Exod. xxix. 38—42 and Num. xxviii. 3—8. Are the Burnt-Offerings which have been already offered, or any of them, regarded as 'the burnt offering of the morning'? or are these last words (so Dillm.) the gloss of a later scribe?

18—21. The sacrifice of Peace-Offerings. The fat parts of both animals are burnt by Aaron on the altar; the breasts and the right thigh (?of both animals) are 'waved before the LORD.'

of the liver: and they put the fat upon the breasts, and he 20
burnt the fat upon the altar: and the breasts and the right 21
thigh Aaron waved for a wave offering before the LORD;
as Moses commanded. And Aaron lifted up his hands 22
toward the people, and blessed them; and he came down
from offering the sin offering, and the burnt offering, and
the peace offerings. And Moses and Aaron went into the 23
tent of meeting, and came out, and blessed the people: and
the glory of the LORD appeared unto all the people. And 24
there came forth fire from before the LORD, and consumed
upon the altar the burnt offering and the fat: and when all
the people saw it, they shouted, and fell on their faces.

And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took each of 10

The right thigh was burnt in the ceremony of consecration (viii. 28); now Aaron, officiating as priest, retains both breast and thigh for himself.

22. Aaron now lifts up his hands and blesses the people, exercising another of his priestly functions.

23. *And Moses and Aaron went into the tent of meeting*] The meaning of this action is not explained and the clause has been interpreted in various ways. If it be regarded as introducing Aaron to the tent of meeting, and to the duties which he had to perform there, the reason why Aaron has not hitherto brought any of the blood into the Holy place is apparent.

24. A second blessing follows after Moses and Aaron come out from the temple. God's approval is signified, for His servant has returned from His presence with gifts of grace for His people. It is further signified by the appearance of the glory of the Lord (cp. *vv.* 4, 6), and the fire from before the Lord which consumes the Burnt-Offering and the fat. Similar manifestations of approval are recorded in Jud. vi. 21; 1 Kgs xviii. 38; 1 Chr. xxi. 26. In 2 Chr. vii. 1 the fire comes down from heaven.

24*a* is perhaps an interpolation. In *vv.* 13, 16 (cp. viii. 20) the 'fat' is not mentioned in connexion with the Burnt-Offerings, while it is stated (*v.* 13) that Aaron burnt the pieces one by one. Moreover, the sacrifice was already ended (*v.* 22), so that there is difficulty in supposing the fat and burnt-offering to be still upon the altar.

Perhaps the LXX.'s 'offered' and 'put' for 'burnt' in *vv.* 13, 17, 20 may be influenced by this consideration. This is, however, a somewhat precarious deduction.

CH. X. (3) *The first priestly transgression and its punishment* (1—7).

1. Nadab and Abihu were specially chosen to 'come up unto the LORD' with Moses, Aaron and the 70 elders (Exod. xxiv. 1, 9—11, the only reference to these sons of Aaron outside P).

them his censer, and put fire therein, and laid incense thereon, and offered strange fire before the LORD, which he
2 had not commanded them. And there came forth fire from before the LORD, and devoured them, and they died before
3 the LORD. Then Moses said unto Aaron, This is it that the LORD spake, saying, I will be sanctified in them that [1]come nigh me, and before all the people I will be glorified.
4 And Aaron held his peace. And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said unto them, Draw near, carry your brethren from before the

[1] Or, *are nigh*

his censer] The Heb. word is used in this sense here, in ch. xvi. 12 (of Aaron on the Day of Atonement), and in Num. xvi. (the censers of Korah and his company, and of Aaron). A dish or pan for carrying live coal is meant.

offered strange fire] This is sometimes explained as fire not taken from the altar of Burnt-Offering (cp. xvi. 12; Num. xvi. 46); but then the adjective 'strange' would have been used with fire when first mentioned —'and put [strange] fire therein.' If the offence consisted in bringing 'strange incense' (Exod. xxx. 9), i.e. incense not prepared according to the prescription in Exod. xxx. 34—36, then the next clause would have been—'and laid [strange] incense thereon.' The whole action is here described as 'offering strange fire before the LORD,' an expression found only here and in passages referring to this event (Num. iii. 4, xxvi. 61). It was an irregular fire-offering, and the sin of Nadab and Abihu consisted in offering that which the Lord had not commanded them. At the commencement of priestly ministrations both priests and people are taught by this visitation to observe scrupulously the Divine commands in all that concerns the ministration of the sanctuary. From xvi. 1 it may be conjectured that the regulations for entering into the Holy place were at one time more closely connected with this narrative.

there came forth fire from before the LORD] As in ix. 24; see note there.

devoured them] They were not wholly consumed (cp. *v.* 5). For similar punishment cp. Num. xi. 1, xvi. 35; 2 Kgs i. 10.

3. *I will be sanctified*] The words seem to be a quotation and are in poetical parallelism:

"In them that come nigh me I will shew myself holy,
And before all the people I will glorify myself."

The sense is that the priests are those who have the right to approach God, and He shews Himself holy in punishing those who do it improperly.

4. For the relationship between the persons mentioned see Exod. vi. 18, 22.

sanctuary out of the camp. So they drew near, and carried 5
them in their coats out of the camp; as Moses had said.
And Moses said unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto 6
Ithamar, his sons, [1]Let not the hair of your heads go loose,
neither rend your clothes; that ye die not, and that he be
not wroth with all the congregation: but let your brethren,
the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the
LORD hath kindled. And ye shall not go out from the door 7
of the tent of meeting, lest ye die: for the anointing oil of
the LORD is upon you. And they did according to the
word of Moses.

And the LORD spake unto Aaron, saying, Drink no wine 8 9
nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when ye go
into the tent of meeting, that ye die not: it shall be a statute

[1] Some ancient versions render, *Uncover not your heads.*

5. *their coats*] their priestly garments. See on viii. 13.

6. The ordinary priest might defile himself for those near of kin (xxi. 2) but the high priest was not allowed to do so (xxi. 11). On this occasion Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar were all subject to the stricter rule. The whole house of Israel joined in the mourning.

Let not the hair of your heads go loose] It was said to Ezekiel when forbidden to mourn, 'bind thy headtire upon thee' (Ezek. xxiv. 17). On removing the headtire the hair would fall down, so that the prohibition 'Uncover not your heads' (A.V.), is in effect the same. To let the hair loose and to rend the garments were and still are signs of mourning among the Jews and Eastern nations.

7. *for the anointing oil of the LORD is upon you*] The commands of this verse do not necessarily imply that the seven days of consecration (viii. 33) are not yet ended, for a similar statement is applied in xxi. 12 to the high priest at all times.

(4) *Wine and strong drink forbidden* (8, 9).

Aaron is the direct recipient of God's commands here and in Num. xviii. 1, 8, 20 only. Elsewhere they are given 'unto Moses and unto Aaron' or 'unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron.'

According to an old tradition, Nadab and Abihu offered strange fire when under the influence of wine. The close connexion of this prohibition with the record of their transgression is probably the basis of this tradition. In many ancient cults wine was forbidden to priests and other officials. Cp. Ezek. xliv. 21.

10 for ever throughout your generations: and [1]that ye may
put difference between the holy and the common, and
11 between the unclean and the clean; and [1]that ye may teach
the children of Israel all the statutes which the LORD hath
spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.
12 And Moses spake unto Aaron, and unto Eleazar and unto
Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take the meal offering that
remaineth of the offerings of the LORD made by fire, and
eat it without leaven beside the altar: for it is most holy:
13 and ye shall eat it in a holy place, because it is thy due, and
thy sons' due, of the offerings of the LORD made by fire:
14 for so I am commanded. And the wave breast and the
heave thigh shall ye eat in a clean place; thou, and thy
sons, and thy daughters with thee: for they are given as
thy due, and thy sons' due, out of the sacrifices of the peace
15 offerings of the children of Israel. The heave thigh and the
wave breast shall they bring with the offerings made by fire
of the fat, to wave it for a wave offering before the LORD:

[1] Or, *ye shall*

10, 11. This passage may well have an immediate relation to the preceding context, as meaning that perfect sobriety was required in order to enable them to discriminate between 'holy' and 'common' and to give right *Torah*. Others have thought that the words in the last clause of *v.* 11 'the LORD hath spoken' shew that it is not connected with *v.* 8, and that *v.* 9 seems marked off by its last clause from what follows. *V.* 10 would form an appropriate introduction to chs. xi.—xv.

Driver and White (Haupt's *SBOT.*, *ad loc.*) think that something may have fallen out here.

(5) *The law of eating the holy things* (12—15).

The reference is to the Meal-Offering and Peace-Offering of ix. 17, 18. The remainder of the Meal-Offering, after the handful therefrom had been burnt, belonged to the priests, ii. 2, 3, vi. 16—18. Being most holy, it was eaten only by priests in a holy place here specified as 'beside the altar.' Cp. vi. 16, 26; 'in the court of the tent of meeting.' The priestly portions of the Peace-Offering might be eaten by the families of the priests in a clean place, of course only by those who were ritually clean (vii. 20, 21). The Sin-Offering when eaten, being most holy, was treated as the Meal-Offering. See vi. 24—29.

14. For the 'wave breast' and the 'heave thigh' see Appendix IV, pp. 183 ff.

and it shall be thine, and thy sons' with thee, as a due for ever; as the LORD hath commanded.

And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, 16
and, behold, it was burnt: and he was angry with Eleazar
and with Ithamar, the sons of Aaron that were left, saying,
Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the place of 17
the sanctuary, seeing it is most holy, and he hath given it
you [1]to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make
atonement for them before the LORD? Behold, the blood 18
of it was not brought into the sanctuary within: ye should
certainly have eaten it in the sanctuary, as I commanded.
And Aaron spake unto Moses, Behold, this day have they 19
offered their sin offering and their burnt offering before the
LORD; and there have befallen me such things as these:

[1] Or, *to take away*

(6) *Aaron's excuse for not eating the Sin-Offering* (16—20).

The Sin-Offering is that of ix. 15 which was offered as the first, i.e. as Aaron's, Sin-Offering, and burnt without the camp (ix. 11). This burning (as opposed to eating by the priests) should only have taken place, if (as was not done in this case) the blood had been brought into the 'tent of meeting.' Moses is angry with Aaron's sons, but they acted under direction, and Aaron acknowledges his responsibility by replying.

17. *and he hath given it you to bear* [mg. *to take away*] *the iniquity of the congregation*] Two interpretations of this clause have been proposed, (*a*) God has given the Sin-Offering for the purpose of taking away the iniquity of the congregation, (*b*) God has given to you the Sin-Offering (the part not burnt on the altar) to eat for the purpose of bearing (or taking away) the iniquity...The first is a general statement as to the efficacy of the Sin-Offering; the second attributes an atoning value to the eating by the priests, although not to this action apart from the ceremonial of which it formed a constituent portion. The acceptance of a sacrifice depends on the due observance of the whole appointed ritual, and each action as contributing towards the acceptance of the whole may be said to have an atoning value.

19. Aaron in his reply admits that he should have eaten the Sin-Offering, but gives as a reason for not doing so 'there have befallen me such things as these.' This is explained as a reference to the death of his sons. Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar were forbidden to mourn for them; but Aaron considered their death as a sign that God was displeased and refrained from eating the Sin-Offering. The whole incident presents

and if I had eaten the sin offering to-day, would it have been
20 well-pleasing in the sight of the LORD? And when Moses
heard *that*, it was well-pleasing in his sight.

11 And the LORD spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying

difficulties which have not been satisfactorily explained, one of which is that the sacrifice to which Moses refers belongs to that class of which the priests were not to eat. The direction in vi. 26, that the priest who offers a Sin-Offering 'shall eat it' is there limited in *v.* 30, by forbidding that this shall be done when any of the blood has been brought into the tent of meeting to make atonement. In accordance with this restriction, the rebuke by Moses in *v.* 18 is justified, but on the other hand it should be noted that no blood has yet been brought into the Holy place, not even that of the calf for Aaron's Sin-Offering (ix. 8 ff.), and yet no objection against the burning of it was made by Moses.

For one who desired to defend the burning of all the parts the argument would be fairly obvious that the rules for the Sin-Offering of the priest as laid down in iv. 3 ff. direct this course. Aaron's line of defence, however, is wholly different. Dillm. suggests that the section as it now stands has arisen through the expansion of an older and simpler narrative in P, in which was set forth the original disinclination of the priests to partake of the flesh of the Sin-Offering.

The most probable explanation of the passage is that it is an attempt to account for a discrepancy between the earlier and later ritual. That the priests should abstain, in the contemplated case, from eating the victim whose blood had not been brought into the sanctuary, was opposed to the later custom, and thus needed special circumstances to justify it, and the consequent sanction of Moses.

CHS. XI.—XV. THE LAWS OF PURIFICATION.

These laws suitably follow chs. viii.—x. which record the consecration of the priests. As sacrifice was the principal element in that consecration, the laws of sacrifice (chs. i.—vii.) appropriately *precede* the account of the inauguration of the worship in chs. viii.—x.

One of the chief duties of the priests was 'to put difference between the holy and the common, and between the unclean and the clean' (x. 10); instructions for putting this difference appropriately *follow* the account in chs. viii.—x.

These laws may be divided into two groups:

(1) those in ch. xi., which relate to food and contact with the carcases of animals;

(2) those in chs. xii.—xv., concerning the uncleanness of persons, garments, furniture, and houses.

unto them, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, These 2
are the living things which ye shall eat among all the beasts
that are on the earth. Whatsoever parteth the hoof, and is 3
clovenfooted, *and* [1]cheweth the cud, among the beasts, that

[1] Heb. *bringeth up.*

Ch. XI. 1—23[1]. The Distinction between Clean and Unclean Food.

One principle underlying this distinction appears to have been that animals which were recognised as in any way objects of worship by heathen neighbours, or even supposed by them to be connected with unseen supernatural beings, were to be considered unclean. See Bertholet in *KHC.*, introd. note to this ch. But in other cases the prohibition probably rested on the animal's repulsive appearance or uncleanly habits, or on sanitary or totemistic grounds. See Driver, *Deut.* p. 164, and Rob.-Sm. *OTJC.*[2] p. 366.

A list of animals which may and may not be eaten is given in Deut. xiv. 3—20; it has close verbal affinity with *vv.* 2—21 of this ch. The two passages are placed side by side in Driver (*ICC.*) *Deut.* p. 157 f.

Both lists are divided into classes:

(*a*) *Beasts vv.* 2—8. Cp. Deut. xiv. 3—8.

Deut. enumerates three domestic, and seven wild animals, as clean beasts which may be eaten. Lev. does not mention the clean beasts, but both give their two distinguishing marks—'Whatsoever parteth the hoof...*and* cheweth the cud,' and specify the same four beasts which have not both of these marks as unclean. Lev. is more diffuse, but employs the same expressions as Deut.

(*b*) *Fishes vv.* 9—12. Cp. Deut. xiv. 9, 10.

The same criterion of cleanness, having 'scales and fins,' is given both in Lev. and Deut., but Lev. is more diffuse, and introduces a word (Heb. *shéḳeṣ*) detestation, used frequently in this ch., also in vii. 21, and Is. lxvi. 17; Ezek. viii. 10. Another and commoner form (*shiḳḳuṣ*) occurs in Deut. xxix. 16. No fish is mentioned by name, and the distinction between clean and unclean fishes in particular cases was determined by the Jewish rabbis.

(*c*) *Birds vv.* 13—19. Cp. Deut. xiv. 11—18.

Deut. begins with 'Of all clean birds ye may eat' (*v.* 11), but does not give a list like that of clean beasts. The forbidden birds are almost identical in both.

[1] For the sources from which this ch. comes, and its relation from a critical point of view to Deut. xiv. 3 ff. see App. I (*c*), pp. 162 f.

4 shall ye eat. Nevertheless these shall ye not eat of them
that chew the cud, or of them that part the hoof: the
camel, because he [1]cheweth the cud but parteth not the
5 hoof, he is unclean unto you. And the [2]coney, because
he [1]cheweth the cud but parteth not the hoof, he is unclean
6 unto you. And the hare, because she [1]cheweth the cud
7 but parteth not the hoof, she is unclean unto you. And the
swine, because he parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, but
8 cheweth not the cud, he is unclean unto you. Of their
flesh ye shall not eat, and their carcases ye shall not touch;
they are unclean unto you.

[1] Heb. *bringeth up.*
[2] Heb. *shaphan*, the *Hyrax Syriacus* or *rock-badger.*

(*d*) *Winged* **swarming** *things vv.* 20—23. Cp. Deut. xiv. 19, 20.

Lev. adds 'that go upon all four' (*v.* 20), and in *vv.* 21, 22 gives a list of winged swarming things that may be eaten (those that 'leap'), repeating in *v.* 23 the prohibition of *v.* 20. Deut. concludes the list with 'of all clean fowls (the same Heb. word as for 'winged things') ye may eat' (xiv. 20), but gives no list.

4. The camel's hoof is parted above but the lower part is not divided. The Egyptians did not eat the flesh of the camel, but both the flesh and the milk are considered as lawful food by the Arabs.

5. *the coney*] The exact equivalent of the Heb. *shāphān* is given in R.V. mg. In Ps. civ. 18; Prov. xxx. 26 it is described as a weak and timid animal, taking refuge in the rocks, and Tristram (*Land of Israel*, p. 250) remarks that it is difficult to capture. 'Coney,' an old English term for 'rabbit,' is the rendering of A.V., which follows the traditional Jewish interpretation. As 'coney' is no longer in use, it has been retained in R.V., on the principle of avoiding all unnecessary alteration, but with the exact rendering in the margin. This is one of many instances where the rendering of R.V. mg. is essential for the full understanding of that version.

The coney (rock-badger) and hare move their jaws like beasts which chew the cud, but are not ruminating animals. Here, as in other passages of the Bible, the language is popular, rather than scientific.

7. The flesh of the pig is forbidden because it is not a ruminant. Of the four animals here mentioned, the swine was specially obnoxious to the Jews, either owing to its being an object of heathen worship (cp. Is. lxv. 4, lxvi. 3, 17), or for sanitary reasons. To eat pork was by them regarded as abjuring their religion, and it is recorded as one of the abominations that were forced upon the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes in the Maccabaean persecution, 2 Macc. vi. 18, 19.

8. *their carcases ye shall not touch*] The word carcase is the same

These shall ye eat of all that are in the waters: whatso- 9
ever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and
in the rivers, them shall ye eat. And all that have not fins 10
and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in
the waters, and of all the living creatures that are in the
waters, they are an abomination unto you, and they shall be 11
an abomination unto you; ye shall not eat of their flesh, and
their carcases ye shall have in abomination. Whatsoever 12
hath no fins nor scales in the waters, that is an abomination
unto you.

And these ye shall have in abomination among the fowls; 13
they shall not be eaten, they are an abomination: the
[1]eagle, and the gier eagle, and the ospray; and the kite, 14
and the falcon after its kind; every raven after its kind; 15

[1] Or, *great vulture*

as that translated 'that which dieth of itself' (xvii. 15; Deut. xiv. 21). Here and in Deut. xiv. 8 contact with the dead bodies of these unclean animals is prohibited.

13. *the eagle*] Heb. *nésher*. *great vulture* R.V. mg. The *nésher* is described (Mic. i. 16) as bald, as spying for prey on the peaks of the rocks, and as swooping down upon the slain (Hab. i. 8; Job xxxix. 27—30). The griffon, of the vulture family, is denoted by this Heb. word. The eagle cannot be described as bald, having feathers on the head and neck, but the griffon has only down.

the gier eagle] Heb. *péres*, the 'breaker' or 'cleaver': the bearded vulture, *Gypaetus barbatus*, which breaks the bones of animals in order to obtain the marrow. Hence the name 'ossifrage' (bone breaker) in A.V. Geire (cp. the German Geier) was an old English word for vulture.

the ospray] The fishing hawk or another species of eagle. There are seven different kinds of eagle in Palestine.

14. *the kite*] *vulture* A.V. The Heb. word *dā'āh* occurs only here as the name of a bird, but a similar word *dayyāh* is found in Deut. xiv. 13 and Is. xxxiv. 15 (*kite*[*s*] R.V., *vulture*[*s*] A.V.) only. The Heb. words in Lev. and Deut. are

Lev. *dā'āh* (kite) *'ayyah* (falcon),
Deut. *rā'āh* (glede) *'ayyah* (falcon) *dayyah* (kite).

rā'āh is doubtless a copyist's error for *dā'āh* (it has been translated in R.V. and A.V. 'glede,' an old English word for 'kite'), and *dayyah* may have been added instead of the omitted *dā'āh*.

the falcon] *kite* A.V. The word occurs here, in Deut. xiv. 13 and Job xxviii. 7 (*vulture* A.V.) only.

The expression 'after his kind' following, implies that several varieties

16 and the ostrich, and the [1]night hawk, and the seamew, and
17 the hawk after its kind; and the little owl, and the
18 cormorant, and the great owl; and the [2]horned owl, and
19 the pelican, and the vulture; and the stork, the [3]heron after its kind, and the hoopoe, and the bat.

[1] Heb. *tahmas*, of uncertain meaning. [2] Or, *swan* [3] Or, *ibis*.

of this bird were known. The Heb. *'ayyah* may be derived from the bird's cry which is rendered in Arabic as *yā yā*.

16. *ostrich*] Here and in Deut. xiv. 15; Job xxx. 29; Is. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 13, xliii. 20; Jer. l. 39; Mic. i. 8 the rendering 'owl' of A.V. should be corrected to 'ostrich.'

the night hawk] The meaning of the Heb. *taḥmās* is very uncertain. The root seems to indicate a bird of aggressive and violent character.

the seamew] *cuckow* A.V. So LXX. and Vulg.

the hawk after its kind] Many varieties of the hawk are indicated. The Heb. word *nēṣ* occurs here, in Deut. xiv. 15 and Job xxxix. 26 only.

17. *the little owl*] Heb. *kōs* in the two texts and in Ps. cii. 7 only. A bird screeching by night is indicated by the LXX. and Vulg.

the cormorant] The position of this word in Deut. is more suitable than here. The Heb. word *shālāk* implies plunging downwards with force and the Targ. translates it 'a bird that catches fishes.'

the great owl] In the two texts and Is. xxxiv. 11 ('owl,' R. and A.V., 'bittern' R.V. mg.) the LXX. translate 'ibis.' Some species of owl is indicated.

18. *the horned owl*] (*swan* A.V. and R.V. mg.) another kind of owl. The Heb. root (also used in *v.* 30 for the chameleon [*mole* A.V.]) suggests a bird that makes a snorting sound, or breathes hard. The LXX. trans. πορφυρίων. Tristram (*Nat. Hist. of the Bible*, p. 249) and Driver (*Deut. in loc.*) 'the water hen.'

the pelican] In the lists and Ps. cii. 6 [Heb. 7] ('a pelican of the wilderness'); Is. xxxiv. 11; Zeph. ii. 14 (*cormorant* A.V.) it is used of a bird inhabiting desolate places.

the vulture] (*the gier-eagle* A.V.) It is distinguished by zoologists as *vultur percnopterus*.

The cormorant follows in Deut. at the close of xiv. 17.

19. *the stork*] In the two lists, and Ps. civ. 17 ('the fir trees are her house'); Jer. viii. 7 ('knoweth her appointed times,' i.e. of migration), Zech. v. 9†. The Heb. word means 'pious' or 'merciful' (referring to her tenderness towards her young). In the difficult passage, Job xxxix. 13, either the stork is mentioned, or there is a play upon words with reference to her name, and a contrast between her and the ostrich seems indicated. See R.V. mg. and A.V. mg.

the heron] Many kinds of heron are found both in Egypt and

All winged creeping things that go upon all four are an abomination unto you. Yet these may ye eat of all winged creeping things that go upon all four, which have legs above their feet, to leap withal upon the earth; even these of them ye may eat; the [1]locust after its kind, and the [1]bald locust after its kind, and the [1]cricket after its kind, and the [1]grasshopper after its kind. But all winged creeping things, which have four feet, are an abomination unto you. 20 21 22 23

[1] Four kinds of locusts or grasshoppers, which are not certainly known.

Palestine. The ibis R.V. mg. was a sacred bird to the Egyptians, and one variety of heron found in great numbers round Lake Huleh is called the white ibis.

the hoopoe] (*lapwing* A.V.) The traditional interpretation of this strange Heb. word *dūkīphath* from LXX. and Vulg. onwards is fixed. Some consider it to be derived from the cry of the bird, like that of the cuckoo. Cheyne thinks it is derived by transposition of letters from *ḳippōd*, the 'porcupine' or bittern, Is. xiv. 23, xxxiv. 11; Zeph. ii. 14†.

the bat] In both lists and Is. ii. 20 (there in plur.)†. The derivation of the Heb. word is uncertain, but its meaning is not questioned.

20—23. The connexion between these *vv.* and *v.* 41 is very close, and *vv.* 24—30 are generally regarded as supplementary. See pp. 162 f.

20. *All winged* **swarming** *things*] The same words as in Deut. xiv. 19; swarming creatures which also fly, i.e. flying insects. A.V. obscures for the English reader the identity of expression by rendering here 'all fowls that creep,' and in Deut. xiv. 19 'every creeping thing that flieth.' In Deut. these things are all classed as unclean and not to be eaten. They are here further described as those 'that go upon all four.' All these swarming things have *six* feet, but the text describes their action as it appears to an ordinary observer, and, as in *vv.* 5, 6, the language is popular, rather than scientific.

21—23. Four kinds of these swarming things which may be eaten are mentioned. The first and last of these occur frequently in the O.T., the second and third only here.

The first is *'arbeh*, the general term for a locust, and from the passages in which it occurs (e.g. Exod. x. 4, of the plague of locusts, Jud. vi. 5, vii. 12, of invading troops) is clearly a highly destructive insect.

The fourth, *ḥāgāb*, is translated 'grasshopper' except in 2 Chr. vii. 13, where both R.V. and A.V. render 'locust.' From the words which follow, 'to devour the land,' it is clear the grasshopper is not meant, but one of the locust family. The rendering 'beetle' of A.V. for the third is certainly wrong. The Heb. word probably means *a galloper*, and the characteristic of the four kinds is that they 'have legs...to leap withal.'

That they were actually eaten appears from Mt. iii. 4; Mk i. 6.

24 And by these ye shall become unclean: whosoever
toucheth the carcase of them shall be unclean until the
25 even: and whosoever beareth *aught* of the carcase of them
shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even.
26 Every beast which parteth the hoof, and is not clovenfooted,
nor cheweth the cud, is unclean unto you: every one that
27 toucheth them shall be unclean. And whatsoever goeth
upon its paws, among all beasts that go on all four, they are
unclean unto you: whoso toucheth their carcase shall be
28 unclean until the even. And he that beareth the carcase
of them shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the
even: they are unclean unto you.
29 And these are they which are unclean unto you among
the creeping things that creep upon the earth; the weasel,
30 and the mouse, and the great lizard after its kind, and the

24—28. UNCLEANNESS CAUSED BY DEAD BODIES.

(See introductory note on *vv.* 20—23.)

Vv. 24, 25 are a general introduction. 'And by these' (*v.* 24) refers to what follows, not to the 'winged creeping things' of *v.* 23.

(*a*) touching or bearing the carcase of (α) beasts specified in *vv.* 26, 27 or (β) swarming things specified in *vv.* 29, 30 caused uncleanness till the even; if they were carried, the clothes must also be washed.

(*b*) further cases of defilement were caused by a carcase, (α) a vessel (32, 33), (β) food (34), (γ) ovens, etc. (35), (δ) water in a pit (36), (ε) seed (37, 38).

Carrying part of the carcase involves uncleanness of a higher degree than that caused by mere contact. Note the difference in the regulations of *vv.* 24, 25 and 27, 28.

In 26, 27 the beasts are specified by their characteristics; in 29, 30 by their names.

27. *goeth upon its paws*] animals like the dog and cat whose feet are hand-like in form, having digits and claws.

29—38. UNCLEANNESS CAUSED BY CREEPING THINGS.

29. *the weasel*†] According to early Versions, and the Mishna the Heb. word should be thus translated; but some prefer the rendering 'mole.'

the great lizard†] *tortoise* A.V. The cognate words in Arab. and Syr. support the rendering of R.V.

30. For the four words which follow see R.V. mg. They occur only in this verse.

[1]gecko, and the [1]land-crocodile, and the [1]lizard, and the [1]sand-lizard, and the chameleon. These are they which 31
are unclean to you among all that creep: whosoever doth
touch them, when they are dead, shall be unclean until the
even. And upon whatsoever any of them, when they are 32
dead, doth fall, it shall be unclean; whether it be any
vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever
vessel it be, wherewith any work is done, it must be put
into water, and it shall be unclean until the even; then
shall it be clean. And every earthen vessel, whereinto any 33
of them falleth, whatsoever is in it shall be unclean, and it
ye shall break. All food *therein* which may be eaten, that 34
on which water cometh, shall be unclean: and all drink
that may be drunk in every *such* vessel shall be unclean.
And every thing whereupon *any part* of their carcase falleth 35
shall be unclean; whether oven, or [2]range for pots, it shall
be broken in pieces: they are unclean, and shall be unclean
unto you. Nevertheless a fountain or a [3]pit wherein is a 36
gathering of water shall be clean: but [4]that which toucheth

[1] Words of uncertain meaning, but probably denoting four kinds of lizards. [2] Or, *stewpan* [3] Or, *cistern* [4] Or, *he who*

chameleon] *mole* A.V. following the versions. The same Heb. word is translated *horned owl* in *v.* 18.

It seems strange that so many kinds of lizards are mentioned; also that the same Heb. word should have two such different meanings in the same chapter.

31. *creep*] **swarm.**

32. The case of one of these small animals creeping into a pan or bag or garment, and being found dead, seems to be contemplated. In such a case the vessel is unclean for the rest of the day and (*v.* 33) if earthen must be broken, cp. vi. 28.

34. Any food mixed with or put in water (for cooking or eating) and any drink into or upon which one of these swarming things has fallen is unclean.

35. If the carcase of any swarming thing come in contact with an oven, or small cooking stove, the vessel becomes unclean and must be broken.

The Heb word *kīraim*† probably means a small cooking stove. LXX. translate 'pots with feet.' The dual form is used either because the vessel consisted of two parts, or because two portions could be prepared in it; somewhat like a modern egg-boiler for two.

36. The continuous renewal of water in a well renders the unclean-

37 their carcase shall be unclean. And if *aught* of their carcase fall upon any sowing seed which is to be sown, it
38 is clean. But if water be put upon the seed, and *aught* of their carcase fall thereon, it is unclean unto you.
39 And if any beast, of which ye may eat, die; he that toucheth the carcase thereof shall be unclean until the even.
40 And he that eateth of the carcase of it shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even: he also that beareth the carcase of it shall wash his clothes, and be unclean until the even.
41 And every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth is
42 an abomination; it shall not be eaten. Whatsoever goeth upon the belly, and whatsoever goeth upon all four, or whatsoever hath many feet, even all creeping things that creep upon the earth, them ye shall not eat; for they are
43 an abomination. Ye shall not make yourselves abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth, neither shall ye make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be
44 defiled thereby. For I am the LORD your God: sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye holy; for I am holy: neither shall ye defile yourselves with any manner of

ness inappreciable, but he who takes out the carcase is rendered unclean by touching it. The case of the pit or cistern is not clear. It might be so large that the effect of a small swarming thing could be neglected, or the water might be replenished by rain.

37, 38. For the seed which is to be sown, contact with swarming things may be disregarded; but if water be added (i.e. if it is put with water in a vessel for cooking), uncleanness will ensue.

A special case comes in *vv.* 39, 40.

39. The carcase even of a clean beast causes uncleanness.

40. Eating the carcase is forbidden as in Deut. xiv. 21. According to xvii. 15, the eater must also bathe himself. LXX. supply this command here.

41—44. This would come appropriately as a conclusion to the rules about eating, after *v.* 23. Cp. Ezek. viii. 10 f.

41. *creeping thing that creepeth*] **swarming** thing that **swarmeth**, and so in *vv.* 42—44 except the last part of *v.* 44 'that moveth (*creepeth* A.V.) upon the earth.'

43—45 may be an excerpt from H (see *Introd.* p. xix, *The Law of Purification*). In fact, Horst and Kuenen (and Dillm. partially) would include in H a large part of this ch.

creeping thing that moveth upon the earth. For I am the 45
LORD that brought you up out of the land of Egypt, to be
your God: ye shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.
This is the law of the beast, and of the fowl, and of 46
every living creature that moveth in the waters, and of
every creature that creepeth upon the earth: to make a 47
difference between the unclean and the clean, and between
the living thing that may be eaten and the living thing that
may not be eaten.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the 12 2
children of Israel, saying, If a woman conceive seed, and
bear a man child, then she shall be unclean seven days; as
in the days of the [1]impurity of her sickness shall she be
unclean. And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin 3
shall be circumcised. And she shall continue in the blood 4
of *her* purifying three and thirty days; she shall touch no
hallowed thing, nor come into the sanctuary, until the
days of her purifying be fulfilled. But if she bear a maid 5
child, then she shall be unclean two weeks, as in her [1]im-
purity: and she shall continue in the blood of *her* purifying

[1] Or, *separation*

45. The reason for these prescriptions is given; it is the same as in H.

46, 47. Summary. It refers only to the rules about eating, and so makes no reference to *vv.* 24—30. See App. I (*c*).

46. *creepeth*] **swarmeth.**

CH. XII. 1—8. PURIFICATION AFTER CHILDBIRTH.

For the connexion between this chapter and xv. 19—30 see *Introd.* p. xix.

1. These precepts are addressed to Moses only.

2. Compare Gen. xvii. 12; Exod. xxii. 29, 30; Lk. i. 59; Phil. iii. 5. Reference is here made to the regulation of xv. 19.

4, 5. The time of purification after the birth of a female was twice as long as that after a male. The belief that the birth of a girl was more dangerous for the mother than the birth of a boy prevailed among ancient nations, who considered that hostile supernatural beings were more to be feared in these cases. The practice, as here, survived the belief on which it was founded. Observe that the mother is regarded as unclean but not the child.

6 threescore and six days. And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb of the first year for a burnt offering, and a young pigeon, or a turtledove, for a sin offering, unto the door of
7 the tent of meeting, unto the priest: and he shall offer it before the LORD, and make atonement for her; and she shall be cleansed from the fountain of her blood. This is the law for her that beareth, whether a male or a female.
8 And if her means suffice not for a lamb, then she shall take two turtledoves, or two young pigeons; the one for a burnt offering, and the other for a sin offering: and the priest shall make atonement for her, and she shall be clean.

13 And the LORD spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying,

6. At the end of her purification she was to bring an offering. The alternative of a pigeon for the lamb of the Burnt-Offering is allowed in i. 14 and also in the Sin-Offering (v. 7—10), but the further alternative of a Meal-Offering (v. 11—13) is not found here. The Virgin Mary (Lk. ii. 24) offered the sacrifices of one whose 'means suffice not for a lamb.'

8. *if her means suffice not for a lamb*] 'if she be not able to bring,' A.V. Its mg. 'If her hand find not sufficiency of,' is the literal rendering of the Heb.

CHS. XIII., XIV. THE TREATMENT OF LEPROSY.

The word leprosy is now used to denote a malignant disease which in the Middle Ages swept over Europe and the British Isles. Traces of this visitation are found in the leper houses which were built in England. At present the disease is the subject of special treatment in Norway, but it is prevalent in India and elsewhere in the East and in parts of the Pacific Ocean. Many travellers have described the pitiable condition of the modern lepers, and the heroic action of Father Damien at the leper settlement of Molokai, Hawaii (†1889) in devoting his life to the alleviation of their sufferings has drawn public attention to the continued existence of this malady, but in by far the majority of cases these accounts of lepers and their sufferings are read with interest mainly because of the prominent position assigned to the treatment of leprosy in these chapters, and other references to lepers in both the Old and New Testaments. References are often made in the Bible to other diseases, but none are described with such particularity as that which is called leprosy. The symptoms here described refer to the earlier stages of the leprosy, if indeed that name be the right one. The Art. *Leprosy* in *Enc. Bib.* III. (by Creighton) says, however, 'it may be doubted whether anyone would ever have discovered true

When a man shall have in the skin of his flesh a rising, or a 2
scab, or a bright spot, and it become in the skin of his flesh
the plague of leprosy, then he shall be brought unto Aaron
the priest, or unto one of his sons the priests: and the 3
priest shall look on the plague in the skin of the flesh: and
if the hair in the plague be turned white, and the appearance
of the plague be deeper than the skin of his flesh, it is the
plague of leprosy: and the priest shall look on him, and
pronounce him unclean. And if the bright spot be white 4
in the skin of his flesh, and the appearance thereof be not
deeper than the skin, and the hair thereof be not turned
white, then the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the plague
seven days: and the priest shall look on him the seventh 5
day: and, behold, if in his eyes the plague be at a stay, and

leprosy in these chapters but for the translation [of the Heb. word] in LXX. and Vulgate' (quoted by Kennedy), *Lev. ad loc.* (*Cent. Bible*).

For translation of portions of the Talmudic treatise *Negâim*, which deals with leprosy, see Jos. Barclay's *Talmud*, pp. 267 ff., and cp. the Midrashic commentaries *Siphra* (on Lev.) and *Mechilta* (on Exodus): see also the Art. *Leprosy* (A. Macalister) in *HDB*.

Leprosy in man (xiii. 2—46).

Appearances in the skin which should be shewn to the priest (2—8).

2. *a rising, or a scab, or a bright spot*] Of the three words thus translated, the first is a common Heb. word for 'lifting up,' but employed in these chs. only in the sense of a swelling in or under the skin; the second (*sappahath*) occurs only here and xiv. 56, the form *mispahath* from the same root only in xiii. 6—8; the third is from a root signifying 'to be bright or clear,' and is used only in these chs. They all seem to denote an appearance like that of an angry-looking boil.

the plague of leprosy] rather **a plague.**

plague] lit. 'a stroke' (*plaga*: cp. a 'stroke' of paralysis), which also represents the sense of the Heb. word *nega'*, which gives its name to the treatise *Negâim*. The leper was rejected as 'smitten of God.' See introd. note on ch. xiv.

3. The distinctive marks of leprosy are—the hair, which is generally very dark among Jews, turns white, and the swelling appears deep-seated; in that case the priest is at once to declare the man unclean.

4. If any of the symptoms are not found, the man is to be shut up seven days and again examined.

5. If the plague (i.e. the rising described in *v.* 2) has not spread (the Heb. verb occurs only in chs. xiii., xiv.), he is to be shut up another

the plague be not spread in the skin, then the priest shall
6 shut him up seven days more: and the priest shall look on
him again the seventh day: and, behold, if the plague be
dim, and the plague be not spread in the skin, then the
priest shall pronounce him clean: it is a scab: and he shall
7 wash his clothes, and be clean. But if the scab spread
abroad in the skin, after that he hath shewn himself to the
priest for his cleansing, he shall shew himself to the priest
8 again: and the priest shall look, and, behold, if the scab be
spread in the skin, then the priest shall pronounce him
unclean: it is leprosy.
9 When the plague of leprosy is in a man, then he shall be
10 brought unto the priest; and the priest shall look, and,
behold, if there be a white rising in the skin, and it have
turned the hair white, and there be quick raw flesh in
11 the rising, it is an old leprosy in the skin of his flesh, and
the priest shall pronounce him unclean: he shall not shut

seven days, and if the spot then appears dull (the Heb. word in this sense is confined to the two chs.; it is applied to the eye becoming dim through age, 1 Sam. iii. 2), and there is no sign of its spreading, the priest shall pronounce him clean.

7. *after that he hath shewn himself to the priest for his cleansing*] i.e. in order to be declared clean. Three inspections by the priest are ordered with a week's interval between each. If during either week the rising spreads, the priest shall pronounce him unclean.

It will be noticed that the word 'plague' is used to denote the rising or scab which is a mark of the leprosy, and also the person afflicted (in *vv.* 4, 12, 13, 17 *him that hath* is not in the Heb.), as well as the disease itself in the phrase 'the plague of leprosy.'

9—17. The first part of this section is obscure; most modern commentators explain *vv.* 9—11 as referring to another form of leprosy in which the rising described in *v.* 10 appears without any of the premonitory symptoms of *v.* 2; if in addition to the white hair (already mentioned in *v.* 3) there is 'quick raw flesh' (*v.* 10) in the rising, this is a sure sign of leprosy, and the man must be declared unclean at once without waiting for any further examination. By 'quick raw flesh' (Heb. 'the rawness of raw flesh,' or lit. 'the quickness of quick flesh') is understood an appearance like that of raw meat. The Heb. words for 'raw flesh' [*bāsār ḥay*] are used of raw meat in 1 Sam. ii. 15; Prof. Macalister describes it as 'red granulation tissue' (*HDB.* iii. 96*a*). The words 'old leprosy' must then mean a leprosy of long standing which has not manifested itself in the preliminary stages, but, when first noticed, shews this definite indication of the disease. It is possible that

him up; for he is unclean. And if the leprosy break out 12
abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of *him that hath* the plague from his head even to his feet, as far as appeareth to the priest; then the priest shall look: and, 13
behold, if the leprosy have covered all his flesh, he shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague: it is all turned white: he is clean. But whensoever raw flesh appeareth in 14
him, he shall be unclean. And the priest shall look on the 15
raw flesh, and pronounce him unclean: the raw flesh is unclean: it is leprosy. Or if the raw flesh turn again, 16
and be changed unto white, then he shall come unto the priest, and the priest shall look on him: and, behold, if the 17
plague be turned into white, then the priest shall pronounce *him* clean *that hath* the plague: he is clean.

And when the flesh hath in the skin thereof a boil, and it 18

these verses may include the case when the first symptoms described in *v.* 2 have been either unobserved or concealed.

Another explanation of *vv.* 9—11 is that they describe a fresh outbreak in one who has been pronounced clean, or who has been cured of a previous attack. The traditional interpretation of 'quick raw flesh' (*the quickening of living flesh*, A.V. mg.) is 'sound flesh.' The appearance of this sound flesh in a rising was, in the opinion of the rabbis, evidence that an old leprosy had developed fresh activity.

The words of *v.* 7, 'after that he hath shewn himself to the priest for his cleansing,' are by some considered as referring to the *third* of the inspections prescribed in *vv.* 2—6. It has been observed that the suspected person at the first and second inspection must either be pronounced unclean, or shut up for further enquiry, and he cannot be pronounced clean till the third examination. Then *vv.* 7, 8 would refer to the reappearance of leprous symptoms after a man had been pronounced clean by the priest, and *vv.* 9—11 would supply further rules for such cases.

The case when the whole body is turned white (12—17).

A form of skin disease which is not infectious seems to be here indicated. A white efflorescence spreads over the whole body, which after a time peels off, and the skin resumes a healthy appearance. The presence of the raw flesh indicates disease (*vv.* 14, 15), but as soon as the whole surface becomes white, the priest shall pronounce him clean.

Leprosy developing in the place of an old boil or a burn (18—28).

The distinguishing marks of leprosy are similar to those already indicated; it would seem that in these cases they are more easily recognised,

19 is healed, and in the place of the boil there is a white rising,
or a bright spot, reddish-white, then it shall be shewed
20 to the priest; and the priest shall look, and, behold, if
the appearance thereof be lower than the skin, and the hair
thereof be turned white, then the priest shall pronounce
him unclean: it is the plague of leprosy, it hath broken out
21 in the boil. But if the priest look on it, and, behold, there
be no white hairs therein, and it be not lower than the skin,
but be dim, then the priest shall shut him up seven days:
22 and if it spread abroad in the skin, then the priest shall
23 pronounce him unclean: it is a plague. But if the bright
spot stay in its place, and be not spread, it is the scar of the
boil; and the priest shall pronounce him clean.
24 Or when the flesh hath in the skin thereof a burning
by fire, and the quick *flesh* of the burning become a bright
25 spot, reddish-white, or white; then the priest shall look
upon it: and, behold, if the hair in the bright spot be
turned white, and the appearance thereof be deeper than
the skin; it is leprosy, it hath broken out in the burning:
and the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it is the
26 plague of leprosy. But if the priest look on it, and, behold,
there be no white hair in the bright spot, and it be no
lower than the skin, but be dim; then the priest shall shut
27 him up seven days: and the priest shall look upon him the
seventh day: if it spread abroad in the skin, then the priest
shall pronounce him unclean: it is the plague of leprosy.
28 And if the bright spot stay in its place, and be not spread in
the skin, but be dim; it is the rising of the burning, and
the priest shall pronounce him clean: for it is the scar of
the burning.

for only one shutting up for seven days is required. The Heb. word (*shĕḥīn*) for 'boil' is used of Hezekiah (2 Kgs xx. 7) and Job (Job ii. 7); also for 'the botch (boil R.V.) of Egypt' (Deut. xxviii. 27). As Egypt was notorious for malignant skin diseases, this expression may denote some form of leprosy.

23. *the scar of the boil*] The Heb. for 'scar' occurs only here and in *v.* 28. It is from a root signifying 'to burn,' which is found in Ezek. xx. 47 (Heb. xxi. 3), 'all faces...shall be burnt.'

And when a man or woman hath a plague upon the head 29
or upon the beard, then the priest shall look on the plague: 30
and, behold, if the appearance thereof be deeper than the
skin, and there be in it yellow thin hair, then the priest
shall pronounce him unclean: it is a scall, it is leprosy of
the head or of the beard. And if the priest look on the 31
plague of the scall, and, behold, the appearance thereof be
not deeper than the skin, and there be no black hair in
it, then the priest shall shut up *him that hath* the plague of
the scall seven days: and in the seventh day the priest 32
shall look on the plague: and, behold, if the scall be not
spread, and there be in it no yellow hair, and the appear-
ance of the scall be not deeper than the skin, then he shall 33
be shaven, but the scall shall he not shave; and the priest
shall shut up *him that hath* the scall seven days more: and 34
in the seventh day the priest shall look on the scall: and,
behold, if the scall be not spread in the skin, and the
appearance thereof be not deeper than the skin; then the
priest shall pronounce him clean: and he shall wash his
clothes, and be clean. But if the scall spread abroad in the 35
skin after his cleansing; then the priest shall look on him: 36
and, behold, if the scall be spread in the skin, the priest
shall not seek for the yellow hair; he is unclean. But if in 37
his eyes the scall be at a stay, and black hair be grown
up therein; the scall is healed, he is clean: and the priest
shall pronounce him clean.

Leprosy in the hair of the head or face (29—37).

The treatment is similar to that in the preceding cases, but two periods of confinement are prescribed, and the hair is to be shaven after the first seven days.

30. *yellow thin hair*] The Heb. word for 'yellow' is used only here and in *vv.* 32, 36.

a scall] *a dry scall* A.V.; the Heb. word *néthek* is used only in this section, and denotes 'what one is inclined to scratch or tear away' (*Oxf. Lex.*).

33. It is enjoined in the Mishna (Tal. Bab. *Neg.* x. § 5) that two hairs on each side of the scall should be left so that the priest might judge whether the disease had spread.

38 And when a man or a woman hath in the skin of their
39 flesh bright spots, even white bright spots; then the priest shall look: and, behold, if the bright spots in the skin of their flesh be of a dull white; it is a tetter, it hath broken out in the skin; he is clean.
40 And if a man's hair be fallen off his head, he is bald; *yet*
41 is he clean. And if his hair be fallen off from the front
42 part of his head, he is forehead bald; *yet* is he clean. But if there be in the bald head, or the bald forehead, a reddish-white plague; it is leprosy breaking out in his bald head, or
43 his bald forehead. Then the priest shall look upon him: and, behold, if the rising of the plague be reddish-white in his bald head, or in his bald forehead, as the appearance of
44 leprosy in the skin of the flesh; he is a leprous man, he is unclean: the priest shall surely pronounce him unclean; his plague is in his head.
45 And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and the hair of his head shall go loose, and he shall
46 cover his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague is in him he shall be unclean;

White spots in the skin (38, 39).

These, if they are dull, and not of the character described in *v.* 3, are a 'tetter' (*freckled spot* A.V.), a skin disease which is not of a leprous character. The Heb. word *bohaḳ* (only in *v.* 39) is still used by the Arabs to denote this kind of eruption.

Baldness in the back or front part of the head (40—44).

This is not in itself a sign of uncleanness, but if in either part a *reddish white plague* (*white reddish sore* A.V.) appears, he must be seen by the priest. The word 'bald' in *v.* 40 means bald at the back of the head, as distinguished from forehead bald in *v.* 41.

43. *as the appearance of leprosy*] The criterion of white hair is absent, but the other tests of leprosy already mentioned are sufficient to determine whether the outbreak is leprous. According to tradition, two periods of seclusion were necessary as in *vv.* 2—6 and in *vv.* 29—37.

Rules for treatment of leprous persons (45, 46).

45. *his clothes shall be rent*] not the usual Heb. word, but one used only here and in x. 6, xxi. 10; Jewish tradition exempted women from rending their clothes. The actions of the leper here prescribed are those of a mourner; rending the garments, and letting the hair go

he is unclean: he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his dwelling be.

The garment also that the plague of leprosy is in, whether 47
it be a woollen garment, or a linen garment; whether it be 48
in [1]warp, or woof; of linen, or of woollen; whether in a
skin, or in any thing made of skin; if the plague be greenish 49
or reddish in the garment, or in the skin, or in the warp, or
in the woof, or in any thing of skin; it is the plague of
leprosy, and shall be shewed unto the priest: and the priest 50
shall look upon the plague, and shut up *that which hath*
the plague seven days: and he shall look on the plague on 51
the seventh day: if the plague be spread in the garment,
either in the warp, or in the woof, or in the skin, whatever
service skin is used for; the plague is a fretting leprosy; it
is unclean. And he shall burn the garment, whether the 52
warp or the woof, in woollen or in linen, or any thing of
skin, wherein the plague is: for it is a fretting leprosy;
it shall be burnt in the fire. And if the priest shall look, 53
and, behold, the plague be not spread in the garment, either
in the warp, or in the woof, or in any thing of skin; then 54
the priest shall command that they wash the thing wherein
the plague is, and he shall shut it up seven days more: and 55

[1] Or, *woven or knitted stuff* (and in vv. 49, &c.)

loose (cp. x. 6, xxi. 10; Ezek. xxiv. 17), covering the upper lip (cp. Ezek. xxiv. 17, 22; Mic. iii. 7), crying, Unclean (Lam. iv. 15). The leper was regarded as one dead; Miriam is so described (Num. xii. 12) and Josephus refers to lepers as 'in no way differing from the dead' (*Ant.* iii. 11. 3). Cp. mediaeval rites relating to lepers in *HDB.* iii. 98 *b*.

The office from the Sarum Manual used at the seclusion of a leper may be found in R. M. Clay's *Mediaeval Hospitals*, pp. 273 ff.

Leprosy in garments (47—59).

The nature of these spots in clothing is not clear. It is generally supposed that they are caused by mildew or moth (see Art. *Leprosy*, *HDB.*); another suggestion is that the clothing had been worn by a leprous person, but this is not stated in the text. The materials of the garments are either wool, linen, or skin.

48. *whether it be in warp, or woof*] The LXX. and other versions translate thus; another suggestion is that different ways of working up the material are meant (so R.V. mg.).

51. *a fretting leprosy*] i.e. malignant.

the priest shall look, after that the plague is washed: and, behold, if the plague have not changed its colour, and the plague be not spread, it is unclean; thou shalt burn it in the fire: it is a fret, [1]whether the bareness be within or
56 without. And if the priest look, and, behold, the plague be dim after the washing thereof, then he shall rend it out of the garment, or out of the skin, or out of the warp, or out of
57 the woof: and if it appear still in the garment, either in the warp, or in the woof, or in any thing of skin, it is breaking out: thou shalt burn that wherein the plague is with fire.
58 And the garment, either the warp, or the woof, or whatsoever thing of skin it be, which thou shalt wash, if the plague be departed from them, then it shall be washed the second
59 time, and shall be clean. This is the law of the plague of leprosy in a garment of woollen or linen, either in the warp, or the woof, or any thing of skin, to pronounce it clean, or to pronounce it unclean.

14 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, This shall be the law of the leper in the day of his cleansing: he shall be

[1] Heb. whether *it* be *bald in the head thereof, or in the forehead thereof.*

55. *it is a fret, whether the bareness be within or without*] The Heb. word for 'fret' occurs only here, and probably means a depression in the surface caused by the material being eaten away. The Heb. words which follow are those used for baldness in the back or front of the head in *vv.* 40, 41. They are used here to denote the back or front of the garment, the inside or outside. The word 'fret' has nothing in common with 'fretting' in *v.* 51.

56, 57. If after washing, the colour is dim, the affected part is to be torn out, and if any further sign of infection is found, the garment must be burnt.

58. The garment which after washing (*v.* 54) shews no further sign of the plague, is to be washed again, and then declared clean.

The purification of the leper (ch. xiv. 1—32).

The ceremonies to be observed are of two kinds:
(1) before the leper is brought into the camp,
(*a*) by the priest (*vv.* 2—7),
(*b*) by the leper (*v.* 8),

brought unto the priest: and the priest shall go forth out of 3
the camp; and the priest shall look, and, behold, if the
plague of leprosy be healed in the leper; then shall the 4
priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two
living clean birds, and cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop:

(a) after the leper is readmitted to the camp, but remaining outside his tent seven days,
(c) by the leper on the seventh day (*v.* 9),
(d) the sacrificial ritual on the eighth day (*vv.* 10—20),
(e) modification for the poor leper (*vv.* 21—32).

The leper was regarded (1) as one dead (see on xiii. 45 f.), (2) as unclean, (3) as smitten of God: hence the ceremonial indicated (1) restoration to life, (2) removal of uncleanness, (3) readmission to God's presence.

(1) is thought to represent the older rite, while *vv.* 14—20 are later, giving more detail and laying greater stress on religious motives.

3. The priest goes outside to meet the leper; probably signs of convalescence have already been notified to the priest, which have satisfied him, and he now declares the plague to be healed.

4—7. The priest was to see that two living clean birds were brought. The Heb. word is *ṣippōr*, which is used of the birds of Abraham's sacrifice (Gen. xv. 10) and of clean birds generally (Deut. xiv. 11). In Ps. lxxxiv. 3 [Heb. 4], cii. 7 [Heb. 8] it is translated 'sparrow,' and A.V. mg. of *v.* 4 has 'sparrows,' following the traditional interpretation, and Vulg. These birds were employed in a ceremony which was without the camp, and the blood was not brought to the altar.

cedar wood, and scarlet, and hyssop] The cedar and hyssop were bound together by a scarlet band of wool. From 1 Kgs iv. 33 it appears that cedar and hyssop were regarded as two extremes in respect of size among trees: the cedar is a symbol of health and vigour (Ps. xcii. 12); it is used figuratively of the great ones of the earth (Jud. ix. 15; Is. xiv. 8, xxxvii. 24), not without reference to the haughtiness of those occupying such high positions (Is. ii. 13; Ezek. xxxi. 3, 10). Hence some Jewish writers have seen in the cedar a figure of pride punished by a visitation of leprosy, while the hyssop signified that humility which was necessary to obtain forgiveness, and the removal of the stroke.

The cedar is noted for its durability, and the oil of the cedar was employed as a preservative; the Egyptians used it for embalming. This power of arresting decay may be regarded as akin to that shewn in restoring the tainted flesh of the leper. The scarlet colour has been generally taken as representing the blood, or the life which has been bestowed on one who was regarded as dead (Num. xii. 12). The hyssop seems to have been chosen for the purpose of sprinkling (*v.* 7, cp. Exod. xii. 22). The Mishna orders that the cedar wood should be a cubit in length, and that the hyssop shall not be Greek or Roman

5 and the priest shall command to kill one of the birds in an
6 earthen vessel over [1]running water: as for the living bird,
he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and
the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the
blood of the bird that was killed over the [1]running water:
7 and he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from
the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and
8 shall let go the living bird into the open field. And he that

[1] Heb. *living.*

hyssop, or desert hyssop, or any hyssop with a distinctive name (Tal. Bab. *Neg.* xiv. § 6).

6. *in an earthen vessel over running water*] The word 'running' is somewhat misleading. The Heb. expression is 'living water,' i.e. water from a spring. It was to be put into the vessel over which the bird was killed: the water served as a medium for conveying the blood of the slain bird (*v.* 6); so the ashes of the red heifer were mixed with water (Num. xix. 9, 17).

7. *seven times*] As in *vv.* 27, 51 and so in iv. 6, 17, viii. 11, xvi. 14, 19; Num. xix. 4. Cp. 2 Kgs v. 10 and Art. *Number* in *HDB.* iii. specially p. 565.

let go the living bird] The similarity between the two birds and the two goats brought on the Day of Atonement has been noted by Jewish and Christian commentators; it is necessary to point out the differences. On that Day the high priest officiated; the slain goat was a Sin-Offering, and on the goat that was sent away all the sins of the children of Israel were solemnly laid. The whole service was at the sanctuary, its inner shrine was entered on that day only; and there was no physical contact between the two goats. The two birds brought for the cleansing of the leper were respectively killed and set free outside the camp by an ordinary priest; the blood of the slain bird was not brought near the altar nor treated sacrificially, but applied to the living bird which was let go. The ritual is not markedly Hebraic, but antique in character, and similar to that followed by tribes whose ideas about the removal of impurity are in the most elementary stage. Some parts of it were probably in use among Semites before the age of Moses, as an inheritance from a distant past. The time when these rites were adopted into Israel's cultus cannot be fixed with certainty; when they became part of that system which requires holiness from the worshippers of a holy God, their significance was spiritualized, and the superstitious beliefs of an earlier age were eliminated, though not entirely forgotten.

We find among primitive peoples that sicknesses are in many cases transferred to a bird or beast which thus becomes a kind of scapegoat (Frazer, *G. B.*[2] iii. 15f., 101 f.) or are sent away in boats (*ib.* 97 f. Cp. Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.* 422, Berth. *ad loc*).

The Heb. word for 'cedar' includes, besides the Lebanon variety,

is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and bathe himself in water, and he shall be clean: and after that he shall come into the camp, but shall dwell outside his tent seven days. And it shall be on the seventh 9
day, that he shall shave all his hair off his head and his beard and his eyebrows, even all his hair he shall shave off: and he shall wash his clothes, and he shall bathe his flesh in water, and he shall be clean. And on the eighth day he 10
shall take two he-lambs without blemish, and one ewe-lamb of the first year without blemish, and three tenth parts *of an ephah* of fine flour for a meal offering, mingled with oil, and one log of oil. And the priest that cleanseth him 11

juniper and some sorts of pine; the Gk. κέδρος has a correspondingly broad significance. The 'hyssop' is supposed to be a kind of marjoram; the plant now known as hyssop does not grow in Egypt or Syria. For further details see Dillm. *in loc.* and Arts. *Juniper*, *Cedar*, in *HDB.* and *Enc. Bib.*

The cedar is regarded as a sacred tree. Instances of its use are given in Frazer, *G. B.*[3] 49 f., where it is described as *Juniperus excelsa.*

8. The person to be cleansed now began to take part in the ceremonial. He must wash his clothes, shave and wash himself; he was then admitted into the camp, but not allowed to enter his own dwelling.

9. On the seventh day, after repeating the cleansing processes of the first, he was fit to take part in the service of the sanctuary.

10. On the following (the eighth) day he brings his sacrifice to the usual place, the entrance to the Tent of Meeting. In the Temple the leper, after bathing in a chamber at the N.W. corner of the Court of the Women, was brought to the gate of Nicanor, between the Court of the Women and the Court of Israel, where he presented his offerings.

tenth parts of an ephah] See on xxiii. 17. For 'parts' A.V. has 'deals,' a substantive of the same meaning, but now surviving as such only in the common phrase, 'a great deal,' although the *verb* is still in ordinary use. Cp. *dole*, and the German *Teil*, portion.

log] a liquid measure approximately equal to an English pint.

The ritual here enjoined is peculiar:

(1) The first offering is a Guilt-Offering—a he-lamb.

(2) The whole lamb is waved with the log of oil before the Lord.

(3) The blood of the sacrifice and the oil are applied to the leper with a ceremonial similar to that used at the consecration of the priests (Lev. viii. 12, 23 f., 30).

The he-lamb was of the first year, and younger than the ram usually brought for a Guilt-Offering; the waving of the whole animal was unusual; certain parts only of a sacrifice were waved, and the ceremony

shall set the man that is to be cleansed, and those things,
12 before the LORD, at the door of the tent of meeting: and
the priest shall take one of the he-lambs, and offer him for
a guilt offering, and the log of oil, and wave them for a wave

of waving was not practised with the Guilt-Offering and Sin-Offering. So that in respect of the animal employed, the act of waving, and the matter waved, this sacrifice was different from the ordinary Guilt-Offering.

The Nazirite who had been defiled by a dead body brought a Sin-Offering, a Burnt-Offering, and a Guilt-Offering; they were offered in this order, and no special regulations about the Guilt-Offering are given (Num. vi. 10—12). But in the case of the leper, the fact that the Guilt-Offering is brought first, with an accompanying ritual of marked significance, invests this sacrifice with a special importance and distinguishes it from the Guilt-Offering brought by the Nazirite. The Guilt-Offering with its accompanying ritual is the prominent feature in the leper's sanctuary service. It seems to imply that the disease of leprosy had removed him who had been smitten from the 'kingdom of priests' (Exod. xix. 6); that a re-consecration was necessary, before he could again take his place among his brethren. But it may also mean that leprosy was thought to imply some sin for which atonement must be made by fine or compensation.

The reason why this sacrifice should be a Guilt-Offering is not apparent. The distinctive character of the Guilt-Offering was that it involved restitution for wrong done, whether in respect of 'the holy things of the LORD' (v. 15), or against a neighbour (vi. 2 f.). As the Nazirite had vowed a period of separation, it might be considered that the defilement of that separation (Num. vi. 12), though involuntary, was a wrong done in respect of 'the holy things of the LORD'; but it seems doubtful whether the leper's enforced absence from the sanctuary during the period of his uncleanness can be so regarded. If it is urged that every Israelite in virtue of his priesthood (Exod. xix. 6) is dedicated to the service of God, then a Guilt-Offering would be required after any prolonged illness, and after cases of lengthened uncleanness such as those mentioned in chs. xii. and xv.; but no Guilt-Offering is prescribed for these persons. Can there be here a remnant of some older practice of which no certain traces survive? The Heb. word *'āshām*, used for the Guilt-Offering in P, is applied in the older literature to certain offerings and fines (1 Sam. vi. 3; 2 Kgs xii. 17). Was an *'āshām* or money payment required in earlier times on the recovery of a leper? This would explain the demand for a Guilt-Offering in P.

12. *and wave them for a wave offering before the LORD*] The offerer usually took part in the waving; according to some, this act took place where the leper stood, and that he assisted in the ceremony; another view was that it took place before the altar, and the leper did not assist. See Appendix IV (WAVE-OFFERING), pp. 183 ff.

offering before the LORD: and he shall kill the he-lamb in 13
the place where they kill the sin offering and the burnt
offering, in the place of the sanctuary: for as the sin offering
is the priest's, so is the guilt offering: it is most holy: and 14
the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt offering, and
the priest shall put it upon the tip of the right ear of him
that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right
hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot: and the 15
priest shall take of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm
of his own left hand: and the priest shall dip his right finger 16
in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the
oil with his finger seven times before the LORD: and of the 17
rest of the oil that is in his hand shall the priest put upon
the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon
the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his
right foot, upon the blood of the guilt offering: and the rest 18
of the oil that is in the priest's hand he shall put upon the
head of him that is to be cleansed: and the priest shall
make atonement for him before the LORD. And the priest 19
shall offer the sin offering, and make atonement for him
that is to be cleansed because of his uncleanness; and after-
ward he shall kill the burnt offering: and the priest shall 20
offer the burnt offering and the meal offering upon the

13. *in the place where they kill the sin offering and the burnt offering*] For the Burnt-Offering see ch. i. 11; for the Sin-Offering, vi. 25; and for the Guilt-Offering, vii. 2.

in the place of the sanctuary] i.e. in the court, not in the tabernacle.

14. In N.T. times the leper put his head, hand, and foot through the gate of Nicanor and the priest applied the blood and the oil. Two priests officiated; one caught the blood in a bowl and threw it on the sides of the altar; the other received some of the blood in his hand and applied it to the leper (*Neg.* xiv. §§ 8—10). The blood of the Guilt-Offering was applied in the same way in which the blood of the Ram of consecration was applied to the priests (viii. 23 f.), but the whole ceremony was performed by one person.

15. *and the priest shall take of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand*] Heb. *and pour it into the left hand of the priest.* The traditional interpretation is that the one priest poured the oil into the palm of the other priest (see note on *v.* 14), but the Mishna adds 'if he pours it into his own palm, it is allowed.' The procedure, as described in EVV is supported by authority.

altar: and the priest shall make atonement for him, and he shall be clean.

21 And if he be poor, and cannot get so much, then he shall take one he-lamb for a guilt offering to be waved, to make atonement for him, and one tenth part *of an ephah* of fine flour mingled with oil for a meal offering, and a log of oil;
22 and two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get; and the one shall be a sin offering, and the
23 other a burnt offering. And on the eighth day he shall bring them for his cleansing unto the priest, unto the door
24 of the tent of meeting, before the LORD. And the priest shall take the lamb of the guilt offering, and the log of oil, and the priest shall wave them for a wave offering before the
25 LORD: and he shall kill the lamb of the guilt offering, and the priest shall take of the blood of the guilt offering, and put it upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon
26 the great toe of his right foot: and the priest shall pour of
27 the oil into the palm of his own left hand: and the priest shall sprinkle with his right finger some of the oil that is in
28 his left hand seven times before the LORD: and the priest shall put of the oil that is in his hand upon the tip of the right ear of him that is to be cleansed, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot,
29 upon the place of the blood of the guilt offering: and the rest of the oil that is in the priest's hand he shall put upon the head of him that is to be cleansed, to make
30 atonement for him before the LORD. And he shall offer one of the turtledoves, or of the young pigeons, such as he
31 is able to get; even such as he is able to get, the one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering, with the meal offering: and the priest shall make atonement for him that
32 is to be cleansed before the LORD. This is the law of him in whom is the plague of leprosy, who is not able to get *that which pertaineth* to his cleansing.

21—32. The poor man's offerings. The Sin-Offering and Burnt-Offering are modified; birds may be brought as in i. 14, v. 7, and the amount of the Meal-Offering is reduced, but the Guilt-Offering remains

And the LORD spake unto Moses and unto Aaron, saying, 33
When ye be come into the land of Canaan, which I give to 34
you for a possession, and I put the plague of leprosy in
a house of the land of your possession; then he that owneth 35
the house shall come and tell the priest, saying, There
seemeth to me to be as it were a plague in the house: and 36
the priest shall command that they empty the house, before
the priest go in to see the plague, that all that is in the
house be not made unclean: and afterward the priest shall
go in to see the house: and he shall look on the plague, 37
and, behold, if the plague be in the walls of the house with
hollow strakes, greenish or reddish, and the appearance
thereof be lower than the wall; then the priest shall go out 38
of the house to the door of the house, and shut up the house
seven days: and the priest shall come again the seventh day, 39
and shall look: and, behold, if the plague be spread in the
walls of the house; then the priest shall command that they 40
take out the stones in which the plague is, and cast them
into an unclean place without the city: and he shall cause 41
the house to be scraped within round about, and they shall
pour out the mortar that they scrape off without the city into
an unclean place: and they shall take other stones, and put 42
them in the place of those stones; and he shall take other
mortar, and shall plaister the house. And if the plague 43
come again, and break out in the house, after that he hath
taken out the stones, and after he hath scraped the house,
and after it is plaistered; then the priest shall come in and 44
look, and, behold, if the plague be spread in the house, it is
a fretting leprosy in the house: it is unclean. And he shall 45
break down the house, the stones of it, and the timber

the same; a further indication that this sacrifice is the most important feature of the rite.

Leprosy in houses (33—53).

Nothing definite is known about these appearances on the walls of a house, which are here described as leprosy. It was regarded as a special visitation of God (xiv. 34, 'I put the plague'); the Jews believed that the plague was peculiar to Palestine and the chosen people, and was not found in the houses of foreigners. The owner of the house must say 'There seemeth to me...' (*v.* 35): the decision whether the

thereof, and all the mortar of the house; and he shall carry
46 them forth out of the city into an unclean place. Moreover
he that goeth into the house all the while that it is shut up
47 shall be unclean until the even. And he that lieth in the
house shall wash his clothes; and he that eateth in the
48 house shall wash his clothes. And if the priest shall come
in, and look, and, behold, the plague hath not spread in the
house, after the house was plaistered; then the priest shall
pronounce the house clean, because the plague is healed.
49 And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar
50 wood, and scarlet, and hyssop: and he shall kill one of the
51 birds in an earthen vessel over [1]running water: and he shall
take the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and
the living bird, and dip them in the blood of the slain bird,
and in the [1]running water, and sprinkle the house seven
52 times: and he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the
bird, and with the [1]running water, and with the living bird,
and with the cedar wood, and with the hyssop, and with the
53 scarlet: but he shall let go the living bird out of the city
into the open field: so shall he make atonement for the
house: and it shall be clean.
54 This is the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and
55 for a scall; and for the leprosy of a garment, and for a
56 house; and for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright
57 spot: to teach when it is unclean, and when it is clean:
this is the law of leprosy.

[1] Heb. *living.*

house is leprous rests with the priest. The order to empty the house before the priest comes to inspect shews that there is no fear of contagion. It has been suggested that the appearances were due to damp, or decay, or the growth of some vegetable matter. The diagnosis is similar to that for leprosy in man; the remedy is to remove the stones in which the plague is, and to scrape and plaister the house. If the plague is not stayed, the house must be pulled down. The method of purification if the house be pronounced clean is the same as that prescribed for the leper in *vv.* 4—7. Further regulations are found in *Neg̊āim*, chs. xii., xiii.

54—57. A summary of the cases dealt with in chs. xiii., xiv. Special sections have also their closing verses, see xiii. 59, xiv. 32.

And the LORD spake unto Moses and to Aaron, saying, 15
Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When 2
any man hath an issue out of his flesh, because of his issue
he is unclean. And this shall be his uncleanness in his 3
issue: whether his flesh run with his issue, or his flesh be
stopped from his issue, it is his uncleanness. Every bed 4
whereon he that hath the issue lieth shall be unclean: and
every thing whereon he sitteth shall be unclean. And 5
whosoever toucheth his bed shall wash his clothes, and
bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the even. And 6
he that sitteth on any thing whereon he that hath the issue
sat shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and
be unclean until the even. And he that toucheth the flesh 7
of him that hath the issue shall wash his clothes, and bathe
himself in water, and be unclean until the even. And if he 8
that hath the issue spit upon him that is clean; then he
shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be
unclean until the even. And what [1]saddle soever he that 9
hath the issue rideth upon shall be unclean. And whosoever 10
toucheth any thing that was under him shall be unclean
until the even: and he that beareth those things shall wash
his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until
the even. And whomsoever he that hath the issue toucheth, 11
without having rinsed his hands in water, he shall wash his
clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until

[1] Or, *carriage*

CH. XV. THE UNCLEANNESS OF ISSUES AND THEIR CLEANSING.

As regards men (1—18).

2. ***an issue out of his flesh***] by flesh is here meant the private parts, as in vi. 10, xvi. 4. Everything which a man in this condition touched was unclean, so that anyone coming in contact with the man, or with anything that he had touched, must wash his clothes and bathe himself in water, and was not considered purified until the evening.

9. ***saddle***] any seat in a carriage or other kind of conveyance is included.

11. ***without having rinsed his hands in water***] This is the only case mentioned in the law where a person who is unclean can, by washing his hands, avoid communicating uncleanness to another.

12 the even. And the earthen vessel, which he that hath the
issue toucheth, shall be broken: and every vessel of wood
13 shall be rinsed in water. And when he that hath an issue
is cleansed of his issue, then he shall number to himself
seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes; and he
shall bathe his flesh in [1]running water, and shall be clean.
14 And on the eighth day he shall take to him two turtledoves,
or two young pigeons, and come before the LORD unto the
door of the tent of meeting, and give them unto the priest:
15 and the priest shall offer them, the one for a sin offering,
and the other for a burnt offering; and the priest shall make
atonement for him before the LORD for his issue.
16 And if any man's seed of copulation go out from him,
then he shall bathe all his flesh in water, and be unclean
17 until the even. And every garment, and every skin, whereon
is the seed of copulation, shall be washed with water, and
18 be unclean until the even. The woman also with whom
a man shall lie with seed of copulation, they shall both
bathe themselves in water, and be unclean until the even.
19 And if a woman have an issue, *and* her issue in her flesh
be blood, she shall be in her [2]impurity seven days: and
whosoever toucheth her shall be unclean until the even.
20 And every thing that she lieth upon in her [2]impurity shall

[1] Heb. *living.* [2] Or, *separation*

12. The difference between the earthen and wooden vessel is the same as that in vi. 28, xi. 32 f. The rabbis inferred from this verse that metal vessels should be washed. The Jew who purchased a brasen pot was bound to wash it, for it might have been handled by one who was ritually unclean. These 'washings of cups, and pots, and brasen vessels,' are referred to in Mk vii. 4.

13. When the man is physically cured, he has yet to observe the rules for ritual purification, and to offer sacrifices, a Sin-Offering and a Burnt-Offering.

16. A similar precept is found in Deut. xxiii. 10.

18. As unclean they could not take part in the service of the sanctuary. Similar limitations are found Exod. xix. 15; 1 Sam. xxi. 5 f.

As regards women (19—30).

19—24. Normal periodical issues. The uncleanness of these issues is similar to that in the preceding case (cp. *vv.* 4—11), but no sacrifice is required at the close of the period. For the belief in early religions

be unclean: every thing also that she sitteth upon shall be
unclean. And whosoever toucheth her bed shall wash his 21
clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until
the even. And whosoever toucheth any thing that she 22
sitteth upon shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in
water, and be unclean until the even. And if it be on the 23
bed, or on any thing whereon she sitteth, when he toucheth
it, he shall be unclean until the even. And if any man lie 24
with her, and her impurity be upon him, he shall be unclean
seven days; and every bed whereon he lieth shall be
unclean.

And if a woman have an issue of her blood many days 25
not in the time of her impurity, or if she have an issue
beyond the time of her impurity; all the days of the issue
of her uncleanness she shall be as in the days of her
impurity: she is unclean. Every bed whereon she lieth all 26
the days of her issue shall be unto her as the bed of her
impurity: and every thing whereon she sitteth shall be
unclean, as the uncleanness of her impurity. And who- 27
soever toucheth those things shall be unclean, and shall
wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be
unclean until the even. But if she be cleansed of her issue, 28
then she shall number to herself seven days, and after that
she shall be clean. And on the eighth day she shall take 29
unto her two turtledoves, or two young pigeons, and bring
them unto the priest, to the door of the tent of meeting.
And the priest shall offer the one for a sin offering, and the 30
other for a burnt offering; and the priest shall make
atonement for her before the LORD for the issue of her
uncleanness.

that in such cases special precautions were needed against maleficent spiritual agencies, see Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.*[2] 447 ff., and Frazer, *G.B.*[2], Pt II. pp. 145 ff.

24. It is generally supposed that the case treated in this verse is different from that contemplated in xviii. 19, xx. 18. If, as some think, the three passages refer to the same act, they cannot all be from the same source.

25—30. If the issue be abnormal, it is of the nature of a disease, and is treated in the same manner as the first case (*vv.* 2—15). The woman in the Gospel (Matt. ix. 20; Mk v. 25; Lk. viii. 43) was thus afflicted.

31 Thus shall ye separate the children of Israel from their uncleanness; that they die not in their uncleanness, when they defile my tabernacle that is in the midst of them.
32 This is the law of him that hath an issue, and of him whose seed of copulation goeth from him, so that he is
33 unclean thereby; and of her that is sick with her impurity, and of him that hath an issue, of the man, and of the woman, and of him that lieth with her that is unclean.

16 And the LORD spake unto Moses, after the death of the two sons of Aaron, when they drew near before the LORD,

31. A reason for these purifications is given.

my tabernacle] Another name for the tabernacle is (Heb. *mishkān*) *dwelling*, e.g. Exod. xxv. 9 R.V. mg. In Exod. xxv.—xxvii., and in parts of xxxv.—xl. the word is used to denote the structure described in xxvi., xxxvi., and distinguished as the 'tabernacle' from the 'tent over the tabernacle' (Exod. xxvi. 7, xxxvi. 14 in R.V.). But in other passages it is used as the equivalent of the 'tent of meeting' for the tabernacle with its covering tent. It indicates the place where God dwells among the children of Israel according to His promise (so in xvi. 16, xxvi. 11 f.; Exod. xxix. 45; cp. Exod. xxv. 8; Num. v. 3, xxxv. 34), and is used only of the tabernacle[1] (in the plur., Num. xxiv. 5, it is used of Israel in poetical parallelism with 'tents'). The combination 'tabernacle of the tent of meeting' occurs Exod. xl. 2, 6, 29†. As the A.V. renders both '*ohel* (see on i. 1) and *mishkān* by 'tabernacle,' the difference does not appear in that version.

32, 33. The concluding *vv.* include all the cases mentioned in this chapter. Cp. the conclusion to ch. xi.

The gradations in the methods of cleansing should be noted: (*a*) the uncleanness lasted till the end of the day, and ceased without any further ceremonial, 'he shall be unclean until the even'; (*b*) washing the clothes and bathing in running water is added (xv. 13); (*c*) sacrifices must also be offered, for the leper, a woman in childbirth (ch. xii.) and two cases in ch. xv. (*vv.* 15, 30).

CH. XVI. THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

The regulations for the observance of an annual rite of expiation follow appropriately after the laws of purification contained in chs. xi.—xv.

1. On the introductory clauses see App. I (*d*), pp. 163 ff.

[1] The use of the word tabernacle of the tents of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (see McNeile *C. B. ad loc.* Num. xvi. 24, 27) is very strange, and the text must be considered doubtful.

and died; and the LORD said unto Moses, Speak unto 2
Aaron thy brother, that he come not at all times into the holy place within the veil, before the mercy-seat which is upon the ark; that he die not: for I will

The ritual to be observed (1—28).

2. *into the holy place within the veil*] the veil (*pārōketh*), which separates the 'holy place' from the 'most holy' (here called 'the holy place within...'), cp. Exod. xxvi. 31—33.

the mercy-seat] Heb. *kappōreth*, here and in *vv.* 13—15, a solid gold plate of the same size as the top of the ark (2½ by 1½ cubits), to which the two cherubim were fixed, as described in Exod. xxv. 17—21. It was the place where the Lord appeared (*v.* 2); from which He gave His commands (see note on i. 1); the most holy spot in the most holy place, the 'footstool' of the Lord who sitteth enthroned upon the cherubim (1 Chr. xxviii. 2; Ps. xcix. 5, cp. *v.* 1; cxxxii. 7, cp. *v.* 5). The Heb. word is formed from *kipper, to make propitiation*, and means *that which propitiates*. The Gk. ἱλαστήριον exactly corresponds, and from the Vulg. *propitiatorium* the word '*propitiatorie*' was used in Wiclif's translation. This word is the best English equivalent for the Heb., and indicates the nature of the solemn rite performed within the veil on the Day of Atonement. As 'oratory' is the place of 'oration' or prayer, so 'propitiatory' in the sense of 'place of propitiation' would fitly express the Heb. word which is rendered in EVV by 'mercy-seat.' See note on Exod. xxv. 17 (*C.B.*); Art. *Mercy-seat* in *Enc. Bib.*; and Art. *Tabernacle* in *HDB.* iv. 665*a*. The mercy-seat is described as 'upon the testimony' in *v.* 13. 'The testimony' is the name given to the two tables on which the Ten Words were written, so called because they contain the 'testimony' or witness of God's will for man. See note on Exod. xxv. 16, and *Intr. to Pent.* App. II. pp. 221 f.

that he die not] Here and in *v.* 13 there is reference to the penalty attending breach of the rules to be observed in the service of the sanctuary. A general warning is given in xxii. 9 to the priests who keep the charge of the Lord, 'lest they bear sin for it, and die therein, if they profane it.' The expression in the text is found in Exod. xxviii. 35 with reference to putting on the robe of the ephod with the bells on its skirt when going in unto the holy place; in xxviii. 43 the same penalty is threatened for omitting to wear the linen breeches; in xxx. 20 for omitting to wash before entering the holy place; in Lev. viii. 35 in connexion with the ceremonial prescribed at the inauguration of the priesthood; also in x. 6, 7, 9, xv. 31; Num. iv. 19 (of the Kohathites, cp. *vv.* 15, 20), xvii. 10, xviii. 3, 32, xxxv. 12. The variety of the offences for which the penalty of death is threatened in these passages should be noticed. The expression 'that he die not' is used generally in connexion with infringement of rules by priests, Levites, and people, and its use here does not imply any reference to the story of Nadab and Abihu.

3 appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat. Herewith shall
Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bullock
4 for a sin offering, and a ram for a burnt offering. He shall
put on the holy linen coat, and he shall have the linen
breeches upon his flesh, and shall be girded with the linen
girdle, and with the linen [1]mitre shall he be attired: they
are the holy garments; and he shall bathe his flesh in water,
5 and put them on. And he shall take of the congregation
of the children of Israel two he-goats for a sin offering, and
6 one ram for a burnt offering. And Aaron shall present the
bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and make
7 atonement for himself, and for his house. And he shall
take the two goats, and set them before the LORD at the
8 door of the tent of meeting. And Aaron shall cast lots
upon the two goats; one lot for the LORD, and the other lot
9 for [2]Azazel. And Aaron shall present the goat upon which
the lot fell for the LORD, and offer him for a sin offering.
10 But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be set
alive before the LORD, to make atonement [3]for him, to send

[1] Or, *turban* [2] Or, *dismissal* [3] Or, *over*

3. *Herewith*] with the offerings and ceremonies set forth in what follows.

4. The linen garments here mentioned are the garments described in Exod. xxviii. 39—43. Cp. *vv.* 23, 24.

5. The two he-goats are described as one Sin-Offering.

6, 7. The animals for the Sin-Offerings are presented 'before the LORD.' The verb in *v.* 7, 'and set them,' is different from that in *v.* 6, 'and Aaron shall present'; after the lots are cast, Aaron 'presents' the goat 'upon which the lot fell for the LORD' (*v.* 9). No distinction is made in A.V.

8. *for Azazel*] *for the scapegoat*, A.V. For this peculiar feature of the Day of Atonement see Appendix V, pp. 185 ff.

10. *to make atonement for* (mg. *over*) *him*] The meaning of this phrase is obscure. It probably refers to some ceremony of atonement performed over the goat, before being sent into the wilderness. Kennedy (*ad loc.*) suggests that it was an early purification rite, here reintroduced, but otherwise unknown. The name 'scapegoat' is to be traced back to the *caper emissarius* of the Vulg. Neither this nor the R.V. mg.'s rendering, *dismissal*, can be obtained etymologically from the Heb.

In *vv.* 3—10 we find prescribed *how* Aaron is to come into the holy place, the garments which he must wear, the animals which he is to

him away for Azazel into the wilderness. And Aaron shall present the bullock of the sin offering, which is for himself, and shall make atonement for himself, and for his house, and 11

bring, and their destination: the following *vv.* 11—28 contain a detailed account of the whole ceremonial.

11. According to the Mishna (Tal. Bab. *Yoma*), the high priest on presenting his bullock (*v.* 6) made a confession of sin to which the people answered 'Blessed be the Name of the glory of His Kingdom for ever and ever.' He cast lots upon the goats, and declared which was for the Lord, and they answered 'Blessed be the Name, etc.' (fol. 39 *a*). He put a tongue-shaped piece of scarlet wool upon the head of the goat to be sent away, and came beside his bullock (*v.* 11) the second time and repeated his confession, and they answered 'Blessed be the Name, etc.' (41 *b*). He killed the bullock, and caught the blood in a bowl; he took the censer and put burning coals from the altar in it (43 *b*). They brought him the cup and the censer; he filled his hands with incense and put it into the cup; he took the censer in his right hand and the cup in his left (47 *a*), and went into the temple, and when he came to the altar, he heaped the incense on the burning coals and the whole house was filled with smoke; he returned, and offered a short prayer in the outer house, but did not prolong it, lest (by a lengthy absence) he should cause terror in Israel (51 *b*, 52 *b*). In the second temple the high priest placed the censer on a stone in the Holy of Holies, called 'foundation,' which was three fingers high. [There was no altar in the second temple.] He took the blood of the bullock and returned within the veil, and sprinkled of it once upwards and seven times downwards; he went out and placed the bowl on a column in the sanctuary. He then killed the goat, and brought the blood within the veil, and sprinkled it as he did with the blood of the bullock; he went out and placed the bowl on a column in the sanctuary [tradition varies as to whether the column was the same as that on which the bowl containing the bullock's blood had been placed]; he then sprinkled the blood of the bullock on the veil on the outside, and afterwards the blood of the goat, both sprinklings being once upwards and seven times downwards, as he sprinkled the blood within the veil; he then mixed the blood of the bullock with that of the goat (53 *b*), and went out to the altar that is 'before the LORD,' the golden altar [but cp. note on *v.* 18], and began cleansing it; he sprinkled on the middle [the clean place] of the altar seven times, and some of the remainder of the blood he poured out on the western base of the outer altar [the altar of Burnt-Offering] and the remainder of the blood he poured out on the southern base of that altar (58 *b*). If the high priest did not perform the work of the Day of Atonement in the prescribed order, it was invalid (60 *b*). Concerning the two goats for the Day of Atonement, it is commanded that they should be alike in colour, height, and price, with provision in the event of one of the goats dying (61 *b*). The high priest placed his two hands on the goat to be sent away, and said (Tal. Bab.

shall kill the bullock of the sin offering which is for himself:
12 and he shall take a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar
before the LORD, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten
13 small, and bring it within the veil: and he shall put the incense
upon the fire before the LORD, that the cloud of the incense
may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony, that he

Yoma, 66*a*): O Lord, Thy people the house of Israel have committed iniquity, and transgressed, and sinned before Thee. O Lord pardon now the iniquities, the transgressions, and the sins which Thy people, the house of Israel, have iniquitously done, transgressed, and sinned before Thee, as it is written in the law of Moses Thy servant, 'For on this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the LORD' (*v.* 30).

And the priests and the people when they heard the Name from the mouth of the priest, bowed, and worshipped, and fell on their faces and said, 'Blessed be the Name, etc.' (66*a*). The goat was conducted to a place called *Ẓōḳ*, about 12 miles from Jerusalem (66*b*), where it was thrown backwards from the edge of a cliff. Booths were placed at the end of each of the first ten miles; the nobles of Jerusalem accompanied the goat to the first booth, and the rest of the people as far as the last booth from which they watched the actions of the man who took charge of the goat. Watchmen made signals when the goat arrived at the edge of the wilderness, and its arrival was thus made known to the high priest (67*a*, 68*b*).

This treatise, though it contains many additional directions not found in Scripture, throws light on some parts of the Biblical account. It makes clear the occasions on which the high priest enters the Most Holy place: (1) he goes in with the censer and the incense as ordered in *vv.* 12, 13; (2) after going out to fetch the blood of the bullock he enters the Most Holy place the *second* time (*v.* 14); he then kills the goat, the Sin-Offering of the people; and (3) enters the Most Holy place the *third* time with the blood of the goat (*v.* 15). It also mentions the mixing of the blood of the bullock with that of the goat, which seems implied in *v.* 18. The text of *vv.* 14, 15 ordains sprinkling *upon* the mercy-seat, according to EVV, and the generally accepted meaning of the Heb. But according to the Jewish tradition the sprinkling was in front of the mercy-seat, and the mercy-seat itself was not touched with the blood.

13. *the testimony*] *ʿēduth*, always with the definite article, except in the Psalms. This was something put into the ark, Exod. xxv. 16, 21, xl. 20; cp. 'which I shall give thee,' xxv. 16, with xxxi. 18, 'And he gave unto Moses...the two tables of the testimony.' They are so called xxxii. 15, and are identified with the first tables on which the ten words were written, Deut. v. 22, ix. 10—17. The first tables being broken were replaced by others which were put into the ark, Exod. xxxiv. 28, 29; Deut. x. 1—5. Hence the ark is called the 'ark of the testimony,' and the tabernacle is called the 'tabernacle (*mishkān*) of the testimony,'

die not: and he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and 14
sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy-seat on the east;
and before the mercy-seat shall he sprinkle of the blood
with his finger seven times. Then shall he kill the goat of 15
the sin offering, that is for the people, and bring his blood
within the veil, and do with his blood as he did with the
blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it upon the mercy-seat,
and before the mercy-seat: and he shall make atonement 16
for the holy place, because of the uncleannesses of the
children of Israel, and because of their transgressions, even
all their sins: and so shall he do for the tent of meeting,
that dwelleth with them in the midst of their uncleannesses.
And there shall be no man in the tent of meeting when he 17
goeth in to make atonement in the holy place, until he
come out, and have made atonement for himself, and for
his household, and for all the assembly of Israel. And 18
he shall go out unto the altar that is before the LORD, and

Exod. xxxviii. 21; Num. i. 50, 53, x. 11, and the 'tent (*'ohel*) of the testimony,' Num. ix. 15, xvii. 7, xviii. 2 (note that of these three passages which are all that contain the expression, the first is correctly rendered by A.V., but the other two are rendered 'tabernacle of witness').

The mercy-seat (*kappōreth*) which is upon the ark is described here as 'the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony'; and the veil (*pārōkheth*) which is before the ark is described (Exod. xxvii. 21) as 'the veil which is before the testimony,' and (Lev. xxiv. 3) as 'the veil of the testimony.'

16, 17. *for (in) the holy place*] by 'the holy place,' here distinguished from the 'tent of meeting' as in *vv.* 20, 23, is meant the Holy of Holies, and so in *vv.* 2, 3, 27. The tent of meeting which was among an unclean people required periodical cleansing. The altar was cleansed when it was erected (Exod. xxix. 36; Lev. viii. 15) and also anointed (Lev. viii. 11), but it required cleansing.

18. *And he shall go out unto the altar that is before the LORD*] The Mishna sees here a reference to the golden altar (*Yoma*, 58 *b*), but this must be questioned: throughout this chapter 'the altar' is mentioned, and in *v.* 12, where it undoubtedly means the altar of Burnt-Offering, it is described as 'the altar before the LORD,' as in this verse. The words 'and he shall go out,' after the purification of the whole tabernacle enjoined in *vv.* 16, 17, can hardly have any other meaning than 'he shall go out of the tabernacle into the court in which was the brasen altar.' In Exod. xxx. 10 the high priest is commanded to make atonement for the altar of incense once a year with the blood of the Sin-

make atonement for it; and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the blood of the goat, and put it upon the
19 horns of the altar round about. And he shall sprinkle of the blood upon it with his finger seven times, and cleanse it, and hallow it from the uncleannesses of the children
20 of Israel. And when he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place, and the tent of meeting, and the altar, he
21 shall present the live goat: and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, even all their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the
22 hand of a man [1]that is in readiness into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness.
23 And Aaron shall come into the tent of meeting, and shall put off the linen garments, which he put on when he went
24 into the holy place, and shall leave them there: and he

[1] Or, *appointed*

Offering of atonement, but the performance of this rite is not recorded here.

20. *when he hath made an end of atoning*] The three things mentioned here indicate the order in which the atonement was made—for the holy place (i.e. the Holy of Holies); the tent of meeting (the outer part of it) and the altar (outside the tabernacle)—and the course of the high priest was from W. to E.

21. The words of confession are given (p. 92) from the Mishna.

22. The goat that was sent away was a symbol of the entire removal of the sins for which the blood of the sacrificed animals had already made atonement (*vv.* 14, 15, 18). In *v.* 20 it is expressly said that the high priest had *made an end* of atoning.

21. *a man that is in readiness*] *a fit man*, A.V., one *appointed* (as R.V. mg.) for the purpose. In the time of the second temple, one that was not an Israelite was usually chosen (Tal. Bab. *Yoma*, 66 *a* and *b*).

22. *a solitary land*] Heb. *a land cut off*, 'a land not inhabited,' as A.V., or a land from which return was cut off.

23. The high priest now removed the special garments in which he had performed the service of the day, and after again washing, put on the usual high priestly garments (Exod. xxviii.) and offered the Burnt-Offerings. In Num. xxix. 7—10 a young bullock and seven he-lambs of the first year are also prescribed. According to tradition these were offered after the ram for Aaron, and the ram for the people.

shall bathe his flesh in water in a holy place, and put on his garments, and come forth, and offer his burnt offering and the burnt offering of the people, and make atonement for himself and for the people. And the fat of the sin 25
offering shall he burn upon the altar. And he that letteth 26
go the goat for Azazel shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp. And the bullock of the sin offering, and the goat of the sin 27
offering, whose blood was brought in to make atonement in the holy place, shall be carried forth without the camp; and they shall burn in the fire their skins, and their flesh, and their dung. And he that burneth them shall wash his 28
clothes, and bathe his flesh in water, and afterward he shall come into the camp.

And it shall be a statute for ever unto you: in the 29
seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, and shall do no manner of work, the homeborn, or the stranger that sojourneth among you: for 30

25. *And...shall he burn*] The position of this verse has been the subject of much comment. In *vv.* 11—19 no definite instruction has been given to burn the fat portions of the Sin-Offerings, but the manner in which the blood of the victims should be applied for the purification of the sanctuary and altar has been fully described. A supplementary notice has been inserted here, apparently in order that this important part of the ceremonial should be mentioned.

26—28. The bullock and the goat for the Sin-Offerings were not eaten, as their blood had been brought into the holy place (vi. 30). They were carried forth and burnt in the fire. The ordinary Heb. word for 'burn' is here used—the burning was not sacrificial. The Sin-Offering was most holy (vi. 25). Whatsoever touched the flesh thereof was holy (vi. 27), and those who carried them out must remove the contagion of holiness by washing their clothes and bathing. The same ceremony was required of the man that let go the goat for Azazel (*v.* 26). Whether this goat was regarded as sin-laden and unclean, or whether it shared the holiness of the Sin-Offering (the two goats constitute the Sin-Offering; see *v.* 5), is not stated. It may be noted that in iv. 1—21 those who carried the Sin-Offerings outside are not required to undergo this rite of washing and bathing.

29. *in the seventh month*, etc.] A certain sanctity attached to the day which closed the first decade of the month. See Driver on Exod. xii. 3. In view of the fact that the Feast of Ingathering was placed five days later, Dillm. suggests that from very early times there

on this day shall atonement be made for you, to cleanse you; from all your sins shall ye be clean before the LORD.
31 It is a sabbath of solemn rest unto you, and ye shall afflict
32 your souls; it is a statute for ever. And the priest, who shall be anointed and who shall be consecrated to be priest in his father's stead, shall make the atonement, and shall
33 put on the linen garments, even the holy garments: and he shall make atonement for the holy sanctuary, and he shall make atonement for the tent of meeting and for the altar; and he shall make atonement for the priests and for all the
34 people of the assembly. And this shall be an everlasting statute unto you, to make atonement for the children of Israel because of all their sins once in the year. And he did as the LORD commanded Moses.

may have existed a ceremonial of purification in preparation for that festival.

The choice of the 24th day of the same month for the solemn service of confession of sin in the time of Nehemiah (Neh. ix. 1) seems to shew that this statute, whatever be its age, was not on that occasion considered to be binding.

afflict your souls] Here and *v.* 31, xxiii. 27, 29, 32, Num. xxix 7 of the Day of Atonement; the expression occurs Num. xxx. 13; Ps. xxxv. 13 (with the addition of 'with fasting'); Is. lviii. 3, 5 (also with ref. to fasting)†: cp. Ezr. viii. 21; Is. lviii. 10.

the homeborn, or the stranger] See notes on xvii. 13, 15.

31. *a sabbath of solemn rest*] Heb. *shabbath shabbāthōn*, here and xxiii. 32 of the Day of Atonement; Exod. xxxi. 15, xxxv. 2; Lev. xxiii. 3 of the sabbath; xxv. 4 of the sabbatical year. *Shabbāthōn* is used of the first day of the seventh month, xxiii. 24, and of the first and eighth days of Tabernacles, xxiii. 39. In Exod. xvi. 23 the order of the two Heb. words is inverted, with ref. to an ordinary sabbath, 'a solemn rest, a holy sabbath.'

Statute of yearly atonement (29—34).

On the annual Day of Atonement the people are to practise self-denial and to abstain from work. According to Benzinger this section forms an original and independent law (with the exception of 34 *b*), involving a simple rite for expiation of guilt, and afterwards combined with directions as to the conditions under which the high priest should enter the Holy of Holies. See App. p. 163.

32. *shall be consecrated*] See on viii. 33.

33. *all the people of the assembly*] An unusual expression, contrasting them with the priests who were also members of it.

Chs. XVII.—XXVI. THE 'LAW OF HOLINESS[1].'

The leading features of this code, the probable date of its compilation, and an explanation of its origin and development, are discussed in *Introd.* The Law of Holiness, pp. xxii ff., and in App. I, pp. 167 ff. It is there shewn that laws drawn from various sources have been collected by an editor (R^H), and this collection has been revised by a later writer (R^P). The analysis of the separate chapters which follows will shew their composite character; in drawing the distinction between R^H and R^P the inferences that these represent two stages in the composition of the code will be further illustrated; with an occasional hint that the two stages may themselves be capable of sub-division. This code has a certain likeness to Exod. xx. 22—xxiii. 33, 'the Book of the Covenant.' The precepts of both are addressed (in the main) to the people, not to the priests, and in both codes many of the laws are cast in a terse form, as though for the purpose of aiding the memory to retain them. But in the 'Law of Holiness' there is (i) a greater amount of detail, and (ii) it deals with the ceremonial, rather than with the civil, side of an Israelite's life (see *LOT.*[9] p. 58).

Traces of H have been found elsewhere in the Pentateuch. We find some of its characteristic expressions combined in Exod. xxxi. 13, 14*a* (to the word 'death'). So Lev. xi. 43 ff. See note there.

We may append the following as characteristic expressions of H—

abomination, xviii. 22, 26, 29, xx. 13.

blemish (מוּם), xxi. 17—23, xxii. 20, 25, xxiv. 19.

(his) blood shall be upon (him), xx. 9, 11—13, 16, 27.

reverence my sanctuary, xix. 30, xxvi. 2.

I am Jehovah your (their) God (occasionally followed by, which brought you forth out of the land of Egypt), xviii. 2, 4, 30, xix. 3, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36, xx. 7, 24, xxii. 32, xxiii. 22, 43, xxiv. 22, xxv. 17, 38, 55*b*, xxvi. 1, 13, 44.

I, Jehovah your God am holy, xix. 2, xx. 26.

I (am) Jehovah which sanctify (hallow) you (him, them), xx. 8, xxi. 8, 15, 23, xxii. 9, 16, 32.

neighbour (עָמִית), xviii. 20, xix. 11, 15, 17, xxiv. 19, xxv. 14*a*, *b*, 15, 17.

the (a or any) priest, as a designation for the order, in contrast to 'the sons of Aaron,' xvii. 5, xix. 22, xxi. 9, xxii. 10—14, xxiii. 10, 11, 20.

(to) vomit (of the land casting forth its inhabitants), xviii. 25, 28*a*, *b*, xx. 22.

what man soever (or the like; with negatives, *none*, אִישׁ אִישׁ), xvii. 3, 8, 10, 13, xviii. 6, xx. 2, 9, xxii. 4, 18, xxiv. 15.

On these chapters see *Introd.* pp. xxii ff. and App. I, pp. 167 ff.

[1] It should be noted that the 'Law of Holiness' denoted by H is sometimes used to mean the *whole* of chs. xvii.—xxvi., sometimes the old laws embedded in these chs., and sometimes again these laws together with their hortatory settings.

17 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and unto his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them; This is the thing which the LORD hath

CH. XVII. 1—16. LAWS RELATING TO SACRIFICE AND TO THE EATING OF ANIMAL FOODS.

The ch. may be sub-divided as follows:

(1) *vv.* 3—7. The slaughter of all animals fit for sacrifice is to take place at the tent of meeting.

(2) *vv.* 8, 9. All Burnt-Offerings and sacrifices are to be brought to the tent of meeting.

(3) *vv.* 10—12. The eating of blood is forbidden, because of its atoning efficacy.

(4) *vv.* 13, 14. The blood of animals taken in hunting is to be poured out and covered with dust.

(5) *vv.* 15, 16. The flesh of that which dies of itself or is torn in pieces is not to be eaten.

Of the first four commands, those which commence *vv.* 3, 8, and 10 are introduced by such words as, 'what man soever there be of the house of Israel,' while *v.* 13 has 'of the children (lit. sons) of Israel[1].'

According to *vv.* 3, 4, all animals suitable for sacrifice must, when killed, be brought to the door of the tent of meeting, and presented as Peace-Offerings. No distinction is made between slaughtering for sacrifice and for food. This may well have accorded with ancient practice, and pointed to the time when the use of domestic animals for food was rare, and all slaughter was connected with sacrifice.

On the rare occasions on which an Israelite wished to kill a domestic [i.e. a sacrificial] animal, he brought it to the priest at the nearest high place, who poured out the blood at the altar. Shedding blood was regarded as a solemn act, which should be accompanied with certain religious ceremonies. When permission was accorded in the Deuteronomic code to kill the animal at home (see *Intr. to Pent.* p. 141, and the reff. to Driver, *Deut. I. C. C.* p. 145, Rob.-Sm. *OTJC.*[2] p. 249), the old feeling remained, and prompted the person who killed it to add certain actions similar to those which he had seen the priest perform at the altar. Probably he killed it on a stone after the manner described in 1 Sam. xiv. 31—34. In this way killing 'in the open field' assumed a sacrificial aspect, and some of the observances were probably of a superstitious character. Such ceremonial slaughtering seems to be described in *v.* 5

[1] In *v.* 13 'children' occurs instead of 'house.' The difference is slight, and it is possible that 'house' may have been the original reading. See the note there, p. 101. The LXX. have 'of the sons of' in all four places, and the Heb. MSS. vary. The LXX. of *vv.* 3, 4 contain some additional matter, and Kayser (*Jahrbuch für Protestantische Theologie*, 1881, pp. 541 ff.) with its help proposes to amend the text so as to make the whole passage refer only to beasts *offered in sacrifice*. His theory, however, is not favourably regarded by other critics (see Kuenen, *Hex.* § 6, 28 *a*, etc., following him, Baentsch, *das Heiligkeits-Gesetz*, p. 17).

commanded, saying, What man soever there be of the house 3
of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp,
or that killeth it without the camp, and hath not brought it 4
unto the door of the tent of meeting, to offer it as an
oblation unto the LORD before the tabernacle of the LORD:

as 'their sacrifices, which they sacrifice in the open field.' There was a real danger lest sacrifices in the open field with their attendant irregularities, might produce more evils than the old system of 'sacrificing in the high places'; at the latter there was some control, though not sufficient to satisfy the reformers who aimed at a higher standard, but 'in the open field' the common people might indulge their fancy for idolatrous cults, and definitely offer some part of the animal killed for food to the demons which, according to popular belief, were near and ready to do them harm. (Compare what was done in Jerusalem, according to Jer. vii. 18, xi. 13, and Ezek. viii.) From *v.* 7 it appears that sacrifices to 'satyrs,' which were abolished at Josiah's reformation (2 Kgs xxiii. 8), were one of the many forms of idolatry which had regained their hold on the popular imagination.

The prohibition here affects the Israelites only (in the LXX. the stranger is included), whereas the command of *vv.* 8, 9, that *all sacrifices* shall be brought to the tent of meeting applies to the stranger also.

In this ch. the reader will at once notice the recurrence of such a phrase as 'What man soever there be of the house of Israel' in *vv.* 3, 8, 10, 13. It introduces four precepts relating to sacrifice and cognate subjects, and in each precept the punishment awaiting him who disregards it is announced in nearly the same terms 'that man shall be cut off,' or 'I will cut him off from his people,' briefly in the last precept '(he) shall be cut off' (*v.* 14). The four precepts are (1) *vv.* 3—7; (2) *vv.* 8, 9; (3) *vv.* 10—12; (4) *vv.* 13—16.

vv. 15, 16 may be considered as an obvious deduction from *vv.* 10—14; both kinds of meat would contain some part of the blood. The introductory phrase 'every soul that' is different from that employed in the preceding verses, and the penalty announced 'he shall bear his iniquity' is not the same. Many critics assign these two verses to R^P. They are probably an addition to the precepts of *vv.* 3—14; whether due to R^h or R^P may be left undecided: the fourth precept may be regarded as originally ending at *v.* 14.

3. *killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat*] The animals mentioned are those which are suitable for sacrifice, 'of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD' (vii. 25), and the verb, though used of sacrificial slaughter (i. 5, ix. 8, etc.), also has the sense of ordinary killing for food. This is its meaning here. The act of killing a beast included in the category of those admissible for sacrifice must be accompanied by certain other religious rites, viz. (1) bringing it before the LORD, (2) bringing it to one special place.

4. *the tent of meeting...the tabernacle*] For the significance of the

blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood;
and that man shall be cut off from among his people:
5 to the end that the children of Israel may bring their
sacrifices, which they sacrifice in the open field, even that
they may bring them unto the LORD, unto the door of the
tent of meeting, unto the priest, and sacrifice them for
6 sacrifices of peace offerings unto the LORD. And the priest
shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar of the LORD at the
door of the tent of meeting, and burn the fat for a sweet
7 savour unto the LORD. And they shall no more sacrifice
their sacrifices unto the [1]he-goats, after whom they go
a whoring. This shall be a statute for ever unto them
throughout their generations.
8 And thou shalt say unto them, Whatsoever man there be
of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn
9 among them, that offereth a burnt offering or sacrifice, and
bringeth it not unto the door of the tent of meeting, to
sacrifice it unto the LORD; even that man shall be cut off
from his people.
10 And whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or
of the strangers that sojourn among them, that eateth any

[1] Or, *satyrs*

double indication of place which suggests a combination of two sources see p. 88.

5. The whole *v.* appears to be an expansion on the part of RP. See p. 99.

the open field] In contrast to the city. For the expression cp. xiv. 7, 53.

7. *he-goats*] **satyrs**, as R.V. mg., i.e. demons of the desert believed to take the shape of goats, like the satyrs of classical mythology. For the survival of Canaanitish rites, as practised by Israelites, cp. Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16; Is. xiii. 21; xxxiv. 14, lvii. 6 (with note in Camb. Bible), lxv. 7.

go a whoring] A frequent expression (e.g. Exod. xxxiv. 15, 16) for the worship of other gods.

8. *of the strangers...*] See p. 99.

9. *his people*] Although the EVV render 'his people' in *vv.* 4, 9, 10, the Heb. noun is plural in *v.* 9, and should there be translated **his father's kin.** See *Intr. to Pent.* App. II. (25), pp. 215 f. See also Skinner (*Cent. Bible*) on 2 Kgs xxiii. 8.

10. The prohibition (cp. *v.* 12) is found also in iii. 17, vii. 26, xix. 26; Deut. xii. 16, 23, 24, xv. 23. It is regarded as having been obligatory

manner of blood; I will set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people.
For the [1]life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given 11
it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls:
for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the
[1]life. Therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul 12
of you shall eat blood, neither shall any stranger that
sojourneth among you eat blood.
And whatsoever man there be of the children of Israel, 13
or of the strangers that sojourn among them, which taketh
in hunting any beast or fowl that may be eaten; he shall
pour out the blood thereof, and cover it with dust. For as 14
to the life of all flesh, the blood thereof is *all one* with the
life thereof: therefore I said unto the children of Israel, Ye
shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh: for the life of all
flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut

[1] Heb. *soul.*

from the beginning (Gen. ix. 4). The word 'eat' is probably used in order to include eating flesh which contained blood. When the people ate thus in their haste after the defeat of the Philistines, this is described as eating 'with (Heb. upon) the blood' (1 Sam. xiv. 32—34). Cp. ch. xix. 26; Ezek. xxxiii. 25.

11. The reason for avoiding blood is given.

the life...your souls...the life] The Heb. word *néphesh* is the same in the three cases.

it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life] i.e. the life which it contains, not as A.V. 'maketh atonement for the soul.'

13, 14. Directions how the blood of beasts or fowls taken in hunting is to be dealt with.

13. *of the children of Israel*] The Samaritan text and certain of Kennicott's Heb. MSS read 'house' here, as in *vv.* 3, 5, 10. The LXX. (see above) have 'sons' in all four places, but the Vulg. follows MT.

the strangers that sojourn among them] Foreigners are here made to be subject to the same law in the matter as the home born. On the other hand, in Deut. (xiv. 21) that which dieth of itself may be given to 'the stranger' or sold to 'a foreigner.' According to Dillm. the contradiction arises from a difference in standpoint, the direction in Deut. basing itself on real and practical life, while that of P has in mind an ideal theocracy. More probably, the greater strictness of P is the product of a time (later than Deut.) when emphasis was laid on the binding character of Israel's laws upon the resident of foreign extraction, who desired to share the advantages afforded him. So Driver.

15 off. And every soul that eateth [1]that which dieth of itself,
or that which is torn of beasts, whether he be homeborn or
a stranger, he shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in
water, and be unclean until the even: then shall he be
16 clean. But if he wash them not, nor bathe his flesh, then he
shall bear his iniquity.

18 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the
children of Israel, and say unto them, I am the LORD your
3 God. After the doings of the land of Egypt, wherein ye
dwelt, shall ye not do: and after the doings of the land of

[1] Heb. *a carcase.*

15. Cp. **vii. 24, xxii. 8**; Deut. **xiv. 21** allowed the 'stranger' to eat that which 'dieth of itself.'

17. See on **xix. 26**.

CHS. XVIII.—XX. LAWS DEALING WITH VARIOUS MORAL SUBJECTS.

These three chs. contain features common to two or all three of them, which are found nowhere else in the Pentateuch. Such are (1) a collection of laws combined with a hortatory introduction and summary (xviii. 1—5, 24—30, xix. 2, 37, xx. 1—8, 22—26), (2) the prohibition of magic (xix. 26, 31, xx. 6, 27), (3) reference to Molech worship (xviii. 21, xx. 2—5). Paton (*Hebraica*, x. [1894] 111 ff.) considers that ch. xx. does not present an independent code or recension, but is a hortatory exposition based on chs. xvii.—xix. by a later editor. At all events, the amount of repetition coupled with a variation in expressions in ch. xx. as compared with the three preceding it affords sufficient evidence that the two groups of laws are not in their present form the work of one writer.

CH. XVIII. 1—30. PROHIBITION OF UNLAWFUL MARRIAGES AND UNCHASTITY, AND OF MOLECH WORSHIP.

The introductory clause as far as 'and say unto them' is all that belongs to the final revision. The style of R^h appears in *vv.* 2*b*—5 and in *vv.* 24—30; the repetition of the same phrases and the brevity of expression in *vv.* 7—23 shew that they form a *torah* on social relations which has been included by R^h in his collection. The second person sing. is employed throughout *vv.* 7—23, the plural in *v.* 6 seems to distinguish it as an introduction added by R^h; cp. the plural in *vv.* 3—5 and *vv.* 24—30.

Paton (*J. Bibl. Lit.* xvi. [1897] pp. 43 ff.) takes 'I am *Jehovah* your God' in *v.* 2 as the conclusion of ch. xvii. which he regards as a pentad (or *torah* made up of a fivefold prohibition) on sacrifice. He considers *vv.* 3—5 as a second pentad enjoining allegiance to *Jehovah*, and

Canaan, whither I bring you, shall ye not do: neither shall ye walk in their statutes. My judgements shall ye do, and 4
my statutes shall ye keep, to walk therein: I am the LORD your God. Ye shall therefore keep my statutes, and my 5
judgements: which if a man do, he shall live [1]in them: I am the LORD.

None of you shall approach to any that is near of kin to 6
him, to uncover *their* nakedness: I am the LORD. The 7
nakedness of thy father, even the nakedness of thy mother, shalt thou not uncover: she is thy mother; thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. The nakedness of thy father's wife 8

[1] Or, *by*

concluding with 'I am the LORD.' He also divides the rest of the chapter into two decalogues:

1. Purity in those connected through the relationship of parent and child.

The first Pentad: *Kinship of the first degree, vv.* 6—10.

The second Pentad: *Kinship of the second degree, vv.* 11—15.

2. Purity in remoter relationships.

The first Pentad: *Relationships through marriage, vv.* 16—19.

The second Pentad: *Purity outside of the family, vv.* 20—23.

To the exhortation concluding with 'I am the LORD your God' (*v.* 30) he would add xix. 2*b*, 'Ye shall be holy,' etc.

The arrangement in this ch. is better than in ch. xx., and the cases dealt with are more numerous. Ch. xx. contains no parallels to xviii. 7, 10, 17*b*, 18, and has therefore been taken as representing an earlier code. On the other hand ch. xx., unlike ch. xviii., mentions penalties for the offences, while such indications as it affords by the juxtaposition of 'you' in 14*b*, 15*b*, and 'thou' in 16, 19, and the duplicate clauses in *v.* 10 suggest that whatever age may be ascribed to the code in ch. xx., as compared with that which appears in ch. xviii., the former has at any rate been subjected to later editing.

5. *I am the LORD*] For the significance of this often repeated expression, see pp. xlviii f.

6. A general exhortation (hence perhaps the plural; see above), introductory to the enumeration of specific cases. Baentsch attributes it to the author of the preceding verses.

8. This is the one case which appears (apart from two others in the imprecations, Deut. xxvii. 22, 23), but stated in different words, in Deut. (xxii. 30 [Heb. xxiii. 1], xxvii. 20). This has been thought to point to the code represented by the *v.* in Deut. as earlier than that here; but an easier explanation is to suppose that the practice, as specially prevalent at the time, needed specific prohibition. Illicit connexion with a step-

9 shalt thou not uncover: it is thy father's nakedness. The
nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father, or the
daughter of thy mother, whether born at home, or born
abroad, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover.
10 The nakedness of thy son's daughter, or of thy daughter's
daughter, even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover: for
11 theirs is thine own nakedness. The nakedness of thy
father's wife's daughter, begotten of thy father, she is thy
12 sister, thou shalt not uncover her nakedness. Thou shalt
not uncover the nakedness of thy father's sister: she is
13 thy father's near kinswoman. Thou shalt not uncover the
nakedness of thy mother's sister: for she is thy mother's
14 near kinswoman. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness
of thy father's brother, thou shalt not approach to his wife:
15 she is thine aunt. Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness
of thy daughter in law: she is thy son's wife; thou shalt not
16 uncover her nakedness. Thou shalt not uncover the naked-
ness of thy brother's wife: it is thy brother's nakedness.
17 Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of a woman and her
daughter; thou shalt not take her son's daughter, or her
daughter's daughter, to uncover her nakedness; they are
18 near kinswomen: it is [1]wickedness. And thou shalt not
take a woman to her sister, to be a rival *to her*, to uncover
19 her nakedness, beside the other in her life time. And thou
shalt not approach unto a woman to uncover her nakedness,
20 as long as she is [2]impure by her uncleanness. And thou
shalt not lie carnally with thy neighbour's wife, to defile

[1] Or, *enormity* [2] Or, *separated for*

mother, here forbidden, was not uncommon in the polygamous East. See Driver, *Deut.*, p. 259, for the custom in Syria and Arabia. It seems to have been still common in the time of Ezekiel (xxii. 10).

10. The prohibition in the case of a daughter was probably omitted accidentally by a copyist from the beginning of this *v.*

18. *a woman to her sister*] This is clearly right, as against the A.V. mg. '*one* wife to another.' It is the marriage of two sisters together that is prohibited. The words that follow ('in her lifetime') show that the law, as set down here, does not prohibit marriage with a deceased wife's sister. However weighty the reasons which may be adduced against such a connexion, scholars are generally agreed that they derive no support from this *v.*

thyself with her. And thou shalt not give any of thy seed 21
[1]to make them pass through *the fire* to Molech, neither shalt
thou profane the name of thy God: I am the LORD. Thou 22
shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is
abomination. And thou shalt not lie with any beast to 23
defile thyself therewith: neither shall any woman stand
before a beast, to lie down thereto: it is confusion.

Defile not ye yourselves in any of these things: for in all 24
these the nations are defiled which I cast out from before
you: and the land is defiled: therefore I do visit the 25
iniquity thereof upon it, and the land vomiteth out her
inhabitants. Ye therefore shall keep my statutes and my 26
judgements, and shall not do any of these abominations;
neither the homeborn, nor the stranger that sojourneth
among you: (for all these abominations have the men of the 27
land done, which were before you, and the land is defiled;)
that the land vomit not you out also, when ye defile it, as it 28
vomited out the nation that was before you. For whosoever 29
shall do any of these abominations, even the souls that do
them shall be cut off from among their people. Therefore 30
shall ye keep my charge, that ye do not any of these
abominable customs, which were done before you, and that
ye defile not yourselves therein: I am the LORD your God.

[1] Or, *to set them apart to Molech*

21. A more suitable position for this precept would be at the end of the laws in *vv.* 7—23. It occurs in a developed form in xx. 2—5. Its sudden interposition may be accounted for by remembering the condemnation of idolatry under the figure of unfaithfulness to the marriage tie (cp. the expressions in xx. 5*a*), see Jer. iii. 1 ff. For the worship of Molech (Milcom), the god of the Ammonites, see Barnes (*C.B.*) on 1 Kgs xi. 5.

24—30. See general note at the beginning of the ch. These *vv.* are probably expanded from earlier materials. After the warning in *v.* 24 the standpoint changes, and the remainder of the passage is a reflection on the past, the verbs being really in the past tense, *were* defiled, *was* defiled, I *visited*, (the land) *vomited*.

CH. XIX. 1—37. A MISCELLANY OF LAWS, MORAL AND CEREMONIAL.

The fragmentary character of this ch. is apparent on a first reading. The ch. thus affords ample ground for the conclusion that it is composite,

19 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am holy.

although it may be impossible to trace with certainty the process of compilation. The commands and exhortations are (with the exception of *vv.* 6—8 and 20—22) in the second person, with numerous shiftings between singular and plural. The natural inference is that material from various sources has been gathered by a compiler who has not allowed himself much editorial freedom.

This ch. contains precepts relating to religious observances (sabbath 3, 30; sacrifice 5—8, 21, 22, etc.), moral duties (towards parents 3, against stealing and lying 11, 12, etc.), administration of justice (15, 35), care of the poor and stranger (9, 10, 33, 34), just weights and measures (36), etc. They are introduced by the command, 'Ye shall be holy: for I the LORD your God am holy' (xix. 1). They illustrate the spirit in which commands should be obeyed by a holy people serving a holy God. Many of them are also found in the Decalogue (Ex. xx.), the book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi.—xxiii.), and Deut., though expressed in different terms. No reason for their selection or arrangement is apparent, and their position between chs. xviii. and xx., which contain almost identical precepts on matters of a very different character, is remarkable.

The introductory command in *v.* 2, together with the reference to the deliverance from Egypt (*v.* 36), forms an exhortation similar to that of xi. 44*a*, 45, and the phrase, 'I am the LORD,' or more fully, 'I am the LORD your God,' occurs more frequently than in chs. xviii. or xx.

vv. 1, 2 set forth the fundamental principle which gives the Laws of Holiness their special character (see pp. xlviii f.). The remainder of the ch. may be divided thus (excluding for the moment *vv.* 5—8, 21, 22): (1) *vv.* 3, 4, which have a kinship with the first part of the Decalogue (Exod. xx. 3—12), (2) *vv.* 9—21, analogous to certain precepts in the latter part of the Decalogue, (3) *vv.* 23—37, consisting of a special introduction (*v.* 23) and supplementary directions of a more general nature. In this last part (as in 2—8) the 2nd pers. pl. prevails, and the sing. (on the whole) in 9—19.

The whole ch. may be referred to H, with the exception of *vv.* 21, 22, which are shown by their character to belong to P. *Vv.* 5—8, dealing with the time within which the Peace-Offering must be consumed, might also, as far as its subject is concerned, be ascribed to P but for the fact that its directions do not quite harmonise with the similar passage (vii. 15—18), which is undoubtedly part of P. There, of the three classes into which the Peace-Offering is subdivided, one only (the Thank-Offering) must be consumed on the same day, while the remainder of the other two (the vow and the Freewill-Offering) may be kept uneaten till the morrow. Here no such distinction is made. With *v.* 5 cp. xxii. 29, 'that ye may be accepted,' and the note on i. 3.

Notwithstanding the parallelisms which have been traced between

Ye shall fear every man his mother, and his father, and 3
ye shall keep my sabbaths: I am the LORD your God.
Turn ye not unto [1]idols, nor make to yourselves molten 4
gods: I am the LORD your God. And when ye offer a 5
sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD, ye shall offer it
that ye may be accepted. It shall be eaten the same day 6
ye offer it, and on the morrow: and if aught remain until
the third day, it shall be burnt with fire. And if it be eaten 7
at all on the third day, it is an abomination; it shall not be
accepted: but every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity, 8
because he hath profaned the holy thing of the LORD: and
that soul shall be cut off from his people.

[1] Heb. *things of nought.* See Jer. xiv. 14.

some parts of this ch. and certain precepts in the Decalogue any such influence on the arrangement of directions in this ch. is far from being established. Paton's position, e.g., seems quite unjustified, when he says (*loc. cit.* p. 53), 'It cannot be doubted that it was the intention of the original H to follow the order of thought of the Decalogue.' It will be seen that so far as the commands are common to the two passages, they differ much in their order.

3. *his mother, and his father*] The command in the Decalogue is to 'honour,' here to 'fear,' or act reverently towards parents. The mother is put first, as in xxi. 2. This order probably indicates diversity of origin. But Rashi, on the authority of the Midrashic commentary, *Mechilta*, on Exod. xx., accounts for this order on the ground that the child by *nature* fears the father more than the mother.

ye shall keep my sabbaths] Repeated in *v.* 30. For the sabbath law cp. xxvi. 2; Exod. xxxi. 13. It has been remarked that the two injunctions associated together in this *v.* are the only two *positive* commands in the Decalogue.

4. *Turn ye not unto*] As in *v.* 31 (A.V. 'Regard not'), and xx. 6.

idols] (*'ĕlīlīm*) *things of nought* R.V. mg. See reference there. The Heb. word occurs only here and xxvi. 1 in Pentateuch; a word of uncertain etymology, possibly suggesting the idea of gods from its sound (similar to that of *'ēl* and *'ĕlōhīm*), but always associated with the idea of worthlessness. It is used by the prophets ironically of false gods in contrast to the true God.

molten gods] See Exod. xxxiv. 17. Cp. Deut. xxvii. 15.

5—8. See introd. note to ch.

7. *it is an abomination*] As in vii. 18. See note there.

The precepts in *vv.* 9—18 set forth the duty of each man towards his neighbour, especially towards the poor, and such as are in need of protection.

9 And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt
not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou
10 gather the gleaning of thy harvest. And thou shalt not
glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather the fallen fruit
of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and for
11 the stranger: I am the LORD your God. Ye shall not steal;
12 neither shall ye deal falsely, nor lie one to another. And
ye shall not swear by my name falsely, so that thou profane
13 the name of thy God: I am the LORD. Thou shalt not
oppress thy neighbour, nor rob him: the wages of a hired
servant shall not abide with thee all night until the morning.
14 Thou shalt not curse the deaf, nor put a stumblingblock
before the blind, but thou shalt fear thy God: I am the
15 LORD. Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgement:
thou shalt not respect the person of the poor, nor honour
the person of the mighty: but in righteousness shalt thou
16 judge thy neighbour. Thou shalt not go up and down as
a talebearer among thy people: neither shalt thou stand

9—11. Cp. xxiii. 22. The law of gleaning: a portion of the produce of the soil is to be left for the poor. A similar law is found in Deut. xxiv. 19—21. The word translated '*the fallen fruit*' ('every grape,' A.V.) occurs only here in O.T., but is of common occurrence in Mishnaic Heb. to denote a *particular* object as distinguished from the *general* name of the class to which it belongs. The traditional interpretation is that the grapes were to be gathered in bunches, but a single grape was to be left, as well as those that fell to the ground during the gathering. The law is expressed in 2nd pers. sing. and in xxiii. 22.

11, 12. Precepts analogous to those in the Decalogue and expressed in 2nd pers. plur. (except the last).

13, 14. Cp. Deut. xxiv. 14, 15; Mal. iii. 5; Jas. v. 4. Precepts expressed in 2nd pers. sing. against unjust dealing, and taking advantage of a neighbour's infirmities. Though the deaf cannot hear, the curse must not be uttered, and the helpless condition of the blind calls for protection and the removal of stumblingblocks (cp. Deut. xxvii. 18). Cp. Job's description of his conduct, 'I was eyes to the blind' (xxix. 15).

15, 16. Against unrighteousness in judgement, and slander. Cp. Exod. xxiii. 1—3, 6, 7; Deut. i. 17, xvi. 19, xxvii. 19; Ps. lxxxii. 2; Prov. xxiv. 23.

15. *Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgement*] Cp. *v.* 35.

16. *a talebearer*] Cp. Prov. xi. 13, xx. 19. Jewish teachers frequently insist on the heinousness of slander. See Otho, *Lex. Rabb. s.v. Calumnia*, and note the rendering of Targ. Jon., 'Thou shalt not go

against the blood of thy neighbour: I am the LORD. Thou 17
shalt not hate thy brother in thine heart: thou shalt surely
rebuke thy neighbour, and not bear sin because of him.
Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against 18
the children of thy people, but thou shalt love thy neighbour
as thyself: I am the LORD. Ye shall keep my statutes. 19

after the slanderous (lit. triple) tongue.' The epithet 'triple' implies that slander affects three persons: the slanderer, the slandered one, and anyone who repeats the slander. See Tal. Bab. '*Arachin* fol. 15*a*, and cp. Ecclus. xxviii. 14 ff. (*C.B.*) with notes.

stand against the blood of thy neighbour] This expression has been differently interpreted: taken in connexion with the preceding warning against being a talebearer, it seems to forbid endangering the life of an innocent man by bearing false witness. Cp. Ezek. xxii. 9, part of a passage which describes with verbal similarity many of the evil doings which are forbidden in this ch. and the preceding one. Witnessing truly against a murderer is not forbidden, and Targ. Ps-Jon. explains this clause so as to enforce that duty; 'be not silent about thy neighbour's blood, when thou knowest the truth.' Another interpretation is, 'thou shalt not stand (without rendering help) by the blood of thy neighbour,' i.e. when he is in peril of his life.

17, 18. Against hatred and vengeance; instead of cherishing hatred, rebuke thy neighbour (i.e. point out his fault), and persist in so doing (thou shalt *surely*), e.g. as in the case mentioned in Matt. xviii. 15 f.; in so doing thou wilt not 'bear sin because of him.' The command to love thy neighbour as thyself is quoted in the N.T., Matt. xix. 19; as the second great commandment, Matt. xxii. 39; Mark xii. 31; also Luke x. 27; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; the royal law, Jas. ii. 8. These commands *here*, however, are confined in thought to fellow-Israelites. Even *v.* 34 extends only to the 'stranger' who worshipped Israel's God. The universal application of the word 'neighbour' came first in our Lord's teaching.

In *vv.* 9—18 the laws are arranged in groups of two or three verses, each terminated by the phrase, 'I am the LORD (your God).' Each group contains either a complete pentad, or what seems to be the remains of a probable pentad. The laws, except in *vv.* 11, 12, are on the whole in the 2nd pers. sing. Some of them are repeated elsewhere in this collection, e.g. part of *vv.* 5—8 in xxii. 29 f., *vv.* 9, 10 in xxiii. 22, *v.* 4 in xxvi. 1, *v.* 3 in *v.* 30 and xxvi. 2. The precepts in *vv.* 3, 4 are analogous to those in the first part of the Decalogue, and those in *vv.* 11—18 to those in the second part, though *v.* 12 is parallel to the third commandment. Several commentators are of opinion that the order of thought of the Decalogue can be traced here, but see p. 107.

19—32. Miscellaneous precepts in reference to the various circumstances of every-day life.

Thou shalt not let thy cattle gender with a diverse kind: thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed: neither shall there come upon thee a garment of two kinds of stuff
20 mingled together. And whosoever lieth carnally with a woman, that is a bondmaid, betrothed to an husband, and not at all redeemed, nor freedom given her; [1]they shall be punished; they shall not be put to death, because she was
21 not free. And he shall bring his guilt offering unto the LORD, unto the door of the tent of meeting, even a ram for a
22 guilt offering. And the priest shall make atonement for him with the ram of the guilt offering before the LORD for his sin which he hath sinned: and he shall be forgiven for
23 his sin which he hath sinned. And when ye shall come into the land, and shall have planted all manner of trees for food, then ye shall count the fruit thereof as their uncircumcision: three years shall they be as uncircumcised unto you;

[1] Heb. *there shall be inquisition.*

19. Prohibition of improper mixtures. Apparently the precept was based upon the view that each individual, animate or inanimate, had individual qualities assigned by the Creator, and that to mix them was therefore directed against God's ordinance, and as such involved impurity. Cp. Deut. xxii. 5, 9—11, where the prohibition is extended to the wearing by one sex of garments properly belonging to the other, or the attaching of an ox and an ass to the same plough.

20. Inasmuch as the woman here referred to, though betrothed to a husband, is still a slave, it is no ordinary case of adultery, which is punishable by death (xx. 10), and so the penalty is to be less severe, but is nevertheless demanded, on the ground that she is the husband's property.

bondmaid] The Hebrew word used here in place of the term ordinarily employed is found nowhere else in a legal enactment.

they shall be punished] The mg. is the literal rendering of the Heb., but it is implied that the 'inquisition' is with a view to punishment.

21, 22. See introd. note to ch.

23. The fruit tree in its first three years is to be regarded as a male infant during his first eight days (Dillm.), i.e. as unconsecrated. Probably the object was to allow the tree time to become accustomed to the soil, and so to postpone the enjoyment of the fruit till both quantity and quality had had time to develop. This agrees with the direction in *v.* 24 that in the fourth year it should be dedicated to the Lord. Of the manner in which this dedication was to be carried out we are ignorant, but the hallowing itself was on the same principle as that of

it shall not be eaten. But in the fourth year all the fruit 24
thereof shall be holy, for giving praise unto the LORD. And 25
in the fifth year shall ye eat of the fruit thereof, that it may
yield unto you the increase thereof: I am the LORD your
God. Ye shall not eat any thing with the blood: neither 26
shall ye use enchantments, nor practise augury. Ye shall 27
not round the corners of your heads, neither shalt thou mar
the corners of thy beard. Ye shall not make any cuttings 28
in your flesh for the dead, nor print any marks upon you:
I am the LORD. Profane not thy daughter, to make her a 29
harlot; lest the land fall to whoredom, and the land be-
come full of [1]wickedness. Ye shall keep my sabbaths, and 30

[1] Or, *enormity*

the firstborn of mankind and of cattle (Exod. xiii. 2). For a festive celebration, apparently of the kind contemplated in this *v.*, cp. Jud. ix. 27 (with R.V. mg.).

26. *with the blood*] The LXX. has here instead 'upon the mountains,' probably influenced by the phrase in Ezek. xviii. 6, xxii. 9, which, however, according to Rob.-Sm. (*Kinship*, p. 312), should be assimilated to accord with xxxiii. 25.

use enchantments] Employ divination. See e.g. Gen. xliv. 5, where the method was by hydromancy (Driver *ad loc.*).

practise augury] The original meaning of the Heb. verb is uncertain, but probably its sense is to hum (as insects) or whisper (as leaves), and hence is applied to the low murmuring made by diviners. Augury in the etymological sense (inferences from marking the flight of *birds*) was practised in the East. See Driver, Deut. p. 225.

27. *round the corners of your heads*] i.e. cut off the hair from the temples. Cp. Jer. ix. 26, xxv. 23, xlix. 32. According to Herod. (iii. 8) it had a religious significance with certain Arab tribes. The belief that the hair was specially fitted to mark union with the Divine being, seems to have arisen from its continuous growth so long as life continues. See Rob.-Sm. *Rel. of the Sem.*[2] 323 ff., 481 ff.

28. *cuttings in your flesh for the dead*] Another practice common among half-civilized races. It represented the custom of human sacrifices (see e.g. Herod. iv. 71) as a propitiation to the spirit of the departed. Cp. Jer. xli. 5, and perhaps (*C.B.*) Hos. vii. 14. A. R. S. Kennedy, on the other hand (*HDB.* i. 172), considers that the original idea was to make an enduring covenant with the dead. He quotes Rob.-Sm. *Rel. Sem.*[2] p. 305. For the prohibitions in this and *v.* 27, cp. xxi. 5; Deut. xiv. 1.

29. For 'the land' in the sense of its inhabitants, cp. xviii. 25; Jud. xviii. 30; Hos. i. 2.

30. *Ye shall keep my sabbaths*] Cp. *v.* 3.

31 reverence my sanctuary: I am the LORD. Turn ye not unto
them that have familiar spirits, nor unto the wizards; seek
them not out, to be defiled by them: I am the LORD your
32 God. Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honour
the face of the old man, and thou shalt fear thy God: I am
33 the LORD. And if a stranger sojourn with thee in your land,
34 ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth
with you shall be unto you as the homeborn among you,
and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in
35 the land of Egypt: I am the LORD your God. Ye shall
do no unrighteousness in judgement, in meteyard, in weight,
36 or in measure. Just balances, just weights, a just ephah,
and a just hin, shall ye have: I am the LORD your God,
37 which brought you out of the land of Egypt. And ye shall
observe all my statutes, and all my judgements, and do
them: I am the LORD.

31. *familiar spirits...wizards*] Cp. ch. xx. 6, 27. For the difference between the two see Driver on Deut. xviii. 11. The former expression (*'ōb*) may be rendered *ghost*. Its oracles were uttered in a twittering voice, which, through ventriloquism, appeared to rise from the ground. Accordingly the LXX. mostly renders the word by *ἐγγαστρίμυθοι*, ventriloquists. See the narrative of the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii.). The latter of the two appellations, lit. *knowing* (but Rob.-Sm. *Journal of Philology*, xiii. 273 ff.; xiv. 113 ff., prefers *acquaintance*), may fitly be rendered *familiar spirit*. The distinction between the two modes of divination will then be that 'those who divine by the former profess (1 Sam. xxviii. 11) to call up any ghost; those who divine by the latter consult only the particular spirit which is their familiar' (Driver as above).

32. *rise up*, etc.] Herodotus (ii. 80) speaks of this and other acts of respect on the part of youth to age as practised by the Egyptians, to whom, according to him, the Lacedaemonians alone of the Greeks furnish a parallel.

33, 34. Cp. Exod. xxii. 21, xxiii. 9; Deut. x. 19; cp. Mal. iii. 5.

35, 36. Uprightness enjoined in judgement and in commercial dealings. Cp. Deut. xxv. 13—16; Ezek. xlv. 9 ff.

meteyard] lit. (Anglo-Saxon *met-geard*) a measuring rod. For the word see *Taming of the Shrew*, iv. 3. 153.

ephah...hin] The former was about a bushel, the latter about 1½ gallons of our measure.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Moreover, thou 20
2 shalt say to the children of Israel, Whosoever he be of the
children of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel,
that giveth of his seed unto Molech; he shall surely be put
to death: the people of the land shall stone him with stones.
3 I also will set my face against that man, and will cut him off
from among his people; because he hath given of his seed
unto Molech, to defile my sanctuary, and to profane my
4 holy name. And if the people of the land do any ways
hide their eyes from that man, when he giveth of his seed
5 unto Molech, and put him not to death: then I will set my
face against that man, and against his family, and will cut
him off, and all that go a whoring after him, to commit
whoredom with Molech, from among their people. And 6
the soul that turneth unto them that have familiar spirits,
and unto the wizards, to go a whoring after them, I will
even set my face against that soul, and will cut him off from
among his people. Sanctify yourselves therefore, and be ye 7
holy: for I am the LORD your God. And ye shall keep 8

CH. XX. 1—27. VARIOUS LAWS WITH THE ADDITION OF PENALTIES FOR THEIR VIOLATION.

For the relation between this ch. and those parts of ch. xviii. which are kindred to it, see introd. note to the latter. The character stamped upon chs. xvii.—xxvi. as the 'Law of Holiness' is conspicuous in the hortatory framework introduced by the compiler (R^h), and resembling that of ch. xviii.

The ch. may be sub-divided thus: (1) *vv.* 1—7, laws bearing on religion; Molech worship and consultation with the unseen world; (2) *vv.* 8—21, laws bearing on immorality; unlawful marriages and unchastity; (3) *vv.* 22—26, hortatory conclusion; (4) *v.* 27, punishment for offences mentioned in *v.* 6.

2. *Moreover*] This introduction shews that the words that follow do not stand in their original context, but are an extract from a body of laws.

vv. 2 and 3 appear to be inconsistent. In 2 the offender is to be stoned by the people, in 3 he is to be cut off by some kind of divine visitation. Probably we may trace here the juxtaposition of two sources, while for the sake of harmonizing them *vv.* 4, 5 were added.

4. *hide their eyes*] i.e. disregard. For the expression in this sense cp. Prov. xxviii. 27; Is. i. 15.

6. *familiar spirits...wizards*] See on xix. 31.

7. Almost verbally identical with xi. 44*a*.

my statutes, and do them: I am the LORD which sanctify
9 you. For every one that curseth his father or his mother
shall surely be put to death: he hath cursed his father or
10 his mother: his blood shall be upon him. And the man that
committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that
committeth adultery with his neighbour's wife, the adulterer
11 and the adulteress shall surely be put to death. And the
man that lieth with his father's wife hath uncovered his
father's nakedness: both of them shall surely be put to
12 death; their blood shall be upon them. And if a man lie
with his daughter in law, both of them shall surely be put
to death: they have wrought confusion; their blood shall
13 be upon them. And if a man lie with mankind, as with
womankind, both of them have committed abomination:
they shall surely be put to death; their blood shall be upon
14 them. And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is
[1]wickedness: they shall be burnt with fire, both he and
15 they; that there be no wickedness among you. And if a
man lie with a beast, he shall surely be put to death: and
16 ye shall slay the beast. And if a woman approach unto
any beast, and lie down thereto, thou shalt kill the woman,
and the beast: they shall surely be put to death; their
17 blood shall be upon them. And if a man shall take his
sister, his father's daughter, or his mother's daughter, and
see her nakedness, and she see his nakedness; it is a
shameful thing; and they shall be cut off in the sight of the
children of their people: he hath uncovered his sister's
18 nakedness; he shall bear his iniquity. And if a man shall
lie with a woman having her sickness, and shall uncover her
nakedness: he hath made naked her fountain, and she hath

[1] Or, *enormity*

9. The penalty of death is here assigned for cursing a parent, as in Exod. xxi. 17. In both places Targ. Ps-Jon. gives the traditional interpretation that when the sacred Name is mentioned in connexion with the cursing, the penalty of death is incurred. The words 'his (their) blood shall be upon him (them)' occur in this ch. and in Ezek. xviii. 13, xxxiii. 5; cp. Josh. ii. 19; Ezek. xxxiii. 4.

10—21. Directions on the whole similar to those of xviii. 6—20, 22, 23, but adding penalties for transgression.

uncovered the fountain of her blood: and both of them shall be cut off from among their people. And thou shalt not 19
uncover the nakedness of thy mother's sister, nor of thy father's sister: for he hath made naked his near kin: they shall bear their iniquity. And if a man shall lie with his 20
uncle's wife, he hath uncovered his uncle's nakedness: they shall bear their sin; they shall die childless. And if a man 21
shall take his brother's wife, it is impurity: he hath uncovered his brother's nakedness; they shall be childless.

Ye shall therefore keep all my statutes, and all my 22
judgements, and do them: that the land, whither I bring you to dwell therein, vomit you not out. And ye shall not 23
walk in the customs of the nation, which I cast out before you: for they did all these things, and therefore I abhorred them. But I have said unto you, Ye shall inherit their 24
land, and I will give it unto you to possess it, a land flowing with milk and honey: I am the LORD your God, which have separated you from the peoples. Ye shall therefore separate 25
between the clean beast and the unclean, and between the unclean fowl and the clean: and ye shall not make your souls abominable by beast, or by fowl, or by any thing wherewith the ground [1]teemeth, which I have separated from you as unclean. And ye shall be holy unto me: for 26
I the LORD am holy, and have separated you from the peoples, that ye should be mine.

A man also or a woman that hath a familiar spirit, or 27

[1] Heb. *creepeth*.

22—26. An exhortation fundamentally in agreement with xviii. 24—30.

The idea of a separation from other nations is prominent in connexion with that of holiness.

25. The injunction that careful discrimination must be employed in the matter of clean and unclean food must, as Wellh. (*Composition d. Hex.* etc., p. 158, Berlin, 1889) and others point out, in its original context have been accompanied by detailed directions such as now are found in ch. xi.

Vv. 25, 26 in their present form are to be compared with xi. 43—45. See note there.

27. See on xix. 31. This supplementary precept is not identical with the earlier one. Here the subject is the person within whom the

that is a wizard shall surely be put to death: they shall stone them with stones: their blood shall be upon them.

discarnate spirit is supposed to be working (lit. 'when there is in them an *'ôb* or a familiar spirit'), while in *v.* 6 it is the person who makes application to such for assistance.

Chs. XXI. 1.—XXII. 33. Regulations concerning Priests and Offerings.

The general legislation, addressed to the people as a whole in the preceding part of H, is now followed by directions as to the standard of holiness to be maintained by the priests, and the nature of sacrificial offerings. While the peculiar tone of the Holiness section is maintained throughout, the amount of stress laid upon the hortatory element is not so great as in the earlier chs. of the section. Moreover, the revision of these two chs. by R^P is evident. While the unusual expressions, 'the seed of Aaron'[1] (xxi. 21, cp. 17), and 'he that is the high priest among his brethren' (xxi. 10), may well belong to the legislation embodied originally by R^P, the stereotyped phraseology of P occurs in superscriptions and subscriptions, such as 'the sons of Aaron' (xxi. 1, cp. 24, xxii. 2, 18). Again, in the superscription to xxi. 1—15, Moses is bidden to address the priests, while in the remainder of that passage (except *v.* 8, where see note) they are spoken of in the 3rd person. On the other hand, the peculiar expression 'bread of [their] God' (xxi. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22, xxii. 25), and the refrain, 'I am the Lord which sanctify (hallow)' (xxi. 8, 15, 23, xxii. 9, 16, 32) indicate H, as does the conclusion (xxii. 31—33; cp. xviii. 26—30, xix. 37, xx. 22—26). Other expressions which are thought to indicate the influence of the Priestly Code, as being favourites with P (though they are by no means wholly confined to that source), are 'throughout (their) generations' (xxi. 17, xxii. 3), 'veil' (*pārōkheth*, xxi. 23), 'stranger' (*zār*, xxii. 10, 12), 'purchase' (*ḳinyān*, xxii. 11), 'to accomplish' (*i'pallē*, xxii. 21), 'a foreigner' (*ben nēchār*, xxii. 25).

The two chs. may be sub-divided under the following five heads:

(1) Restrictions of a ceremonial and domestic character, binding upon (*a*) xxi. 1—9, priests in general; (*b*) *vv.* 10—15, the high priest;

(2) *vv.* 16—24, bodily disqualifications for those exercising the priestly office;

(3) xxii. 1—16, membership of a priest's family and ceremonial purity as indispensable for those who share in sacrificial food;

(4) *vv.* 17—25, blemishes that are to be avoided in animals offered in sacrifice;

(5) *vv.* 26—30, three directions of a special character with regard to sacrifices. To this is added (*vv.* 31—33) a concluding exhortation.

[1] But probably this expression was originally '*seed of the priests*' (so Wellh. and Dr.), itself an unusual phrase, but one which would not involve the view that R^H considered the priests to be limited to the family of Aaron, as did P.

21 And the LORD said unto Moses, Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron, and say unto them, There shall none
2 defile himself for the dead among his people; except for his kin, that is near unto him, for his mother, and for his father, and for his son, and for his daughter, and for his
3 brother; and for his sister a virgin, that is near unto him, which hath had no husband, for her may he defile himself.
4 He shall not defile himself, [1]*being* a chief man among his

[1] Or, as *a husband* The Sept. has, *on a sudden.*

1. *Speak unto the priests the sons of Aaron*] A quite unusual formula, not occurring elsewhere in the Pentateuch.

defile himself for the dead] The defilement caused by touching a dead body lasted for seven days, and required purification by the water in which the ashes of the red heifer have been mixed, Num. xix. 11—20 (P).

The Romans (Serv. *ad Aen.* vi. 176) used to set up a branch of cypress in front of a house containing a dead body, lest one of the pontifices should inadvertently enter and so contract pollution.

2. The defilement prohibited in *v.* 1 is allowed for certain near relations.

3. The same six cases are enumerated in Ezek. xliv. 25. The non-mention of a wife is not easily accounted for. Was it that this exception would be self-evident? This seems probable from Ezek. xxiv. 15 ff., which appears from its prohibition to assume that a priest would mourn for his wife.

that is near unto him] that is not yet, as the following words shew, transferred by marriage to another family.

4. being *a chief man*] **as a husband** (R.V. mg.). This rendering limits the cases in which defilement is permissible to those already mentioned, and forbids mourning for a wife. The A.V. follows the Targum.

The wording of the *v.* suggests a corruption in the text. The Sept. substitute (see R.V. mg.) for 'a chief man' is apparently obtained by a transposition in Heb. consonants, but fails to convey any clear meaning. It has been suggested, by a somewhat greater modification in the Heb., to read *in mourning*. Baentsch (*HG.* 111A) considers that the words 'defile himself' and 'among his people' shew that the *v.* forms an intimate part of the prohibition contained in the previous *vv.* Inasmuch, then, as the word rendered 'chief man' is regularly used of a husband, and as mention of a wife is strangely absent from the MT., he proposes either of two alternative readings, which assume a copyist's accidental omission of a word or words, expressing wife; so that the precept originally ran, a husband shall not be defiled for his wife. It is, however, difficult, as Dillm. says, to suppose, in the face of

5 people, to profane himself. They shall not make baldness
upon their head, neither shall they shave off the corner of
6 their beard, nor make any cuttings in their flesh. They
shall be holy unto their God, and not profane the name of
their God: for the offerings of the LORD made by fire, the
bread of their God, they do offer: therefore they shall be
7 holy. They shall not take a woman that is a harlot, or
[1]profane; neither shall they take a woman put away from
8 her husband: for he is holy unto his God. Thou shalt
sanctify him therefore; for he offereth the bread of thy God:
he shall be holy unto thee: for I the LORD, which sanctify
9 you, am holy. And the daughter of any priest, if she
profane herself by playing the harlot, she profaneth her
father: she shall be burnt with fire.
10 And he that is the high priest among his brethren, upon
whose head the anointing oil is poured, and [2]that is con-
secrated to put on the garments, shall not let the hair of

[1] Or, *polluted* [2] Heb. *whose hand is filled.*

the opening words of *v.* 2, that a priest whose wife died was forbidden to approach the body.

5. See on xix. 27, 28.

6. The reason is given for the restriction in *v.* 1, viz. that the name of God, whose ministers they are, may not be polluted by ceremonial uncleanness.

the offerings of the LORD made by fire] This expression, or its equivalent, is very frequent in P. The words are probably an insertion from that source here, and so in *v.* 21, xxii. 22, 27, xxiii. 13, 18.

the bread of their God] See iii. 11, 16.

7. *profane*] guilty of immorality.

8. This *v.* has all the air of an insertion. It interrupts the transition from the character of the priest's wife to that of his daughter; and 'thou' is harsh. Who is addressed? It may be an insertion (so *Oxf. Hex.*) by the compiler from an older code to enforce the sanctity of the priesthood.

the bread of thy God] See on *v.* 6.

9. For the form of punishment, cp. xx. 14.

10—15. *Corresponding regulations, but of a somewhat stricter character, for the high priest.*

10. The reference to the anointing and vesting may be taken from P, in which source it now appears in Exod. xxix. 5 ff.

that is consecrated] See R.V. mg. and note on viii. 33.

his head go loose, nor rend his clothes; neither shall he go 11
in to any dead body, nor defile himself for his father, or for
his mother; neither shall he go out of the sanctuary, nor 12
profane the sanctuary of his God; for the [1]crown of the
anointing oil of his God is upon him: I am the LORD.
And he shall take a wife in her virginity. A widow, or one 13, 14
divorced, or a [2]profane woman, an harlot, these shall he
not take: but a virgin of his own people shall he take to
wife. And he shall not profane his seed among his people: 15
for I am the LORD which sanctify him.

[1] Or, *consecration* [2] Or, *polluted*

shall not let the hair of his head go loose] so as to preserve a seemly appearance in contrast to that of the leper. See on x. 6. A.V. wrongly, 'shall not uncover his head.'

nor rend his clothes] as was the custom in sign of mourning (2 Sam. i. 11; iii. 31, etc.).

11. *for his father, or for his mother*] i.e. not even in such cases, where filial affection would otherwise prescribe it.

12. *go out*, etc.] lest, on returning to the sanctuary, he should pollute it. The words seem to imply that the sanctuary was his usual abode. Cp. 1 Sam. i. 9; iii. 2. But they may only mean that he was not to go out during the ceremonial.

crown] R.V. mg. *consecration*. The former is the literal rendering, but the mg. gives the sense here. The oil was the symbol of his office, marking him out as a crowned one among his brethren. The original word is used elsewhere in the special sense of the consecration of a Nazirite (Num. vi. 7, etc.).

14. *A widow*] The rule for the high priest was thus stricter than that for an ordinary priest. The Jewish writer Rashi, in his commentary on the Talmudic treatise *Chagigah* (13*a*, Tal. Bab.), mentions this as one of the instances of apparent discrepancies between Ezekiel (xliv. 22) and the Law (see Ryle, *Canon*, 203). Ezekiel (*loc. cit.*) allowed a priest to marry a widow, provided she was the widow of a priest, whereas, according to the Law here, a high priest might not marry a widow. Ezekiel's rule is, however, for *priests*. He does not say anything about the high priest. According to the law here, he must marry a virgin. As regards the rule for the ordinary priest, while *v.* 7 does not *say* that he may marry a priest's widow, *v.* 14 may perhaps be taken to imply this.

of his own people] of the people of Israel, according to Ezekiel (*loc. cit.*), but the traditional practice was to marry a priest's daughter, cp. Luke i. 5.

15. His posterity would become unholy, if they were not sprung from a mother who was worthy of marriage union with the high priest.

16 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto
17 Aaron, saying, Whosoever he be of thy seed throughout
their generations that hath a blemish, let him not approach
18 to offer the bread of his God. For whatsoever man he be
that hath a blemish, he shall not approach: a blind man,
or a lame, or he that hath a [1]flat nose, or any thing
19 superfluous, or a man that is brokenfooted, or brokenhanded,
20 or crookbackt, or a dwarf, or that hath a blemish in his eye,
21 or is scurvy, or scabbed, or hath his stones broken; no man
of the seed of Aaron the priest, that hath a blemish, shall
come nigh to offer the offerings of the LORD made by fire:
he hath a blemish; he shall not come nigh to offer the
22 bread of his God. He shall eat the bread of his God, both
23 of the most holy, and of the holy. Only he shall not go in
unto the veil, nor come nigh unto the altar, because he hath
a blemish; that he profane not my sanctuaries: for I am

[1] Or, *slit*

The later Jews were very scrupulous as to the descent of those whom it was lawful for a priest to marry.

16—24. *Physical disqualifications for a priest.*

17. *throughout their generations*] See end of introd. note to ch.
the bread of his God] See on *v.* 6.

18. *a flat nose*] **slit**, as R.V. mg., rather than 'flat.' The Heb. word does not occur elsewhere in O.T. But the cognate root in Arabic, having the sense *perforate, pierce*, admits of the sense of perforation of the lip, or the lobe of the ear, as well as a slit in the partition between the nostrils.

any thing superfluous] The rendering of the EVV is too vague. The Heb. root denotes extension, and is applied to an extended (i.e. abnormally long) limb or other member, in this case of a man, in its only other occurrence (xxii. 23) of a beast. The LXX. ὠτότμητος, *having the ear split*, following the Aram. rendering *mutilated*, is wrong.

20. *a dwarf*] lit. thin, hence shrunk, withered.
a blemish] lit. a confusion, obscurity.

21. *the bread of his God*] And so in *v.* 22. See on *v.* 6.

22. *both of the most holy, and of the holy*] This distinction is not recognised elsewhere. In xxii. 1—16, where there is ample opportunity for the distinction, the offerings are spoken of in general terms as holy things. It is therefore probably the insertion of a later reviser.

23. *my sanctuaries*] The plural may have reference to the sacred building and its surroundings, as in Jer. li. 51.

the LORD which sanctify them. So Moses spake unto Aaron, 24
and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto 22 a
Aaron and to his sons, that they separate themselves from
the holy things of the children of Israel, which they hallow
unto me, and that they profane not my holy name: I am
the LORD. Say unto them, Whosoever he be of all your 3
seed throughout your generations, that approacheth unto
the holy things, which the children of Israel hallow unto
the LORD, having his uncleanness upon him, that soul shall
be cut off from before me: I am the LORD. What man 4
soever of the seed of Aaron is a leper, or hath an issue;
he shall not eat of the holy things, until he be clean. And
whoso toucheth [1]any thing that is unclean by the dead, or a
man whose seed goeth from him; or whosoever toucheth 5
any creeping thing, whereby he may be made unclean, or
a man of whom he may take uncleanness, whatsoever un-
cleanness he hath; the soul which toucheth any such shall 6
be unclean until the even, and shall not eat of the holy
things, unless he bathe his flesh in water. And when the 7
sun is down, he shall be clean; and afterward he shall eat
of the holy things, because it is his bread. That which dieth 8
of itself, or is torn of beasts, he shall not eat to defile himself
therewith: I am the LORD. They shall therefore keep my 9
charge, lest they bear sin for it, and die therein, if they
profane it: I am the LORD which sanctify them. There 10

[1] Or, *any one*

CH. XXII. 1—16. *Ceremonial purity and membership of a priestly family are indispensable for those who share in the sacrificial feast.*

The whole or part of *vv.* 1, 2 may be looked upon as the introductory formula by R[P].

2. *separate*] not of course in the full sense of the word. What is meant is that whenever they are in a condition of ceremonial impurity they must be careful not to come into contact with holy things.

3. *your seed*] For this expression, and 'seed of Aaron,' in *v.* 4, see introd. note on chs. xxi., xxii.

your generations] See latter part of the same note.

4—7 may be compared with xxi. 11—15.

8. Cp. xvii. 15.

shall no stranger eat of the holy thing: a sojourner of the priest's, or an hired servant, shall not eat of the holy thing.
11 But if a priest buy any soul, the purchase of his money, he shall eat of it; and such as are born in his house, they shall
12 eat of his bread. And if a priest's daughter be married unto a stranger, she shall not eat of the heave offering of the holy
13 things. But if a priest's daughter be a widow, or divorced, and have no child, and is returned unto her father's house, as in her youth, she shall eat of her father's bread: but there
14 shall no stranger eat thereof. And if a man eat of the holy thing unwittingly, then he shall put the fifth part thereof
15 unto it, and shall give unto the priest the holy thing. And they shall not profane the holy things of the children of
16 Israel, which they offer unto the LORD; and *so* cause them to bear the iniquity that bringeth guilt, when they eat their holy things: for I am the LORD which sanctify them.
17 18 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto Aaron, and to his sons, and unto all the children of Israel, and say unto them, Whosoever he be of the house of

10—16 describe those to whom, outside the priestly body, permission to eat of the holy things may be extended.

10. The 'sojourner,' and the hired servant, were not considered as members of the family; not so the cases mentioned in *v.* 11.

12. *a stranger*] i.e. not a priest. By her marriage she has become a member of a non-priestly family, and thus her rights have lapsed. Cp. xxi. 3.

13. *and have no child*] The children are debarred, as having had a non-priestly father, and the mother shares their disability.

14. *unwittingly*] Cp. iv. 2. We are reminded by the directions here ('the fifth part' to be added) of ch. v. 14—16; but the case there is quite different. It had to do with unintentionally keeping back from the LORD His dues. Here the man has unwittingly eaten of consecrated food, although not belonging to those who, in accordance with the preceding regulations, were privileged in that respect. The penalty in the former case was naturally a heavier one, viz. a Guilt-Offering.

16. *to bear the iniquity that bringeth guilt*] The expression is unique.

17—25. *Directions as to the quality of offerings.*

This passage retains clear signs of a remarkably composite character. *Vv.* 17, 18*a* indicate ('unto Aaron, and to his sons,' 'unto all etc.') that what follows is a blending of directions referring to priests and to the

Israel, or of the strangers in Israel, that offereth his oblation,
whether it be any of their vows, or any of their freewill
offerings, which they offer unto the LORD for a burnt offering;
that ye may be accepted, *ye shall offer* a male without 19
blemish, of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats. But 20
whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer: for it
shall not be acceptable for you. And whosoever offereth 21
a sacrifice of peace offerings unto the LORD to [1]accomplish
a vow, or for a freewill offering, of the herd or of the flock,
it shall be perfect to be accepted; there shall be no blemish
therein. Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having [2]a wen, or 22
scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto the LORD,
nor make an offering by fire of them upon the altar unto
the LORD. Either a bullock or a lamb that hath any thing 23
superfluous or lacking in his parts, that mayest thou offer
for a freewill offering; but for a vow it shall not be accepted.

[1] Or, *make a special vow* [2] Or, *sores*

people. But further, *v.* 21 presents what is virtually a repetition of the directions in *vv.* 18—20, while the differences in phraseology between the two point to diversity of origin. We notice further that the classes of offerings dealt with differ, viz. Burnt-Offerings and Peace-Offerings respectively, while each of these have the same sub-divisions, i.e. Vows and Freewill-Offerings, the former passage making no reference to other classes of Burnt-Offerings, such as the Sin-Offerings and Guilt-Offerings (iv., v.), and the latter ignoring the third species, viz. Thank-Offering (see *v.* 29), included (vii. 12) under the genus Peace-Offering. Moreover, within the parallelism (*vv.* 18—20 as compared with *v.* 21) there are marked differences in phraseology (e.g. 'of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats,' *v.* 19, 'of the herd or of the flock,' *v.* 21). For other differences see *Oxf. Hex.*, which further points out the frequent changes in number and person in 18*a*—20 as indicating successive editorial revisions.

22. The definitions of what constitutes a blemish may be compared with those of xxi. 18 ff. 'Broken' here is from the same root as that so rendered in xxi. 19; 'maimed' is lit. *cut*, *mutilated*; 'a wen' means a running sore, or ulcer.

23. *but for a vow*] The three varieties included under the name Peace-Offering were, as has been noticed (see on vii. 11), (*a*) Thank-Offerings (here mentioned as a separate item in *v.* 29, (*b*) Votive-Offerings, and (*c*) Freewill-Offerings. The first (see W. P. Paterson, *HDB*, Art. *Sacrifice*, p. 338) was offered in acknowledgment of benefits received, the second and third were combined with prayer for blessings hoped for. These two differed thus, that the Freewill-Offering was

24 That which hath its stones bruised, or crushed, or broken,
or cut, ye shall not offer unto the LORD; neither shall ye
25 [1]do *thus* in your land. Neither from the hand of a
foreigner shall ye offer the bread of your God of any of
these; because their corruption is in them, there is a blemish
in them: they shall not be accepted for you.
26 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, When a bullock,
27 or a sheep, or a goat, is brought forth, then it shall be seven
days under the dam; and from the eighth day and thence-
forth it shall be accepted for the oblation of an offering
28 made by fire unto the LORD. And whether it be cow or
ewe, ye shall not kill it and her young both in one day.
29 And when ye sacrifice a sacrifice of thanksgiving unto the
30 LORD, ye shall sacrifice it that ye may be accepted. On
the same day it shall be eaten; ye shall leave none of it

[1] Or, *sacrifice* them

simply in support of the prayer, and was made in anticipation of the benefit asked. The vow was promised on fulfilment of the prayer, and thus, unlike the Freewill-Offering, need not be offered if the prayer remained unfulfilled. According to this *v.*, gratitude for the answer was to be indicated by the greater stringency of the regulation as to the nature of the animal to be offered in acknowledgment of the mercy vouchsafed.

For the general prohibition to offer a sacrifice that had a blemish, cp. the rebuke in Mal. i. 8, 13.

24. A reference to emasculation. Animals thus treated were forbidden to be offered.

25. The case apparently is that of a foreigner who desires to offer sacrifice, and is forbidden to present an animal with a blemish. So Dillm. It is much less probable that the prohibition is directed against an Israelite buying blemished animals from a foreigner for a sacrificial purpose.

the bread of your God] See on *v.* 6.

26—30. *Three further directions of a special character with regard to sacrifices.*

27. For the regulation cp. Exod. xxii. 30 [Heb. 29].

28. Cp. Deut. xxii. 6.

29. A sacrifice of thanksgiving, co-ordinated here with the other two species classified elsewhere under Peace-Offering. See on *v.* 23.

30. See vii. 15.

until the morning: I am the LORD. Therefore shall ye keep 31
my commandments, and do them: I am the LORD. And 32
ye shall not profane my holy name; but I will be hallowed
among the children of Israel: I am the LORD which hallow
you, that brought you out of the land of Egypt, to be your 33
God: I am the LORD.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the 23 2
children of Israel, and say unto them, The [1]set feasts of
the LORD, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations,
even these are my set feasts. Six days shall work be done: 3

[1] Or, *appointed seasons*

31—33. *Concluding exhortation* (characteristic of **H**).

CH. XXIII. A CALENDAR, ENUMERATING SACRED DAYS AND SEASONS.

This ch. and the next shew more of the influence of P than any earlier part of the 'Law of Holiness.' In fact, P is the source of more than half the verses in xxiii. In analysing the contents, we find a collection of independent laws introduced severally by special formulae (*vv.* 2, 4, 9, 23, 33). We also find two threads running through the ch., which are not difficult to separate. The one, drawn from H as its source (*vv.* 9—20, 22, 39*b*, 40—43), contemplates sacred seasons in their relation to land and to agriculture. In the view of H, the three set feasts mentioned as 'the morrow after the sabbath' (of *Maẓẓoth*, i.e. of unleavened bread), the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Booths, have for their purpose the celebration of three stages in nature's yield of the produce of the earth, viz. the first sheaf cut, the end of the barley and wheat harvest, and the completion of the vintage gathering. In presenting this point of view H agrees with JE (Ex. xxiii. 15, 16, xxxiv. 18, 22) and Deut. (xvi. 1, 9, 13). On the other hand, the element drawn from P (*vv.* 1—8, 21, 23—38, 39*a*, 39*c*, 44) is in full harmony with the title (*vv.* 2, 4), and regards these seasons as 'holy convocations,' and times for religious observances, in accordance with its fundamental aim, viz. to set forth Mosaic legislation. It apparently therefore fixes them without reference to their character as nature's festivals. Moreover, P forbids work (*vv.* 3, 7, 8, 21, 25, 28, 35), and prescribes in several instances an offering made by fire (*vv.* 8, 18, 27, 30 f., 36 f.). The compilation was thus made by an editor (RP) who had both H and P before him, and fitted together excerpts from each, with a certain amount of harmonizing, as elsewhere.

2, 3. If we pass from 'say unto them' (*v.* 2) to 'These are,' etc. (*v.* 4), we perceive that the intermediate words have the air of an

but on the seventh day is a sabbath of solemn rest, an holy convocation; ye shall do no manner of work: it is a sabbath unto the LORD in all your dwellings.

4 These are the set feasts of the LORD, even holy convocations, which ye shall proclaim in their appointed season.
5 In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month [1] at
6 even, is the LORD'S passover. And on the fifteenth day of

[1] Heb. *between the two evenings.*

insertion by a reviser, writing in the spirit of P, and desiring to attain completeness by including the weekly sabbath with its 'holy convocation.' This inference is supported by the form of the subscription, where (*v.* 38) the words, 'Beside the sabbaths of the LORD,' etc., have somewhat the air of an addition to the summarized description of the feasts (*v.* 38) which have been enumerated.

an holy convocation] i.e. an assembly called together at the sanctuary for religious purposes. They were summoned (cp. *v.* 24) according to Num. x. 2 (where 'calling' is in the original identical with the word here rendered 'convocation') by blowing of trumpets, cp. the Mohammedan custom, by which the *muezzin* summons the faithful to prayer from the top of a mosque. The expression found here occurs outside this ch. only in Exod. xii. 16, and in the directions for the observance of festival days in Num. xxviii. 18, 25 f., xxix. 1, 7, 12 (all P).

Feasts of the Passover and Unleavened Bread (5—8).

The law in detail is set forth Exod. xii., and is accordingly here assumed as known, and only the chief regulations are mentioned.

5. *the first month*] corresponding to the latter part of March with the former part of April. Here, as elsewhere, P denotes the months by numbers only, whereas JE and Deut. give them the names by which they were known in Canaan or Phoenicia, in this case Abib (Exod. xiii. 4, xxiii. 15, xxxiv. 18; Deut. xvi. 1), while in Neh. ii. 1; Esth. iii. 7 it is called by its Babylonian name Nisan. See further in Driver (*C.B.*), Exod. xii. 2.

on the fourteenth day of the month at even] The Jewish day commencing at sunset, the Passover lamb was to be *killed* before sunset on the day which both by their reckoning and ours was the 14th, and eaten on what *we* should call the night between the fourteenth and fifteenth days.

passover] The etymological meaning of the Heb. word *pesaḥ* is obscure. See Driver, *Exod.* p. 408 for the various conjectures. The LXX. (πάσχα, *Pascha*, whence the adjective *paschal*) and so the N.T. (e.g. Matt. xxvi. 17) transliterate it. Our word is taken from the explanation in Exod. xii. 13 which refers it to the sparing of the Israelitish houses on the occasion of the slaying of the Egyptians' firstborn.

the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the LORD: seven days ye shall eat unleavened bread. In the 7
first day ye shall have an holy convocation: ye shall do no
[1]servile work. But ye shall offer an offering made by fire 8
unto the LORD seven days: in the seventh day is an holy
convocation; ye shall do no servile work.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the 9, 10
children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come
into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the
harvest thereof, then ye shall bring the sheaf of the firstfruits
of your harvest unto the priest: and he shall wave the 11
sheaf before the LORD, to be accepted for you: on the
morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it. And in 12
the day when ye wave the sheaf, ye shall offer a he-lamb
without blemish of the first year for a burnt offering unto
the LORD. And the meal offering thereof shall be two tenth 13

[1] Heb. *work of labour.*

6. *unleavened bread*] For details, see Exod. xii. 15 ff.

7. *servile work*] The expression (see R.V. mg. and introd. note to ch.) is used in reference to the three great festivals and that of the New Year, and implies a less strict abstinence from labour than was demanded by the corresponding rule for the sabbath (*v.* 3) and the Day of Atonement (*v.* 28). In the former case it was probably only work of an agricultural kind that was forbidden.

8. *an offering made by fire*] The details of this offering are given in Num. xxviii. 2 ff.

9—14. *An offering of firstfruits* (H).

11. The ritual here set forth has no parallel elsewhere in the Pentateuch. Deut. xxvi. 2 prescribes that 'the first of all the fruit of the ground' shall be offered, but gives no direction as to any particular day. In Deut. xvi. 9, 10 the nature of the offering is left undetermined, and the date is seven weeks 'from the time thou beginnest to put the sickle to the standing corn.'

shall wave] See Appendix IV, pp. 183 ff.

the morrow after the sabbath] For this vague expression see introd. note to ch. Driver (*LOT*.[9] p. 55 note) says that it is understood traditionally of the 1st day of *Maẓẓoth* (unleavened bread); but this is an unusual sense of 'sabbath.' He considers it probable that in its original connexion the 'sabbath' meant here was the ordinary weekly sabbath which fell during the seven days of *Maẓẓoth*.

parts *of an ephah* of fine flour mingled with oil, an offering made by fire unto the LORD for a sweet savour: and the drink offering thereof shall be of wine, the fourth part of an
14 hin. And ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn, nor fresh ears until this selfsame day, until ye have brought the oblation of your God: it is a statute for ever throughout your generations in all your dwellings.
15 And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave
16 offering; seven sabbaths shall there be complete: even unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath shall ye number fifty days; and ye shall offer a new meal offering unto the LORD.
17 Ye shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves of two tenth parts *of an ephah*: they shall be of fine flour, they shall be baken with leaven, for firstfruits unto the LORD.
18 And ye shall present with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young bullock, and two rams: they shall be a burnt offering unto the LORD, with their meal offering, and their drink offerings, even an offering
19 made by fire, of a sweet savour unto the LORD. And ye shall offer one he-goat for a sin offering, and two he-lambs
20 of the first year for a sacrifice of peace offerings. And the priest shall wave them with the bread of the firstfruits for a wave offering before the LORD, with the two lambs: they
21 shall be holy to the LORD for the priest. And ye shall

13. of an ephah] approximately a bushel. The word does not appear in MT., the sense of the context supplying it.

an hin] Approximately 1½ gallons.

14. For 'parched corn' and 'fresh ears,' see on ii. 14—16.

15—22. The Feast of Weeks (mainly H). Cp. Exod. xxxiv. 22; Deut. xvi. 10.

The name is taken from the seven weeks, which, as the average duration of harvest time, separated this feast from that of unleavened bread.

15. *the morrow after the sabbath*] See on *v.* 11.

17. *wave loaves*] See Appendix IV, pp. 183 ff.

tenth parts] A.V. 'tenth deals,' and so in *v.* 13. With the exception of these *vv.* the expression is peculiar to P, denoting the measure of fine flour used in a Meal-Offering. For the word 'deals' see on xiv. 10.

21. This *v.*, unlike the rest of the section, has the characteristics of the Priestly Code. See above.

make proclamation on the selfsame day: there shall be an holy convocation unto you: ye shall do no servile work: it is a statute for ever in all your dwellings throughout your generations.

And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt 22
not wholly reap the corners of thy field, neither shalt thou gather the gleaning of thy harvest: thou shalt leave them for the poor, and for the stranger: I am the LORD your God.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto 23 24
the children of Israel, saying, In the seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall be a solemn rest unto you, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation. Ye 25
shall do no servile work: and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Howbeit on 26 27
the tenth day of this seventh month is the day of atonement: it shall be an holy convocation unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls; and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD. And ye shall do no manner of work in that 28
same day: for it is a day of atonement, to make atonement for you before the LORD your God. For whatsoever soul 29

22. *And when...harvest*] Probably inserted here from xix. 9 (also H), with which it is verbally identical.

23—36. Three festivals, the Blowing of Trumpets, the Day of Atonement, the Feast of Tabernacles (P).

23—25. This has been called the Festival of the New Year. It is probable that the first day of the 7th month was associated with the reckoning of the commencement of a year (see further on xxv. 9). There was evidently more than one mode of dating. In fact the Mishna (Tal. Bab. *Rôsh Hashânâh*, fol. 2*a*) gives four several months according to the purpose intended in each case. The old Hebrew year began in the autumn, as the Jewish civil year does now, while the Babylonian calendar made it commence in Nisan or March. If we consider the festival in the text to be a celebration of the New Year, it will be a survival of the old mode of reckoning. In Exod. xii. 2 P makes the year commence in spring, though this dating does not necessarily imply a Babylonian influence. Indications of a spring commencement in the times of the monarchy are found in 2 Sam. xi. 1; 1 Kgs xx. 22, 26; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 10, as referring to the time when kings go forth to war. See further *HDB.* Art. *Time* (I. Abrahams).

24. *blowing of trumpets*] See on Ps. xcviii. 3.

26—32. The Day of Atonement (P). See on ch. xvi.

it be that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be
30 cut off from his people. And whatsoever soul it be that
doeth any manner of work in that same day, that soul will
31 I destroy from among his people. Ye shall do no manner
of work: it is a statute for ever throughout your generations
32 in all your dwellings. It shall be unto you a sabbath of
solemn rest, and ye shall afflict your souls: in the ninth day
of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye keep your
sabbath.

33 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the
34 children of Israel, saying, On the fifteenth day of this
seventh month is the feast of [1]tabernacles for seven days
35 unto the LORD. On the first day shall be an holy convoca-
36 tion: ye shall do no servile work. Seven days ye shall offer
an offering made by fire unto the LORD: on the eighth day
shall be an holy convocation unto you; and ye shall offer
an offering made by fire unto the LORD: it is a [2]solemn
assembly; ye shall do no servile work.

37 These are the set feasts of the LORD, which ye shall

[1] Heb. *booths.* [2] Or, *closing festival*

32. *from even unto even*] i.e. from sunset to sunset, according to the Jewish mode of reckoning the day.

33—36. The Feast of Tabernacles (P). Cp. Num. xxix. 7—11; Deut. xvi. 13—15; Ezra iii. 4. Deut. xxxi. 10 f. directs that in the sabbatical year the Law should be publicly read at this Feast, the carrying out of which regulation is recorded in Neh. viii. 18.

36. *a solemn assembly*] R.V. mg. *closing festival.* The Heb. word (*'ăṣéreth*) does not in itself involve the idea of solemnity. It is used of the closing day of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Deut. xvi. 8), and (as here) in Num. xxix. 35 (P); Neh. viii. 18, of the extra day following the seven days of the Feast of Booths, which became 'the great day of the feast' (John vii. 37). According to 2 Chr. vii. 9 (though not recognised in the parallel, 1 Kgs viii. 66), it formed a joyful celebration in thankfulness for the completion of the dedication of Solomon's Temple.

37, 38. *Subscription to the whole* (see on *vv.* 2—4).

We may note that in the summary given in these *vv.* there is no mention of the Sin-Offering prescribed in Num. xxviii. 15, 22, 30, xxix. 5, &c.

proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the LORD, a burnt offering, and a meal offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, each on its own day: beside 38
the sabbaths of the LORD, and beside your gifts, and beside all your vows, and beside all your freewill offerings, which ye give unto the LORD.

Howbeit on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, 39
when ye have gathered in the fruits of the land, ye shall keep the feast of the LORD seven days: on the first day shall be a solemn rest, and on the eighth day shall be a solemn rest. And ye shall take you on the first day the 40
fruit of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook; and ye shall rejoice before the LORD your God seven days. And ye shall keep 41
it a feast unto the LORD seven days in the year: it is a statute for ever in your generations: ye shall keep it in the seventh month. Ye shall dwell in booths seven days; all 42
that are homeborn in Israel shall dwell in booths: that 43
your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt: I am the LORD your God. And Moses 44
declared unto the children of Israel the set feasts of the LORD.

38. *beside the sabbaths of the* LORD] See on *vv.* 2, 3.

39—43. *An Appendix, dealing with the Feast of Booths* (mainly H).

39. See introd. notes.

40. *fruit of goodly trees*] i.e. fruit of goodly (ornamental, beautiful) trees, or goodly tree fruit (so Dillm.).

boughs of thick trees] According to Onkelos, myrtle branches, but the expression may have a more general signification. It has been doubted whether this various material was to be used for the construction of the booths, or for the purpose of making a *lūlāb* or festal bouquet. Among the later Jews the *lūlāb* (Jos. *Ant.* iii. 10. 4) consisted of a myrtle, willow, and palm branch, and an *ethrōg* (orange or citron) carried in the hands. In Nehemiah's time (Neh. viii. 15) there is found no more than a general agreement with the text here as to materials. See further in Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 13. 5, and the Mishna *Sukkah* iii. 1 ff.

44. Conclusion supplied by P.

24 2 And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Command the children of Israel, that they bring unto thee pure olive oil beaten for the light, [1] to cause a lamp to burn continually.
3 Without the veil of the testimony, in the tent of meeting, shall Aaron order it from evening to morning before the

[1] Or, *to set up a lamp continually*

CH. XXIV. 1—23. REGULATIONS, CEREMONIAL AND MORAL (H and P).

The separation of materials derived from different sources in this ch. is fairly simple. P, as in ch. xxiii., takes a prominent place. *Vv.* 1—9 clearly belong to the Priestly Code. Their tone is that of P throughout, and the passage contains various words characteristic of that source, e.g. *v.* 5 *'esrōnīm*, the tenth part (of an ephah, occurring in H only in xxiii. 17), *v.* 9 most holy, lit. holiness of holinesses. *Vv.* 10—14, 23 owe their present form to P. To mark, as is here done, the connexion between laws and the actual events of life is, as Dillm. remarks, quite in P's manner (cp. x. 16 ff.; Num. ix. 6 ff., xv. 32—36), while *vv.* 15—22 unmistakably have their origin in H, while showing indications of modification from the later source. See on *vv.* 16, 22.

It is not easy to account for the combination with one another of the subjects in this ch. and at least as difficult to suggest a reason for their incorporation at this point in the Law of Holiness. The conjecture might be hazarded that *vv.* 1—9 follow on the sacrificial duties of the priesthood as set forth in ch. xxiii. in order to add an account of the *continuous* service demanded of them from day to day. But, then, should we not have expected as well the regulation concerning the daily Burnt-Offering (Exod. xxix. 38 ff.) and Incense-Offering (Exod. xxx. 7 ff.)? Or the connexion may be the application of the results of the ingathering and harvest (such as corn and olives), dealt with in ch. xxiii., to the purposes here mentioned. It may be, however, that there has been at some stage a shifting in position of the material of the ch. such as cannot now be traced. The contents may be thus sub-divided:

(1) *vv.* 1—4, the care of the Tabernacle lamps; (2) *vv.* 5—9, the ordering of the shewbread; (3) *vv.* 10—23, the incident of the blasphemer, and laws arising out of, or suggested by, that circumstance.

1—3. These *vv.* agree almost *verbatim* with Exod. xxvii. 20 f. The care of the lamps is also enjoined in Exod. xxv. 31 ff.; cp. xxxvii. 17 ff.

2. *beaten*] i.e. skimmed off the liquid obtained by pounding the olives in a mortar and then straining the pulp.

3. *the testimony*] the attestation, affirmation of God's will, which was contained on the Tables of Stone, within the Holy of Holies.

tent of meeting] See p. 1 and Driver (*C.B.*) on Exod. xxvii. 21.

Aaron] The LXX. have 'Aaron and his sons,' as in the parallel in Exod.

LORD continually: it shall be a statute for ever throughout your generations. He shall order the lamps upon the pure 4
candlestick before the LORD continually.

And thou shalt take fine flour, and bake twelve cakes 5
thereof: two tenth parts *of an ephah* shall be in one cake.
And thou shalt set them in [1]two rows, six on a row, upon 6
the pure table before the LORD. And thou shalt put pure 7
frankincense upon each [2]row, that it may be to the bread

[1] Or, *two piles, six in a pile* [2] Or, *pile*

4. The *v.* 'has somewhat the air of a later addition to make the directions quite plain' (*Oxf. Hex.*). For 'continually' the LXX. have 'until the morning.'

5—9. *The ordering of the shewbread.*

Cp. Exod. xxv. 30, xxxvii. 10 ff.; Num. iv. 7. The 'twelve cakes' are not here given this name. For its origin and for parallels to the custom in other religions, see Driver, Exod. xxv. 30, and *HDB. s.v.* The undoubtedly correct rendering is **presence-bread** (lit. bread of the countenance [of God]), as in R.V. mg. there, i.e. bread which was placed as an offering in the presence of the LORD. Cp. the expression used of this bread in the story of 1 Sam. xxi. 6 [MT. 7], 'taken from before [from the presence of] the LORD.' The LXX. mostly render by ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως, *loaves of the setting forth* (or, *before* [*God*]).

5. *twelve cakes*] Though probably alluding in the Jewish ritual to the number of the tribes, the original reference in the corresponding Babylonian rite was doubtless to the signs of the zodiac. See Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss d. Babylon. Religion*, p. 94, for a Babylonian parallel.

cakes] most probably unleavened (Jos. *Ant.* iii. 6. 6). They were of flour, the fineness of which was secured by sifting eleven times (*Menahoth*, 76 *b*). In the time of the Chronicler (1 Chr. ix. 32) this was done by the Levitical guild called 'the sons of the Kohathites.' The cakes in the early times of the Jewish monarchy were placed hot upon the table (see 1 Sam. above). The rite in its form is probably a survival from a pre-Mosaic stage of Hebrew religion.

6. *rows...row*] rather, as R.V. mg., *piles*. So the word 'shewbread' should be rendered *pile-bread* in 1 Chr. ix. 32, xxiii. 29; Neh. x. 33.

the pure table] i.e. overlaid with pure gold (Exod. xxv. 24). For a reproduction of the familiar likeness of it as depicted on the Arch of Titus in the Roman Forum, see Driver (*C.B.*) on Exod. at p. 272, or *HDB.* Art. *Music*, iii. 462.

7. *frankincense*] The LXX. add 'and salt,' apparently in view of

for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the LORD.
8 Every sabbath day he shall set it in order before the LORD
continually; it is [1]on the behalf of the children of Israel,
9 an everlasting covenant. And it shall be for Aaron and his
sons; and they shall eat it in a holy place: for it is most
holy unto him of the offerings of the LORD made by fire by
a perpetual statute.

10 And the son of an Israelitish woman, whose father was
an Egyptian, went out among the children of Israel: and
the son of the Israelitish woman and a man of Israel strove
11 together in the camp; and the son of the Israelitish woman
blasphemed the Name, and cursed: and they brought him
unto Moses. And his mother's name was Shelomith, the
12 daughter of Dibri, of the tribe of Dan. And they put him

[1] Or, *from*

the rule in ii. 13. According to a tradition preserved by Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 10. 7) the frankincense was not poured on the bread, but placed beside it in two golden bowls.

an offering made by fire] The frankincense was burnt on the altar of Burnt-Offering. See Jos. *Ant. l.c.*

9. *they shall eat it*] The Tal. Bab. (*Sukkah* 56 *a*) says that half was eaten by the outgoing and half by the incoming division of priests.

10—23. Incident of the blasphemer, and laws arising out of that occurrence or suggested by it.

This section closely resembles Num. xv. 32—36, which relates the punishment of the man found gathering sticks on the sabbath day. The blasphemer was only half Israelite; according to Deut. xxiii. 8 children of the Edomites and the Egyptians were admitted into the congregation in the third generation, but after the Return alliances with Egyptians and other 'strange' nations were prohibited (Ezra ix., x.; Neh. xiii.) on the ground that from such mixed marriages harmful results to the Jewish faith might be anticipated.

11. *blasphemed the Name*] The Heb. verb denotes 'to indicate by name' either honourably or with reproach. In the latter sense it is used in Num. xxiii. 8; Prov. xi. 26, etc., and obviously must be so interpreted here. But the Jews, taking the word in its more general sense, understood the passage as forbidding the mention of the Sacred Name, and wherever it occurs in the Scriptures they either pronounced it Adōnai instead (rendered in English by 'the LORD'), or, where the word Adōnai was itself in immediate juxtaposition with the Sacred Name, they substituted for the latter Elōhīm.

in ward, that it might be declared unto them at the mouth of the LORD.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Bring forth him 13, 14
that hath cursed without the camp; and let all that heard him lay their hands upon his head, and let all the congregation stone him. And thou shalt speak unto the children of 15
Israel, saying, Whosoever curseth his God shall bear his sin. And he that blasphemeth the name of the LORD, he 16
shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall certainly stone him: as well the stranger, as the homeborn, when he blasphemeth the name *of the* LORD, shall be put to death. And he that smiteth any man mortally shall surely 17
be put to death; and he that smiteth a beast mortally shall 18
make it good: life for life. And if a man cause a blemish 19
in his neighbour; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth: as he hath 20
caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be rendered unto him. And he that killeth a beast shall make it good: and he that 21

12. *that it might be declared unto them at the mouth of the* LORD] more exact than the A.V. 'that the mind of the LORD might be shewn them.'

14. *let all that heard him lay their hands upon his head*] Cp. the inclusion of the witnesses in the account of the stoning of St Stephen (Acts vii. 58).

16. *all...stone him*] probably to be attributed to P or R^P, as the original word for 'congregation' is not found elsewhere in H.

The occurrence just related having brought about the enactment of a law dealing with the particular case of blasphemy, an occasion is thus offered for adding penalties for other transgressions. For the death penalty as prescribed in this *v.* for smiting a man mortally, cp. Exod. xxi. 12—14.

18. There is no exact parallel for this direction in Exod. xxi.—xxiii. Exod. xxi. 33, 34 is dealing with a different case.

19. Cp. Exod. xxi. 23—25. The *lex talionis* or law of retaliation bulks largely in the Code of Hammurabi (*op. cit.*), e.g. in the case of human life, §§ 116, 210, 219, 229; of tooth for tooth, § 200; of eye for eye, § 196; and so of ox for ox, §§ 245, 263; of sheep for sheep, § 263; and of goods for goods, § 232. Cp. the *Koran*, *Sura*, 2. 173 ff.

21. A repetition, introduced apparently in order to emphasize the direction to exercise no discrimination (*v.* 22) between 'the stranger' and the 'homeborn.' P repeatedly urges this matter. Cp. Exod. xii. 49; Lev. xvi. 29, xvii. 15, etc.

22 killeth a man shall be put to death. Ye shall have one manner of law, as well for the stranger, as for the homeborn:
23 for I am the LORD your God. And Moses spake to the children of Israel, and they brought forth him that had cursed out of the camp, and stoned him with stones. And the children of Israel did as the LORD commanded Moses.

CH. XXV. 1—55. THE SABBATICAL YEAR. THE YEAR OF JUBILE, ETC. (H and P).

This ch. contains (*a*) legislation with respect to (1) the sabbatical year, and (2) the year of Jubile; and (*b*) sundry applications of the law of Jubile to land and individuals, devised in order to relieve the impoverished Israelite. It would have been placed appropriately after ch. xxiii. The holy seasons here described form a suitable appendix to the list of days to be observed in each year that are contained in the earlier ch.

After seven periods of seven years have passed, each closing with its sabbatical year, the following, viz. the fiftieth, is to be hallowed. Every man shall return to his own possession and to his own family. The land shall not be sold in perpetuity. Only the value of its yield till the next Jubile can at any time be sold. Houses in walled cities are exempt from this law. The connexion between the people and the land is permanent.

This ch. is not one in which it is easy clearly to indicate the parts to be assigned to H and P respectively. The literary analysis, in the absence of historical details relating to the year of Jubile, must remain in a great measure uncertain.

In fact, from the nature of the matters which are here dealt with we conclude that in all probability the present form of the ch. is the result of much editing. That use has been made of the Priestly Code is clear from the occurrence of many words which are favourites with P, e.g. (*v.* 9) 'atonement' (*kippūrīm*), (*v.* 10 and *passim*) 'possession' (*'ăhuzzah*), (*v.* 6 and *passim*) 'stranger' (*tōshāb*), and such expressions as (*v.* 30) 'throughout his generations,' (*vv.* 41, 54) 'he and his children with him,' (*v.* 46) 'your children after you.' Moreover, the legal relations connected with buying, selling, redemption, etc. are akin to that code. On the other hand, that an enactment relating to the sabbatical year dates from much earlier times than P is shewn by its occurrence in the legislation of Exod. xxiii. 10 f. (E).

That some such compulsory relinquishing and resumption of land in private ownership at fixed periods were not unknown, at any rate among other nations, is clear from the analogous customs described by Sir H. Maine, *Village Communities in the East and West*, pp. 77—99, 107—113, etc., and by J. Fenton, *Early Hebrew Life*, pp. 24—26, 29—32, and specially 64—70. The underlying principle seems to have been that lands belonging to a village are to be recognised as belonging to

And the LORD spake unto Moses in mount Sinai, saying, 25
Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, 2
When ye come into the land which I give you, then shall

the inhabitants collectively, and are only to be held by any individual temporarily and then to be restored to the use of the community in general. It may well, however, be doubted whether the Hebrew law of Jubile was ever in actual force. The picture of oppression so graphically drawn by the prophets (Is. iii. 15; Am. ii. 7 f., v. 11) makes it difficult to suppose that while they severely condemn the rich men who 'grind the faces of the poor,' they would not refer to this law, if it existed.

The contents of the ch. may be thus subdivided:

(1) *vv.* 2—7, the sabbatical year; (2) *vv.* 8—17, 23, the year of Jubile (*vv.* 18--22 are an insertion, see note there); (3) *vv.* 24—34, redemption of land and of Levites' houses; (4) *vv.* 35—38, prohibition of usury in the case of a poor Israelite; (5) *vv.* 39—46, prohibition of permanent servitude of one Israelite to another; (6) *vv.* 47—55, Israelites who are slaves of resident foreigners to be redeemed.

1—7. The rest year was a transference to the *land* of the sabbatical idea emphasized each week for *living creatures*, the year being now taken as the unit instead of the day. See App. I, pp. 172 f. for the difference in standpoint between this and the parallel ordinances elsewhere in the Hexateuch, as indicating modifications of the same law in successive periods.

The seventh year is to bear the same relation to the six preceding years as the sabbath to the six preceding days of the week. The parallel between the land and the bondman was close. The divinely appointed seventh day of rest is to be kept holy by abstaining from work, so the land shall keep every seventh year holy to the Lord by resting from all work. It cannot be wholly inactive, but nothing is to be done which will cause the land to put forth its full strength. By a curtailment of the full powers bestowed upon man and land by their Creator both were to keep holy a season to the Lord. In Exod. xxiii. 10, 11 the fallow year is regarded as a provision for the poor and part of the animal creation, while the religious idea underlies the injunctions of the passage in Leviticus.

In pre-exilic times the law seems to have been, at any rate to a large extent, disregarded (see ch. xxvi. 35, 43; 2 Chr. xxxvi. 21).

It is true that the custom of letting land lie fallow prevails in so many countries and can be traced back so far that it is certain that the Hebrews must have observed something of the kind from the time of their being settled. If the fallow time were different for different fields there would be nothing to call for special note, and it is not surprising that no reference is found to the practice in the historical Books. But a fixed fallow year for all the land would cause an interruption of social life of which some traces would be found in the history.

3 the land keep a sabbath unto the LORD. Six years thou
shalt sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vine-
4 yard, and gather in the fruits thereof; but in the seventh year
shall be a sabbath of solemn rest for the land, a sabbath
unto the LORD: thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune
5 thy vineyard. That which groweth of itself of thy harvest
thou shalt not reap, and the grapes of thy undressed vine thou
shalt not gather: it shall be a year of solemn rest for the
6 land. And the sabbath of the land shall be for food for you;
for thee, and for thy servant and for thy maid, and for thy
hired servant and for thy stranger that sojourn with thee;
7 and for thy cattle, and for the beasts that are in thy land,
shall all the increase thereof be for food.
8 And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto
thee, seven times seven years; and there shall be unto thee

Later on, in Nehemiah's time (Neh. x. 31), the people bound themselves to carry out the Law. According to Josephus (*Ant.* xi. 8. 6) both Jews and Samaritans observed it in the time of Alexander the Great, and so later in the days of the Hasmonean dynasty (1 Macc. vi. 49, 53; *Ant.* xiii. 8. 1) and the Herods (*ib.* xiv. 16. 2). Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 4), however, attributes the Jews' observance of it to laziness.

The sabbatical year concluded with the Feast of Tabernacles (Deut. xxxi. 10), and the old reckoning, by which the year began in autumn, not in spring (see on xxiii. 23—25), was necessarily applied in this case. The year's circle of agricultural operations naturally would begin as soon as harvest and vine-gathering were finished. Had it begun in the first month (after the sowing of spring time) the harvests of both sixth and seventh years would have been lost.

2. *keep a sabbath unto the* LORD] The land shall rest in the seventh year, as man rests on the seventh day, the sabbath. This idea is not expressed in Exod. xxiii. 10 f., but may be implied there in the command immediately following with reference to the sabbath in *v.* 12.

5. *undressed*] untrimmed by lopping and hence consecrated. The Heb. word is the same as that denoting the Nazirite, who in token of his consecration wore his hair uncut (Num. vi. 5).

6. *the sabbath*] i.e. the produce during the year of rest. Instead of storing it as in each of the six years, they were only to gather it from time to time when needed for food. Much of the grain in Palestine to-day sows itself, as it falls from the ripe ears.

8—17. The 50th year or year of Jubile. In each such year landed property shall revert to its original owner, and the price to be paid in buying and selling such possessions shall be estimated in accordance with the distance of the transaction from that year.

the days of seven sabbaths of years, even forty and nine years. Then shalt thou send abroad the loud trumpet on 9
the tenth day of the seventh month; in the day of atonement shall ye send abroad the trumpet throughout all your
land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim 10
liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof:
it shall be a jubile unto you; and ye shall return every man
unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his
family. A jubile shall that fiftieth year be unto you: ye 11
shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it,
nor gather *the grapes* in it of the undressed vines. For it is 12
a jubile; it shall be holy unto you: ye shall eat the increase
thereof out of the field. In this year of jubile ye shall 13
return every man unto his possession. And if thou sell 14
aught unto thy neighbour, or buy of thy neighbour's hand,
ye shall not wrong one another: according to the number 15

9. The year of Jubile began on the tenth of the seventh month and was proclaimed by the sound of the trumpet. The coincidence of this ceremony with the Day of Atonement presents a difficulty to some commentators, but according to Ezek. xl. 1 the tenth day of the month is sometimes reckoned as the first day of the year. Others would regard the words 'in the day of atonement' as a later insertion. Dillmann sees nothing incongruous in the trumpet sound on the Day of Atonement, and considers the reconciliation of that day as an appropriate beginning of a year in which each one acquired his liberty. Restoration to God's favour was the preliminary to entering upon his possession. Another explanation of the text is that the trumpet sound was a note of preparation six months before the actual commencement of the Jubile in the spring—but the ceremony seems intended to usher in the actual year, and was coincident with the proclamation of liberty.

10. *a jubile*] lit. 'a ram's horn' (blowing). Doubtless the year had originally the name *year of the ram's horn*, and afterwards the first part of this title was dropped in current speech, thus leaving the Heb. word *yōbēl*, which, through the Vulg. Jubilaeus, has been adopted into English as jubile.

13. See introd. note.

14. *thou...ye*] The variation in person indicates the combination of two sources.

thy neighbour] An unusual Heb. word (*'āmīth*), occurring in the H section eleven times, v. 21 (*bis*), xviii. 20, xix. 11, 15, 17, xxiv. 19, xxv. 14 (*bis*), 15. 17; only once outside Lev., in Zech. xiii. 7.

15, 16. The purchase is in fact not of the soil, but of the expectation of a greater or less number of years' fruits.

of years after the jubile thou shalt buy of thy neighbour,
and according unto the number of years of the crops he
16 shall sell unto thee. According to the multitude of the
years thou shalt increase the price thereof, and according to
the fewness of the years thou shalt diminish the price of it;
17 for the number of the crops doth he sell unto thee. And
ye shall not wrong one another; but thou shalt fear thy
18 God: for I am the LORD your God. Wherefore ye shall do
my statutes, and keep my judgements and do them; and
19 ye shall dwell in the land in safety. And the land shall
yield her fruit, and ye shall eat your fill, and dwell therein
20 in safety. And if ye shall say, What shall we eat the seventh
year? behold, we shall not sow, nor gather in our increase:
21 then I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth
22 year, and it shall bring forth fruit for the three years. And
ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old
store; until the ninth year, until her fruits come in, ye shall
23 eat the old store. And the land shall not be sold in
perpetuity; for the land is mine: for ye are strangers and

17. Summary, together with the guiding motive characteristic of H.

18—22. A hortatory addition, relating to the sabbatical year and interrupting the Jubile regulations. It is thus clearly out of place, and should properly follow *v.* 7. Its tone is that of H, and is in accord with such hortatory passages as xviii. 25 ff., xx. 22 f., xxvi. 3 ff. It may be conjectured that the redactor's reason for placing it here out of its proper context was to indicate that it applies to the regulations for the Jubile as well as the sabbatical year.

The mention of the ninth year (*v.* 22), combined with the words 'three years' (*v.* 21), seems to point to the view (see introd. note to ch.) that the Jubile year was really the 50th, not the 49th, and that thus the land on such occasions was to have two years (the seventh and eighth) of rest. On the other hand, *v.* 20 has 'the seventh year' (not the seventh and eighth), and *v.* 22 'ye shall sow the eighth year' (not the ninth). It is probable that the redactor, with the object mentioned above, introduced into *v.* 22 mention of the *ninth* year. So Dillm. who further makes the 'three years,' originally meaning the sixth, seventh, and eighth (i.e. the produce of the sixth year was to last abnormally till the harvest time of that sowed in the earlier part of the eighth instead of the seventh year) to have been taken by the redactor to mean seventh, eighth, and ninth, so as to fall in with his view that the Jubile followed, instead of coinciding with, the last year of the cycle of seven sabbatical years.

23. A resumption of the Jubile regulation (after the interruption of

sojourners with me. And in all the land of your possession 24
ye shall grant a redemption for the land.

If thy brother be waxen poor, and sell some of his 25
possession, then shall his kinsman that is next unto him
come, and shall redeem that which his brother hath sold.
And if a man have no one to redeem it, and he be waxen 26
rich and find sufficient to redeem it; then let him count the 27
years of the sale thereof, and restore the overplus unto the
man to whom he sold it; and he shall return unto his
possession. But if he be not able to get it back for himself, 28
then that which he hath sold shall remain in the hand of
him that hath bought it until the year of jubile: and in the
jubile it shall go out, and he shall return unto his possession.

And if a man sell a dwelling house in a walled city, then 29
he may redeem it within a whole year after it is sold; for a
full year shall he have the right of redemption. And if it 30
be not redeemed within the space of a full year, then the
house that is in the walled city shall be made sure in per-
petuity to him that bought it, throughout his generations:
it shall not go out in the jubile. But the houses of the 31

vv. 18—22) providing that the land was not to be alienated beyond the next Jubile.

24—28. *Law in respect to the redemption of land* (H and P mixed).

25. *be waxen poor*] The original verb is almost confined to this ch., the one exception being xxvii. 8 ('be poorer').

his kinsman that is next unto him] Cp. the more explicit statement in *vv.* 48 f. For the important term *Gō'ēl*, here rendered 'kinsman,' lit. *vindicator*, cp. Jer. xxxii. 8 ff.; Ruth iv. 1 ff., and Art. *Goel* in *HDB.*

27. *the overplus*] i.e. a proportion of the original price obtained, corresponding to the number of years which were still to intervene between the redemption and the next Jubile year.

29—34. *Law in respect to the redemption of houses* (P).

Houses in a walled town, if sold, and not redeemed within a year, were (with the exception of those belonging to the Levites) to be unaffected by the Jubile, and remain the permanent possession of the buyer, but for houses elsewhere there was no restriction as to the time within which they might be redeemed, and in any case the Jubile law was to be in force.

villages which have no wall round about them shall be reckoned with the fields of the country: they may be
32 redeemed, and they shall go out in the jubile. Nevertheless the cities of the Levites, the houses of the cities of their
33 possession, may the Levites redeem at any time. And if [1]one of the Levites [2]redeem, then the house that was sold, and the city of his possession, shall go out in the jubile: for the houses of the cities of the Levites are their possession
34 among the children of Israel. But the field of the [3]suburbs of their cities may not be sold; for it is their perpetual possession.
35 And if thy brother be waxen poor, and his hand fail with

[1] Or, *a man redeem from the Levites* [2] Or, after the Vulgate, *redeem not* [3] Or, *pasture lands*

33. *if one of the Levites redeem*] The Heb. presents great difficulty as it stands. If we take the rendering in the text, it is unsuitable, because in the case there supposed, viz. that one Levite redeems the house of another, obviously the statement that the house shall 'go out' (i.e. return to its original owner) in the Jubile adds nothing to the law as to Levites, set forth in *v.* 32. But if we take R.V. mg. (so LXX.), *if a man redeem from the Levites*, this purchase on the part of a non-Levite had no connexion with the Jubile law, as not being the purchasing back of a possession on the part of one of the family of the original owner. It seems best therefore to suppose that the 'not' which the Vulg. supplies (see R.V. mg.) has dropped out of the original text. The sense will then be, If one of the Levites does not redeem, then the house which he has sold will at any rate return into his possession at the Jubile.

and the city of his possession] The expression is a somewhat awkward one. The intention seems to be to provide that this rule shall operate only as regards houses within the cities set apart for the Levites (Num. xxxv. 2; Jos. xxi. 2—40), and not elsewhere.

34. The law concerning houses in Levitical cities is not to apply to land outside the walls.

suburbs] rather, as R.V. mg., *pasture lands*, probably referring to common land belonging to the inhabitants of the adjacent city. The original word seems from its derivation to mean lit. land on to which cattle were *driven*.

35—38. *Prohibition of usury in the case of a poor Israelite* (H with perhaps a slight admixture of P).

35. *be waxen poor*] See on *v.* 25.

his hand fail with thee] i.e. if he lose his power of self-support by personal effort, and thou art able as a neighbour to help him.

thee; then thou shalt [1]uphold him: *as* a stranger and a
sojourner shall he live with thee. Take thou no usury of 36
him or increase; but fear thy God: that thy brother may
live with thee. Thou shalt not give him thy money upon 37
usury, nor give him thy victuals for increase. I am the 38
LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land of
Egypt, to give you the land of Canaan, to be your God.

And if thy brother be waxen poor with thee, and sell 39
himself unto thee; thou shalt not make him to serve as a
bondservant: as an hired servant, and as a sojourner, he 40
shall be with thee; he shall serve with thee unto the year of
jubile: then shall he go out from thee, he and his children 41
with him, and shall return unto his own family, and unto
the possession of his fathers shall he return. For they are 42

[1] Or, *relieve*

uphold] The text gives the literal sense of the Heb. verb, and the mg., *relieve*, its application in this context.

as *a stranger and a sojourner shall he live with thee*] The Heb. rather connects the first words of the clause with that which precedes, and so Dillm. and Driver (with the LXX.) suppose that the two substantives are a later insertion here under the influence of *vv.* 23, 47.

36. *usury...increase*] The former was interest on money, the latter on food stuffs and paid in kind. For the important part played by such transactions in Babylonia see Johns, *Bab. and Assyr. Laws*, ch. xxiii., p. 253.

37. No interest was to be permitted in such a case for money lent, nor, if the loan took the form of the necessaries of life, was more than the amount lent to be exacted in return. The same law appears in Exod. xxii. 25 [Heb. 24]; Deut. xxiii. 20. In the latter case it is from 'a stranger' interest may be demanded.

39—46. *Prohibition of permanent servitude of one Israelite to another* (H and P mixed, the former probably preponderating).

This case was to be subject to the operation of the law of Jubile. Moreover, the Israelite so bought shall not be compelled to work as a slave, but only under such conditions as befit a sojourner or hired servant. *V.* 42 adds the reason (cp. *vv.* 23, 55). On the other hand slaves bought from persons of other nations, or from foreigners sojourning in the land, were to be bondservants in the strictest sense of the word. For the differences between the law on these subjects and that in Exod. xxi. 2 ff.; Deut. xv. 12—18, see *ICC Deut.*; p. 185, and *Intr. to Lent.* p. 123.

my servants, which I brought forth out of the land of Egypt:
43 they shall not be sold as bondmen. Thou shalt not rule over
44 him with rigour; but shalt fear thy God. And as for thy bondmen, and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have; of the nations that are round about you, of them shall ye
45 buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they have begotten in your land: and they shall be your posses-
46 sion. And ye shall make them an inheritance for your children after you, to hold for a possession; of them shall ye take your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigour.

47 And if a stranger or sojourner with thee be waxen rich, and thy brother be waxen poor beside him, and sell himself unto the stranger *or* sojourner with thee, or to the stock
48 of the stranger's family: after that he is sold he may be
49 redeemed; one of his brethren may redeem him: or his uncle, or his uncle's son, may redeem him, or any that is nigh of kin unto him of his family may redeem him; or if
50 he be waxen rich, he may redeem himself. And he shall reckon with him that bought him from the year that he sold himself to him unto the year of jubile: and the price of his sale shall be according unto the number of years; according
51 to the time of an hired servant shall he be with him. If there be yet many years, according unto them he shall give back the price of his redemption out of the money that he
52 was bought for. And if there remain but few years unto the year of jubile, then he shall reckon with him; according unto his years shall he give back the price of his redemption.

47—55. *The case of Israelites who are slaves of resident foreigners* (H but with a large admixture of P).

Such a person might be redeemed, or, if he acquired the means, might redeem himself, the price of redemption to be calculated according to the number of years intervening before the Jubile, as in the case of the redemption of land (*v.* 27). In any case the bondage was limited by the law of the Jubile.

48, 49. Cp. *v.* 25.

As a servant hired year by year shall he be with him: he 53
shall not rule with rigour over him in thy sight. And if he 54
be not redeemed [1]by these *means*, then he shall go out in the
year of jubile, he, and his children with him. For unto me 55
the children of Israel are servants; they are my servants
whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt: I am the
LORD your God.

Ye shall make you no idols, neither shall ye rear you 26
up a graven image, or [2]a pillar, neither shall ye place

[1] Or, *in these* years [2] Or, *an obelisk*

53. *in thy sight*] whenever thou art cognizant of it.
55. Cp. *vv.* 23, 42.

CH. XXVI. 1—46. A CONCLUDING EXHORTATION, EMBODYING PROMISES AND WARNINGS (H, except 1, 2, 46 RP).

This ch., closing as it does the collection called the 'Law of Holiness' (xvii.—xxvi.), bears all the characteristics of H, and is evidently the work of the compiler of that document. Accordingly it views the land and agriculture as fundamentally connected with religious observances (cp. chs. xix., xxiii., xxv.). Its one command (apart from *vv.* 1, 2, see below) is to let the land lie fallow in the seventh year (*v.* 34). It begins and ends with characteristic expressions of the 'Law of Holiness,' 'If ye walk in my statutes' (*v.* 3), 'I am the LORD' (*v.* 45). For an examination of the remarkable amount of coincidences in language between this ch. and Ezekiel see *Intr. to Pent.* (p. 240), and for discussion of the dates of the two see App. III, pp. 177 ff. in this volume.

The ch. may be analysed as follows:

(1) *vv.* 1, 2, idolatry forbidden, and the sabbath to be observed; (2) *vv.* 3—45, concluding exhortation; (3) *v.* 46, conclusion.

When we compare this ch. with the similar exhortations and warnings in Exod. xxiii. 20 ff.; Deut. xxviii., it will seem probable that such was the recognised method of concluding a collection of laws prepared for promulgation.

1, 2. These two *vv.* contain only repetitions of the precepts already given (xix. 3, 4, 30); in fact, the direction to observe the sabbath appears here for the third time. The redactor of H attached great importance to these *vv.*, and accordingly closed his legislation with them. Their position, however, at the commencement of this ch. is unsuitable and may be owing to accident. Still their importance, as corresponding to the first four Commandments, may account for their insertion.

1. *a pillar*] *maṣṣēbâh*, an upright stone, frequently mentioned in connexion with local worship. See for illustrations of those discovered at Gezer, Driver's *Schweich Lectures*, p. 63.

any figured stone in your land, to bow down [1]unto it: for
2 I am the LORD your God. Ye shall keep my sabbaths,
and reverence my sanctuary: I am the LORD.
3 If ye walk in my statutes, and keep my commandments,
4 and do them; then I will give your rains in their season,
and the land shall yield her increase, and the trees of the
5 field shall yield their fruit. And your threshing shall reach
unto the vintage, and the vintage shall reach unto the
sowing time: and ye shall eat your bread to the full, and
6 dwell in your land safely. And I will give peace in the
land, and ye shall lie down, and none shall make you
afraid: and I will cause evil beasts to cease out of the land,
7 neither shall the sword go through your land. And ye shall
chase your enemies, and they shall fall before you by the
8 sword. And five of you shall chase an hundred, and an
hundred of you shall chase ten thousand: and your enemies
9 shall fall before you by the sword. And I will have respect
unto you, and make you fruitful, and multiply you; and
10 will establish my covenant with you. And ye shall eat old
store long kept, and ye shall bring forth the old [2]because of
11 the new. And I will set my tabernacle among you: and

[1] Or, *thereon* [2] Or, *from before*

any figured stone] i.e. with some idolatrous representation carved on it.

3—13. *The blessing that shall follow upon obedience.*
(Cp. Deut. xxviii. 1—11.)

5. Such shall be the abundant yield of cereals and wine that the ingathering will be continuous from the commencement of harvest till the time arrives for sowing the next crop. Cp. Am. ix. 13.

6. *none shall make you afraid*] a familiar expression in the prophetical books (Is. xvii. 2; Mic. iv. 4; Nah. ii. 11), found also in Job (xi. 19, etc.).

9. *will establish*] rather, **will carry out.** The Heb. expression means, to fulfil the promises of an older covenant. Cp. Gen. xxvi. 3, 'I will establish [to Isaac] the oath which I sware unto Abraham'; Deut. ix. 5, to 'establish the word which the LORD sware unto thy fathers.' So Jer. xxxiv. 18 of the inhabitants of Jerusalem who did not carry out the words of the covenant which they had made.

10. *because of the new*] better as mg. *from before the new.* The meaning is that the yield shall be so great that what has been gathered

my soul shall not abhor you. And I will walk among you, 12
and will be your God, and ye shall be my people. I am 13
the LORD your God, which brought you forth out of the land
of Egypt, that ye should not be their bondmen; and I have
broken the bars of your yoke, and made you go upright.

But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all 14
these commandments; and if ye shall reject my statutes, 15
and if your soul abhor my judgements, so that ye will not
do all my commandments, but break my covenant; I also 16
will do this unto you; I will appoint terror over you, even
consumption and fever, that shall consume the eyes, and
make the soul to pine away: and ye shall sow your seed in
vain, for your enemies shall eat it. And I will set my face 17
against you, and ye shall be smitten before your enemies:
they that hate you shall rule over you; and ye shall flee
when none pursueth you. And if ye will not yet for these 18
things hearken unto me, then I will chastise you seven times
more for your sins. And I will break the pride of your 19
power; and I will make your heaven as iron, and your earth
as brass: and your strength shall be spent in vain: for your 20
land shall not yield her increase, neither shall the trees of
the land yield their fruit. And if ye walk contrary unto me, 21

in an earlier year must be carried out of the storehouses or barns to make way for the fresh produce.

12. *I will walk among you*] Cp. Gen. iii. 8.

13. *the bars*] with which the yoke was fastened to the animal's neck.

14—39. *The penalties that shall ensue, if Israel prove disobedient.* (Cp. Deut. xxviii. 15 ff.)

They are arranged in five groups, viz. (*a*) 16—18, (*b*) 19, 20, (*c*) 21, 22, (*d*) 23—26, (*e*) 27—39, overthrow and exile of the nation.

16. *terror*] i.e. terrible things, viz. those that follow.

the soul] your life.

17. *ye shall flee when none pursueth you*] Cp. *v.* 36; Prov. xxviii. 1; also Ps. liii. 5.

19. *the pride of your power*] the pride with which ye rely upon your prosperity and the fruitfulness of your land. The expression is found elsewhere only in Ezekiel, where in vii. 24 LXX., xxiv. 21, xxxiii. 28 it refers to the fall of the nation and the destruction of Jerusalem; in xxx. 6, 18, the phrase is applied to Egypt.

and will not hearken unto me; I will bring seven times
22 more plagues upon you according to your sins. And I will
send the beast of the field among you, which shall rob you
of your children, and destroy your cattle, and make you
few in number; and your ways shall become desolate.
23 And if by these things ye will not be reformed [1]unto me,
24 but will walk contrary unto me; then will I also walk con-
trary unto you; and I will smite you, even I, seven times
25 for your sins. And I will bring a sword upon you, that shall
execute the vengeance of the covenant; and ye shall be
gathered together within your cities: and I will send the
pestilence among you; and ye shall be delivered into the
26 hand of the enemy. When I break your staff of bread, ten
women shall bake your bread in one oven, and they shall
deliver your bread again by weight: and ye shall eat, and
not be satisfied.
27 And if ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk
28 contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto you in
fury; and I also will chastise you seven times for your sins.
29 And ye shall eat the flesh of your sons, and the flesh of
30 your daughters shall ye eat. And I will destroy your high

[1] Or, *by*

21. *plagues*] See on xiii. 1.

22. *the beast of the field*] savage animals. Cp. 2 Kgs xvii. 25.

23. *be reformed unto*] rather, *be disciplined by*. See mg.

25. *execute the vengeance of the covenant*] exact retribution from you for disregarding My covenant with you.

ye shall be gathered together within your cities] for shelter. Cp. Jer. iv. 5, xxxv. 11.

26. *your staff of bread*] the bread which sustains life. For the expression see Ps. cv. 16; Ezek. iv. 16, v. 16, xiv. 13, and cp. Is. iii. 1. The rest of the *v.* means that the amount available for baking, and therefore the frequency with which the oven is used, will be so limited that one oven will be sufficient to serve ten families. Moreover, instead of the bread being brought home from the oven in such an abundant quantity that there is no need of weighing it, as there is obviously enough for all comers, it will then be needful to weigh it with the utmost precision, that the scanty supply may be measured out carefully to each, lest any should get more than their share.

29. Cp. Deut. xxviii. 53; Jer. xix. 9, and, for the fulfilment of the prophet's words, Lam. iv. 10.

30. *high places*] places on which the Israelites anciently practised

places, and cut down your sun-images, and cast your carcases upon the carcases of your idols; and my soul shall abhor you. And I will make your cities a waste, and will bring 31 your sanctuaries unto desolation, and I will not smell the savour of your sweet odours. And I will bring the land 32 into desolation: and your enemies which dwell therein shall be astonished at it. And you will I scatter among the 33 nations, and I will draw out the sword after you: and your land shall be a desolation, and your cities shall be a waste. Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth 34 desolate, and ye be in your enemies' land; even then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths. As long as it lieth 35 desolate it shall have rest; even the rest which it had not in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it. And as for them 36 that are left of you, I will send a faintness into their heart in the lands of their enemies: and the sound of a driven leaf shall chase them; and they shall flee, as one fleeth from the sword; and they shall fall when none pursueth. And 37 they shall stumble one upon another, as it were before the

their worship, and often carried on idolatrous rites in connexion with it. They at first used hills or mountains, and afterwards mounds or platforms. Such idolatrous high places were destroyed by Josiah (2 Kgs xxiii. 5—20), but the worship of Jehovah on them (1 Kgs xxii. 43; 2 Kgs xv. 35) continued till the Exile.

sun-images] rather, **sun-pillars**, probably emblems of a Phoenician deity, Baal-Ḥammān, 'Lord of the sun's heat.' See Skinner (*C.B.*) on Is. xvii. 8.

idols] The Heb. word is a favourite one with Ezekiel (vi. 5, etc.). It is a term of contempt, probably meaning blocks, shapeless things.

31. *I will not smell*, etc.] Cp. Is. i. 11 ff.; Am. v. 21 f.

32. *shall be astonished*] Cp. Jer. xviii. 16, xix. 8.

33. *will draw out the sword*] For this expression, as implying the hot pursuit of fugitives, see Ezek. v. 2, 12, xii. 14.

34. *Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths*] The verb *rāṣāh* has for its general meaning in Kal. 'to accept,' 'to be satisfied with,' and so 'to enjoy,' the land being regarded as having been long deprived of its rights, which are now restored. Accordingly the Hiph. (as the causative voice), occurring only in 34 *b*, may perhaps mean 'cause [God] to accept' her sabbaths, and so virtually 'pay back' those which had been disregarded and were due to God. The same verb is rendered 'accept' in *vv.* 41, 43. See on *v.* 41.

36. *the sound of a driven leaf*] Cp. *v.* 17; Prov. xxviii. 1.

sword, when none pursueth: and ye shall have no power to
38 stand before your enemies. And ye shall perish among the
nations, and the land of your enemies shall eat you up.
39 And they that are left of you shall pine away in their
iniquity in your enemies' lands; and also in the iniquities
40 of their fathers shall they pine away with them. And they
shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers,
in their trespass which they trespassed against me, and also
41 that because they have walked contrary unto me, I also
walked contrary unto them, and brought them into the land
of their enemies: if then their uncircumcised heart be
humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their
42 iniquity; then will I remember my covenant with Jacob;
and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with
Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land.
43 The land also shall be left of them, and shall enjoy her
sabbaths, while she lieth desolate without them; and they
shall accept of the punishment of their iniquity: because,
even because they rejected my judgements, and their soul
44 abhorred my statutes. And yet for all that, when they be
in the land of their enemies, I will not reject them, neither
will I abhor them, to destroy them utterly, and to break my
45 covenant with them: for I am the LORD their God: but
I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their
ancestors, whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt
in the sight of the nations, that I might be their God: I am
the LORD.
46 These are the statutes and judgements and laws, which

39. *in the iniquities of their fathers*] in the guilt to which their fathers have contributed.

with them] meaning either, as they have done, or, as holding fast by their fathers' iniquities.

40—45. *Repentance shall bring restoration.*

41. *accept of*] acknowledge that the punishment was deserved and has had its remedial effect.

43, 44. These *vv.* have rather the air of a later insertion.

46. *the statutes and judgements and laws*] This wording shews that the *v.* forms the conclusion not merely of this ch. but of the whole 'Law of Holiness' (xvii.—xxvi.).

the LORD made between him and the children of Israel in mount Sinai by the hand of Moses.

And the LORD spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the 27 2
children of Israel, and say unto them, When a man shall
[1]accomplish a vow, [2]the persons shall be for the LORD by
thy estimation. And thy estimation shall be of the male 3
from twenty years old even unto sixty years old, even thy
estimation shall be fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel
of the sanctuary. And if it be a female, then thy estimation 4

[1] Or, *make a special vow* [2] Or, *according to thy estimation of persons unto the* LORD, *then thy estimation &c.*

CH. XXVII. 1—34. COMMUTATION OF VOWS AND TITHES (P).

The phraseology of the Priestly Code is conspicuous throughout, e.g. 'male' and 'female' (3—7), 'oblation' (*Korbān*, 9, 11), 'most holy' (lit. holiness of holinesses, 28). Moreover, the law of the Jubile year (*vv.* 17 ff.) is assumed to be in force. This fact, and its reference to rights of redemption (ch. xxv.), may account for the position of the ch. here. The last *v.* (34) is intended as the conclusion, not merely of this ch., but of the collection of 'commandments' contained in P, and referred to the Sinai legislation, just as *v.* 46 of the previous ch. was the conclusion of the 'Law of Holiness.' See note there.

The subject of this ch. may be thus analysed:

(1) *vows*, consisting of (*a*) persons, *vv.* 1—8; (*b*) cattle, *vv.* 9—13; (*c*) houses, *vv.* 14, 15; (*d*) land, *vv.* 16—25; but firstborn and 'devoted' are excluded, *vv.* 26—29. (2) *tithes*, *vv.* 30—33; concluding subscription, *v.* 34.

1—8. *The case of persons.*

2. *accomplish a vow*] rather, as mg., **make a special** (lit. *hard*) **vow.** For the definition of a vow, as compared with other classes of offerings, see on vii. 11. It was the utterance, and not merely the intention, that constituted the binding character of a vow (Deut. xxiii. 22). In this first case, viz. that of persons being vowed, the redemption might be made by an offering of money, in accordance with an estimate adapted to the particular case. R.V. mg. is nearer the Heb. than the text, but in strict grammar its 'of' should be omitted, 'persons' being in apposition to the word 'vow' in the original. The pronoun 'thy,' if it stands, seems to refer to Moses, but see on *v.* 13. The estimate evidently turned upon the comparative strength and capability of work to be fairly expected in the two sexes and at various periods of life, in fact, in modern phraseology, on their value in the labour market.

3. *the shekel of the sanctuary*] See on v. 15.

5 shall be thirty shekels. And if it be from five years old
even unto twenty years old, then thy estimation shall be of
the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels.
6 And if it be from a month old even unto five years old, then
thy estimation shall be of the male five shekels of silver, and
for the female thy estimation shall be three shekels of
7 silver. And if it be from sixty years old and upward; if it
be a male, then thy estimation shall be fifteen shekels, and
8 for the female ten shekels. But if he be poorer than thy
estimation, then he shall be set before the priest, and the
priest shall value him; according to the ability of him that
vowed shall the priest value him.
9 And if it be a beast, whereof men offer an oblation unto
the LORD, all that any man giveth of such unto the LORD
10 shall be holy. He shall not alter it, nor change it, a good
for a bad, or a bad for a good: and if he shall at all change
beast for beast, then both it and that for which it is
11 changed shall be holy. And if it be any unclean beast, of
which they do not offer an oblation unto the LORD, then he
12 shall set the beast before the priest: and the priest shall
value it, whether it be good or bad: as thou the priest
13 valuest it, so shall it be. But if he will indeed redeem it,
then he shall add the fifth part thereof unto thy estimation.

8. The case of the poor person. Cp. ch. v. 11.

9—13. *The case of cattle.*

Such an animal, when presented as a vow, must not be changed, a bad for a good. Otherwise both animals became dedicated. If the animal so presented was 'unclean,' and as such could not lawfully be offered to God, the priest was to set upon it a value in proportion to its worth, whereupon the owner might sell it for that sum and pay over the amount. If, however, he desired to have it back, he must pay in addition one-fifth of the price which the priest had adjudged.

12. *thou the priest*] or, *thou, O priest.*

13. *thy estimation*] Cp. *v.* 15, etc. The pronoun constitutes a difficulty, as in *v.* 2. There Moses, who seems to be referred to, is himself speaking to the people. Here the reference is apparently to the priest in *v.* 12. In *v.* 23 'thy' cannot have either of these references. The LXX. omits it in all the cases. It is thought to be the insertion of a reviser, in order to harmonize with *v.* 15, where the subject is similar and the pronoun presents no difficulty as applied to Moses, who is there

And when a man shall sanctify his house to be holy unto 14
the LORD, then the priest shall estimate it, whether it be
good or bad: as the priest shall estimate it, so shall it stand.
And if he that sanctified it will redeem his house, then he 15
shall add the fifth part of the money of thy estimation unto
it, and it shall be his.

And if a man shall sanctify unto the LORD part of the 16
field of his possession, then thy estimation shall be accord-
ing to the sowing thereof: the sowing of a homer of barley
shall be valued at fifty shekels of silver. If he sanctify his 17
field from the year of jubile, according to thy estimation it
shall stand. But if he sanctify his field after the jubile, then 18
the priest shall reckon unto him the money according to the

addressed. But it may possibly, as is suggested by the anomalous grammar in the Heb. of *v.* 23, be a survival of a phrase from old directions addressed to the priest, and have thus ceased to bear any definite meaning.

14, 15. *The case of houses.* **16—25.** *The case of lands.*

The vow, as regards its duration, is thus limited to a maximum of 50 years, being determined by the distance of the year of Jubile. When that year arrives, the field shall return to the owner, to be disposed of as he pleases. But even in the meantime, on payment of a defined sum of redemption-money, the field shall remain in the enjoyment of the owner, and the estimate for the purpose shall be at the rate of fifty shekels of silver for the amount of land (about 3⅜ acres, according to Kennedy, *ad loc.*) which would yield one homer (about eleven bushels) of barley, with an abatement in proportion to the number of years to run before the next Jubile. In order to obtain the enjoyment of the field, however, the owner must pay a further sum amounting to one-fifth of the redemption-money. In case the owner do not desire to redeem, or have alienated the land by selling it to another, the law of Jubile is not to operate; the land shall become the possession of the priest. In the case of a man's vowing land which is his by purchase and not by inheritance, that purchase shall not hold good beyond the Jubile, the purchaser redeeming it in the meantime by a payment calculated on the same principle as above.

16. *fifty shekels of silver*] meaning apparently that at the rate of one shekel a year this shall be the maximum amount of redemption payment. The standard in these cases was to be 'the shekel of the sanctuary.' See Driver, *Exod.* xxx. 13 (where the same words are used), for discussion as to the meaning and value of the shekel thus denominated.

years that remain unto the year of jubile, and an abatement
19 shall be made from thy estimation. And if he that sanctified
the field will indeed redeem it, then he shall add the fifth
part of the money of thy estimation unto it, and it shall be
20 assured to him. And if he will not redeem the field, or if he
have sold the field to another man, it shall not be redeemed
21 any more: but the field, when it goeth out in the jubile,
shall be holy unto the LORD, as a field devoted; the posses-
22 sion thereof shall be the priest's. And if he sanctify unto the
LORD a field which he hath bought, which is not of the
23 field of his possession; then the priest shall reckon unto
him the worth of thy estimation unto the year of jubile:
and he shall give thine estimation in that day, as a holy
24 thing unto the LORD. In the year of jubile the field shall
return unto him of whom it was bought, even to him to
25 whom the possession of the land belongeth. And all thy
estimations shall be according to the shekel of the sanctuary:
twenty gerahs shall be the shekel.

26 Only the firstling among beasts, which is made a firstling
to the LORD, no man shall sanctify it; whether it be ox or
27 sheep, it is the LORD'S. And if it be of an unclean beast,
then he shall ransom it according to thine estimation, and
shall add unto it the fifth part thereof: or if it be not
redeemed, then it shall be sold according to thy estimation.
28 Notwithstanding, no devoted thing, that a man shall

23. *thy estimation*] The Heb. representing these two words presents a grammatical anomaly, although parallels are not absolutely wanting in the MT. But see on *v.* 13.

26, 29. *Classes which may not be vowed.*

Firstlings are already the LORD'S (Exod. xiii. 2). If the firstling is that of an animal which is reckoned among the 'unclean' (according to the rule laid down, ch. xi. 3), it is to be valued and redeemed at 1¼ of its valuation. Driver, *Exod.* xiii. 13 (J), points out that P's law, as given here, is more favourable to the priests. In Exod. the redemption is to be made by a lamb, a less valuable animal.

28. *no devoted thing*] The word lit. means set apart, separated (Arab. *ḥarama*, whence harem, the occupants of the women's portion of a Mohammedan house, or the apartments themselves). See on Exod. xxii. 20 for examples of its application, and for the superiority of

devote unto the LORD of all that he hath, whether of man or beast, or of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed: every devoted thing is most holy unto the LORD. None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be 29 ransomed; he shall surely be put to death.

And all the tithe of the land, whether of the seed of the 30 land, or of the fruit of the tree, is the LORD'S: it is holy unto the LORD. And if a man will redeem aught of his 31 tithe, he shall add unto it the fifth part thereof. And all 32 the tithe of the herd or the flock, whatsoever passeth under the rod, the tenth shall be holy unto the LORD. He shall 33 not search whether it be good or bad, neither shall he change it: and if he change it at all, then both it and that for which it is changed shall be holy; it shall not be redeemed.

These are the commandments, which the LORD com- 34 manded Moses for the children of Israel in mount Sinai.

R.V. over A.V. in the English rendering. For the different species of *separation* in this sense see *HDB.*, Art. *Ban* (Kennedy), where a distinction is drawn between objects set apart for God by individuals (the 'private ban') referred to in this *v.*, and those persons, such as the idolater or blasphemer, who were subjected to a judicial sentence by the authorities. The latter are those meant in *v.* 29

30—33. *Laws concerning tithes.*

A distinction is here made between the tithe on the yield of the land or of fruit trees, and that on animals. The former according to this passage may be redeemed on payment of 1/5th of the estimation. In Num. xviii. 21—24 there is no such permission given. See McNeile (*C.B.*) there for comparison of the two passages. The tithe on cattle here imposed is, as he points out, a fresh demand, found nowhere else in O.T. except 2 Chr. xxxi. 6.

32. *under the rod*] the 'staff' carried by shepherds (Ps. xxiii. 4; Mic. vii. 14; Zech. xi. 7), and used (Tal. Bab., *Bechoroth*, fol. 58 *b*) for counting the flock when they were entering or leaving their fold. For the phrase, and for the reference by classical writers to similar customs, see Davidson (*C.B.*) on Ezek. xx. 37.

33. Cp. *v.* 10.

34. See introd. note to this ch.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE LITERARY STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

(*a*) *Sources of* chs. i. 1—vii. 38.

It seems probable that chs. vi. 8—vii. 38 contain laws selected by a compiler from another source for the purpose of supplementing i.—vi. 7. That source may conceivably have been a separate manual of special directions to priests. The subscription (vii. 37, 38) belongs to the second group as it mentions the sacrifices in the order of that group, and not of the first; the compiler considered it a suitable conclusion to the whole, or he may have added the second clause of *v.* 38, intending it as a reference to the first group. Whether this compiler is the same as the compiler of P cannot be determined.

There are indications that the text of both sections (i.—vi. 7, and vi. 8—vii. 38) has been revised before reaching its present form:

Chs. i. and iii. are closely connected, and ch. iii. seems to follow naturally after i. 13 (cp. iii. 1 with i. 3, 10), for i. 14—17 is probably an addition to i. 1—13, as an offering of fowls is not included in the general introduction of i. 2. The Hebrew particles shew the connexion more clearly; a general statement is made in i. 2—'*When* (Heb. *kî*) any man of you... ; the particular instances follow—'*If* (Heb. *'im*) his oblation be...' (*vv.* 3, 10, 14, iii. 1, 6, 12): cp. Exod. xxi. 2—11, and *Ges. Gr.* § 159. The introductory formula in ii. 1 is different from that in chs. i. and iii., and the use of the 2nd person in ii. 4—15 points to variety of origin.

The substance of ch. i.—iii. may be very old, as Burnt-Offering and Peace-Offering are the earliest recorded varieties of animal sacrifice; an independent Meal-Offering is also an ancient form of offering (Gen. iv.), and the various forms of preparing it specified in ch. ii. seem to imply

that such an offering was not infrequently brought. In the system of P, it appears almost exclusively as an accompaniment of an animal offering. Hence probably its position here, immediately following the Burnt-Offering, and impairing the original close connexion between ch. i. and iii.

In chs. i.—iii. some knowledge about sacrifices is implied. It is assumed that men will bring them on certain occasions; *how* they are to be brought is prescribed. No such knowledge is assumed in the instructions about the Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering; both *when* and *how* men should bring them is determined. It is generally allowed that this distinctive treatment of the sacrifices indicates that the Sin-Offering and Guilt-Offering were additional sacrifices introduced into the Levitical legislation, and that the sacrifices brought in patriarchal times were limited to those specified in chs. i.—iii.

Reasons for assigning ch. iv. to a late stratum of P have been already given in § 2 of the *Introd.* For further reasons to the same effect cp. *LOT.*[9] p. 43. See also the remarks on chs. viii.—x. in the next section of this Appendix.

The connexion between v. 1—13 and ch. iv. is obscure. Each offering is described as a *sin offering* (*vv.* 6, 7, 9, 11, 12). The whole belongs to the section on the Sin-Offering, and the division between the 'sin' and 'guilt' offerings comes at *v.* 14.

Are *vv.* 1—13 to be considered as one passage, or are *vv.* 7—13 to be distinguished from *vv.* 1—6? The exceptional treatment accorded to the poor man in *vv.* 7—13 seems applicable both to the sacrifice prescribed in *v.* 6, and to those prescribed in iv. 27—35. If *vv.* 7—13 were originally connected with *vv.* 1—6, they are by their position intended to apply also to iv. 27—35. If *vv.* 7—13 are the continuation of iv. 35, then v. 1—6 will be an insertion.

There are reasons for assigning ch. v. 1—6 to a source other than that of ch. iv.:

(1) The sins referred to in ch. iv. are committed 'unwittingly' ('through ignorance,' A.V.); the sin in v. 1 is deliberate abstention from giving evidence, and cannot be described as done unwittingly: it seems that the character of the offences for which a Sin-Offering is designed differs in the two sections. Cp. 2 Kgs xii. 16.

(2) The distinction made in ch. iv. between different classes in the community is not made in v. 1—6, and the description of the sacrifice in *v.* 6 is brief, no details being given as in iv. 27—35.

(3) The nature of the offences for which a Sin-Offering is necessary is specified in v. 1—4; but not in ch. iv.

There is also confusion in ch. v. 6. The technical term (Heb. *'āshām*[1]) for the Guilt-Offering is used to denote a penalty or forfeit, which (in the case contemplated in *v.* 6) is to be brought to the priest to be offered as a Sin-Offering (cp. Num. v. 8; Lev. xxii. 14 and pp. 21 f.). *Oxf. Hex.* and Berth. regard this confusion as pointing to a time when the distinction between Sin-Offerings and Guilt-Offerings had not been finally determined, and therefore consider the passage as older than ch. iv. But Bae. looks on this inexactness of language as an indication of late, rather than of early date, and regards the passage as a late supplement to ch. iv.

In the MT. of *v.* 7 there occurs the same confusion in the use of *'āshām* which has been noted in *v.* 6, and this similarity of nomenclature seems a good reason for connecting the two verses, and as a consequence regarding v. 1—13 as one passage. But the LXX. of *v.* 7 reads, 'he shall bring for his *sin* which he hath sinned two turtle doves...,' and this has been thought to indicate—though the inference is by no means a certain one—that the word *'āshām* forfeit, penalty, 'guilt-offering' R.V., 'trespass' A.V. ('for his guilt,' Or, 'his trespass offering' R.V. mg.), was not in their Hebrew text but *ḥaṭṭath* (sin). If the LXX. be admitted as evidence of another and better form of the text, the connexion between *v.* 6 and *v.* 7 disappears. If v. 1—6 be considered earlier than ch. iv., there seems to be some reason for separating it from *vv.* 7—13, which form an appendix to ch. iv.

Three cases follow in which a Guilt-Offering is enjoined. Of these the first (v. 14—16) and last (vi. 1—7) are similar; in the first the offence is unjust dealing 'in the holy things of the LORD,' in the last, unjust dealing in the things of a neighbour: in both the damage is estimated, the amount with the one-fifth additional is restored, and the offering is a ram.

But between these two in v. 17—19 a Guilt-Offering is enjoined for an offence which is described in words identical with those of iv. 27 and no restitution is required. Many critics think that here the confusion between Guilt-Offering and Sin-Offering is similar to that noticed in *vv.* 1—6, and regard the passage as a supplement to that precept.

The supplementary character of vi. 8—vii. 38 has already been noted. Of the eight heads into which the section is divided, five begin with the phrase 'This is the law of...,' and contain regulations for the five sacrifices mentioned in ch. i.—vi. 7. With these laws the summary of

[1] In *v.* 6 the *same* offering is described (erroneously) both as a Guilt-Offering and a Sin-Offering. R.V. mg. 'for his guilt,' though a paraphrase, expresses the sense correctly.

v. 37 seems connected, for it begins with the same phrase 'This is the law of...,' and enumerates the five sacrifices in the order in which they are arranged in vi. 8—vii. 21 (not the order of ch. i.—vi. 7). The introductory clauses of vi. 19—23, vii. 22—27, 28—36, which are not the same as those in vi. 8, 9 and 24, 25, may indicate a different source. It is possible, then, that one part of this section consists of the five sacrificial laws with vii. 37 as their colophon, and that the other three passages have been combined with it.

The phrase 'in the day when he is anointed' connects vi. 19—23 (the daily Meal-Offering of the high priest) with the inauguration of the priesthood (Lev. viii.), and the words 'and of the consecration' in vii. 37 seem to refer to the same ceremonial. Both expressions are, in the opinion of most critics, additions to the original text. Of vii. 28—36 the last two verses at least are late, as they imply the anointing of the priests as well as of Aaron; if any of *vv.* 29—34 are part of the original law of the Peace-Offering, then *vv.* 22—27 which break the connexion are a later insertion.

(*b*) *Sources of* chs. viii. 1—x. 20.

It has already been shewn (*Introd.* § 2 and p. 15) that those passages which refer to the altar of incense, and distinguish the altar of sacrifice as the altar of burnt offering, belong to secondary strata of P. Such passages are found in Exod. xxxvii. 25—28 and xl. 5, 26 (the altar of incense made and set up in the tent of meeting): other facts, deduced from an examination of th LXX. of Exod. xxxv.—xl., furnish independent evidence that these chapters are secondary (see Driver, note on Exod. xxxv., p. 378; *LOT.*[9] pp. 37, 42; McNeile, Exod. pp. 224—226, with reference to Swete, *Introd. to O. T. in Greek*, pp. 235 f.).

It is probable that P originally described briefly the way in which the commands of Exod. xxv.—xxix. were obeyed, by setting up the tent and the altar, and consecrating Aaron and his sons. This statement has been enlarged by adding further prescriptions, elaborating details, and assimilating the language more closely to that of Exod. xxv. ff., until it has assumed the form in which it now appears in ch. xxx., xxxi., xxxv.—xl. and Lev. viii. The grounds for this conclusion rest chiefly on an examination of the chapters in Exodus already mentioned, and are given in the commentary on that book (see references above). How far this original statement has been preserved in Lev. viii. is a question to which no definite answer can be made. The chapter in its present

form repeats almost verbally the injunctions of Exod. xxix., after the manner of chs. xxxv.—xl. It also exhibits other marks of being secondary; on the other hand, its resemblance to ch. ix., in omitting any reference to the altar of incense, gives it priority over some parts of Exod. xxxv.—xl.

From Exod. xxix. 7, cp. Lev. viii. 10—12, it will be seen that Lev. viii. 10 (the first clause as far as 'oil') and *v.* 12 repeat the commands in Exodus. The actions described in the intermediate clauses, anointing the tabernacle, sprinkling and anointing the altar and its vessels and the laver, are not found in Exod. xxix. 7, but occur in xxx. 26—28, xl. 9—11; they are probably later additions. The same may be said of the words 'and purified the altar,...and sanctified it, to make atonement for it' in Lev. viii. 15. They are not found in the corresponding verse (Exod. xxix. 12) and seem based on xxix. 36. The frequent repetition of the words 'as the LORD commanded Moses,' and of similar phrases (Lev. viii. 4, 9, 13, 17, 21, 29), is also found in Exod. xxxix., xl., which belong to a late stratum of P.

On the whole, though there is evidence that Lev. viii. contains late additions, it is probably in the main of earlier date than Exod. xxxv.—xl. So Wellh. *CH.*[2] pp. 146 f., and *Oxf. Hex.* i. 155 and ii. 152 note, 153 note.

In ch. x. 1—7 we find the punishment of Nadab and Abihu following upon the first sacrifices of Aaron and his sons in ch. ix., but in *v.* 7 it seems that the days of consecration are not completed, for Aaron and his sons are still at the entrance to the tent of meeting. The anointing oil is upon the sons of Aaron as well as upon himself, whereas in ch. viii. only Aaron is anointed. There are, then, reasons for supposing that *vv.* 6, 7 do not belong to the original story.

In *vv.* 8—11, the connexion between *v.* 10 and the preceding command is not apparent: possibly some words may have dropped out between *vv.* 9 and 10. Note, however, that in Ezek. xliv. 21—23, *v.* 21 (which is like Lev. x. 9) is separated from *v.* 23 (which is closely similar to Lev. x. 10) by a single verse, to which a parallel may be found in Lev. xxi. 7, 14. The substance of this passage shews affinity with Ezekiel and with earlier laws (see references above and *v.* 11, cp. Deut. xxiv. 8, xxxiii. 10 on priestly teaching or *torah*); its fragmentary character (lack of connexion between *vv.* 9 and 10) conveys the impression that it is not part of P's original narrative (cp. *LOT.*[9] p. 45). That narrative is continued in *vv.* 12—15, on the relation of which to the codes of Lev. i.—vii., cp. Wellh. *CH.*[2] pp. 149 f. with *Oxf. Hex.* ii. p. 155 n.

The last section (16—20) is, in the opinion of nearly all critics, a very late comment on the occurrence related in ix. 15. The Sin-Offering for the people was offered 'as the first,' i.e. in the same way as the sacrifice of 7—11, the remainder of which was 'burnt with fire without the camp' (11). Now according to ch. iv., Sin-Offerings were of two kinds: (*a*) those of which the blood was brought into the sanctuary, and the remainder consumed by fire (Lev. iv. 3—21); (*b*) others, of which the blood was *not* brought into the sanctuary, and the remainder was eaten by the priests (*vv.* 22—35). If every sacrifice belongs to one of these two kinds, then those of which the blood is not brought into the sanctuary must be eaten by the priests. This is the authoritative interpretation of the law laid down by Moses in x. 18, and acknowledged by Aaron in his reply. Aaron gives as a reason for not complying with this regulation, that 'there have befallen me such things as these,' i.e. his two sons had died; he considered that under the circumstances, he was not in a fit state to eat the Sin-Offering of the people, and that, had he done so, he would have incurred the Lord's displeasure. Moses is satisfied with this reply.

An explanation in narrative form is here offered of the difference between the ritual followed in ix. 15 (described in the preceding paragraph) and that prescribed in x. 18, based on ch. iv. and vi. 30. As both question and answer imply knowledge of the developed ritual of the Sin-Offering, which enjoins the application of the blood to the altar of incense within the tent of meeting, the whole section (x. 16—20) must belong to a very late stratum of P. The student may compare the argument in *Introd.* § 2 (pp. xii f.) with reference to the altar of incense and will be able to form some idea of the interval which separates the groundwork of P from its later strata.

Aaron's action was in accordance with the precedent set by Moses in ch. viii., and the instructions of Exod. xxix.; from the standpoint of ch. iv. and vi. 30, it was defective. The ceremony of eating the sacrifice was the alternative of bringing its blood into the Holy place: this latter ceremony indicated that the offerer was, through the sacrifice together with the manipulation of the blood, brought very nigh to God. In those sacrifices where this ceremony was not performed, the solemn consumption of the sacrifice in a Holy place gave an assurance of the close relation established between God and the bringer of the sacrifice. Hence by Aaron's omission of this ceremony the people had suffered loss. This seems to be the underlying thought of the passage, and it supplies a reason for the anger of Moses.

But of the four kinds of Sin-Offering described in ch. iv., the Sin-

Offering for the people (ix. 15) corresponds most nearly to the second (iv. 13—21); it certainly cannot be classed under any of the other three. The question which would most readily occur to anyone reading Lev. iv., vi. 25—30, viii.—x. consecutively, and assuming unity of authorship, would be, Why was not the blood of the Sin-Offering of ix. 15 brought into the Holy place? The rabbis seem to have felt this difficulty, for some consider that the first sacrifices of Aaron were offered on the first of the month Nisan, and that the offering referred to in x. 16 f. was that of the first day of the month (Num. xxviii. 15). This interpretation, however, seems contrary to the notes of time in Exod. xl. 2, 17. Another suggestion is that the dedication of the altar began on the day of Aaron's first sacrifice, and that the goat of the Sin-Offering (x. 16) was that brought by Nahshon (Num. vii. 12—17), the blood of which according to Lev. iv. 22—26 would not be brought into the Holy place. These suggestions seem to arise from a feeling that the Sin-Offering for the people (ix. 15), to which, according to the generally received opinion, x. 16—20 refers, ought to have been treated as is directed in the law of iv. 13—21.

Of the whole chapter, *vv.* 1—5 and 12—15 only can be assigned to the original draft of P, though *vv.* 8—11 have parallels in older sources.

(*c*) *Sources of* ch. xi. 1—47.

It will be seen that Deut. (xiv. 7) gives only once the reason why the camel, the hare, and the coney are unclean, but Lev. (xi. 4—6) repeats the reason for each animal. *Repetition of phrases* is a characteristic of P (see *Introd. to Pent.* p. 57). The law with reference to fishes is expanded, with repetition and added detail, in P's style, and includes 'the swarming things of the waters' which are not mentioned in Deut. The list of birds that may not be eaten is almost identical in Lev. and Deut. In *v.* 20 Lev. adds 'that go upon all four' to 'all winged swarming things' of Deut. xiv. 19. In *vv.* 21, 22 Lev. specifies what swarming things may be eaten, but Deut. does not mention them. In *vv.* 41, 42 another class of swarming things is added. The connexion between *vv.* 20—23 and *vv.* 41 f. is very close, and *v.* 41 seems to be the continuation of *vv.* 20—23, but here Lev. is either adding to the common source of Deut. and Lev. or, as seems very probable, he is borrowing from some other dietary law.

By general consent, *vv.* 24—30 are regarded as supplementary. They deal chiefly with uncleanness caused by contact with carcases, and the summary in *vv.* 46, 47 applies to a law of food, and does not

appear to make reference to this section. The minute rules of *vv.* 32—38 seem to be deductions from a shorter law of contact, and resemble the casuistry of the rabbinic period. It seems probable that if the list in *vv.* 29, 30 had been known to the redactor of *vv.* 2—23, 41—45, it would have been combined with *vv.* 20—23. The view that *vv.* 39, 40 are the conclusion of the section concerning beasts in *vv.* 2—8 deserves mention; also the fact that in the colophon (*vv.* 46, 47) the classes of animals are not mentioned in the order followed in the body of the chapter.

(*d*) *Sources of* ch. xvi. 1—34.

The earlier critics agreed in considering the chapter as a single whole, but were not at one with respect to its position in the Priestly code. Wellh. and Kuenen regarded it as part of 'the book of the law' which Ezra brought before the congregation and read therein as recorded in Neh. viii., while Reuss held that it was a later addition.

Oort was the first to suggest a division of the chapter, by attempting to separate the directions for cleansing the sanctuary from those for atonement. The purification of things may have been originally distinct from purification of persons, but they are combined by the prophet Ezekiel, who insists upon the defilement of the sanctuary caused by the uncleanness of the people. In the rite as described in xvi. 3—28 the cleansing of the sanctuary is united with the atonement for the people in such a manner as to become a single ceremony, and Kuenen was right in maintaining that this attempt on the part of Oort to resolve the whole into component parts had failed.

Benzinger's criticism of the chapter has met with more general approval (*ZATW.* 1889, p. 65 ff.). He is of opinion that:

(1) the regulations for Aaron's entrance within the veil form part of an ordinance issued on the occasion of the death of Nadab and Abihu, and are contained in *vv.* 1—4, 6, 12, 13, 34*b*; that

(2) *vv.* 29—34*a* contain the original law appointing a special day as a yearly fast on which atonement is to be made for the sanctuary, altar, priests and people; and that

(3) the ritual to be observed on that day is prescribed in *vv.* 5, 7—10, 14—28.

Baentsch (*HK.* Lev. xvi.) accepts this division. Bertholet (*KHC.* Lev. xvi.) assigns *vv.* 23, 24 to (1) and rejects *v.* 25 as a gloss: a connexion between *v.* 22 and *v.* 26 is thus established, and it must be allowed that *v.* 26 forms an appropriate continuation of *v.* 22. The

intervening *vv.* 23, 24, however, which refer to the Burnt-Offerings, describe the concluding part of the sacrificial ceremonies, and seem to follow appropriately after *v.* 22. On *v.* 25 see note.

Benzinger laid great stress on the close connexion implied in xvi. 1 with the death of Nadab and Abihu recorded in x. 1 ff. But is a close connexion really implied in that introductory verse? It is possible that the compiler may have commenced this section with a reference to the last recorded event, which is that of x. 1 ff., just as 'after these things' is often found as an introductory phrase. In *Oxf. Hex.* ii. p. 164, xvi. 1 is printed in the small type which indicates editorial addition; if it were removed, the chapter would begin with *v.* 2 in the same way as many others. If *v.* 1 is part of the original narrative, the single word 'saying' might well replace the first clause of *v.* 2. As the text stands at present, the repetition of introductory clauses is unusual.

It seems then that *v.* 1 affords no sure indication that ch. xvi. is closely connected with ch. x. Benzinger refers to other indications of a close connexion (*ZATW.* p. 73), and quotes the expression 'that he die not,' xvi. 2, 13, as pointing to the death of Nadab and Abihu. But this expression has no special reference to that event (see note, p. 89). He also considers that the command to take fire 'from off the altar' (xvi. 12) is in contrast with the 'strange fire' of x. 1. But no special emphasis is laid on the words 'from off the altar' in xvi. 12 (cp. the same expression in Num. xvi. 46), nor is there necessarily any distinction implied between 'strange fire' in x. 1 and 'from off the altar' in xvi. 12.

There is little, if anything, to connect the regulations under which Aaron should enter the Holy of Holies with the story of Nadab and Abihu. It is sometimes assumed that the offering of strange fire 'before the LORD' (x. 1) implies that the sons of Aaron entered the Holy of Holies, but the narrative does not support this inference; the words of x. 4 'from before the sanctuary' are opposed to it. It is true that 'before the LORD' in xvi. 13 is used with reference to the Holy of Holies, but the same phrase is also used of ceremonies performed at the altar of burnt offering (xvi. 18), and in Num. xvi. of incense brought in censers at the entrance to the tent of meeting (cp. *v.* 7 with *v.* 18).

Benzinger's view that Lev. xvi. contains two entirely different laws, having in common only the entry of the high priest into the Holy of Holies, is in great measure dependent on the assumption that the chapter is closely connected with ch. x. It has been shewn in the preceding paragraphs that this close connexion is very doubtful, and that

v. 1 of ch. xvi. may be otherwise explained. The whole chapter may then be considered as containing the ritual prescribed for the Day of Atonement. Even if a connexion be supposed, and it be granted that conditions of entering the Holy of Holies have been combined with instructions for the Day of Atonement, as maintained by Benzinger, it is still open to doubt whether the parts assigned by him to the former are the original conditions of entering the most holy place. Those original conditions may have been removed to make way for the ritual actually followed on the Day of Atonement, and perhaps a slight trace of them remains in *vv.* 2, 4 of *vv.* 2—28.

In the *Oxf. Hex.* vol. ii. p. 164, the following analysis of the chapter is offered as a probable account of its literary history. The kernel is found in the directions for the cleansing of the inner sanctuary, the tent of meeting and the altar (*v.* 20) and for an atonement for the people on the occasion (left undefined) of Aaron's entering within the veil. To this an introductory verse (*v.* 1) has been prefixed connecting the directions with the death of Aaron's sons, and there have been added a special expiation for Aaron and his house (i.e. the priests), contained in *vv.* 3, 6, 11, 14, 17*b*, and the references to Aaron's offering in *vv.* 15, 18, 24, 27. The ceremonial is to be repeated by succeeding high priests, and the day is to be observed as an annual fast day (*vv.* 29—34*a*).

According to Stade (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. p. 258, note 1) *vv.* 3—10 form the kernel of the ordinance. It is connected through *v.* 1 with the account of Nadab and Abihu in ch. x., which seems to furnish the ground of a warning to Aaron (*v.* 2) against entering into the most holy place without due preparation. A brief description of the ceremonies to be performed by Aaron is contained in *vv.* 3—10, and the details of the ritual are added in *vv.* 11—28. These latter are intended as an appendix to *vv.* 3—10, which are regarded as a preliminary description of the offerings required, their presentation, and the casting of lots rather than as a description of the whole ceremonial. Hence in *vv.* 11, 15 there is repetition of what has already been stated in *vv.* 6, 9. The consequence is that from *vv.* 3—10 only it would appear that the lots for the goats were drawn *after* Aaron's sacrifice for himself and his house had been offered, while the intention of the writer in *vv.* 11—28 is to place the casting of lots before the commencement of the sacrificial action.

Stade's analysis of Lev. xvi. was completed before Benzinger's investigation reached him (see note on p. 89 of *ZATW.* 1889). It is a curious coincidence, that, in the first volume of *ZATW.* published after

Stade's death, the deep and warm-hearted appreciation of Stade's life and work contributed in the 'Nachruf' should be immediately followed by an article on the composition of Lev. xvi. by Messel, in which Benzinger's contribution of 1889 is destructively criticized, and a new attempt to solve the problem is proposed, which recognises Stade's analysis as indicating the right solution (*ZATW.* 1907, p. 7).

The composition of the chapter, according to Messel, is given in *ZATW.* 1907, p. 11 f. as follows:

(1) The basis of the law is found in *vv.* 3*b*, 5—10. A date was originally assigned for the rite, and the sacrifice of the rams as burnt offerings was also mentioned.

(2) The ceremonial was further developed according to *vv.* 2, 3*a*, 4, 11, 14—16*a*, 17—28. The blood of the victims was brought into the Holy of Holies, and special linen garments were appointed for the high priest, when he came within the veil.

(3) Additional rites—the use of incense in the Holy of Holies, and the further application of the blood to purify the tent of meeting are found in *vv.* 12 f., 16*b*.

(4) In *vv.* 29—34*a* an ordinance addressed—not (like *vv.* 1—28) to the priests, but—to the people (cp. xxvii. 26—32), is issued, prescribing a fast and sabbath of solemn rest on which atonement is to be made once a year. As the tenth day of the seventh month is here fixed, the date originally supplied after *v.* 2 is withdrawn.

Stade's analysis is accepted substantially by Kennedy and also by Bertholet (*Bibl. Theol. des A. T.* 1911, ii. 37).

Different attempts to separate these ideas and rites have been put before the reader, and it will be noticed that what to one critic appears primary is secondary in the estimation of another, and that a group of verses which is treated as a whole by one is disintegrated by others. It should be also remembered that keen and competent critics (e.g. Kuenen) were content to leave the chapter as a whole. From these facts it seems that two inferences may fairly be drawn: (1) that the ceremonial here prescribed is put forward in a developed form as suitable for a single occasion; and (2) that an examination of the existing text does not supply a sufficiently firm basis for tracing the steps of its development.

The service appointed for the Day of Atonement is complicated. Several sacrifices and ceremonies are enjoined, and they seem designed to illustrate more than one idea in connexion with atonement and purification.

(*e*) *Sources of* ch. xvii. 3—16.

In dealing with these verses the reader may notice:

(1) The brevity of the second precept in *vv.* 8, 9. It begins with the introductory clause, describes the prohibited action, and announces the punishment which will follow on disobedience.

(2) That the other precepts are similar in structure, and contain these three elements. Cp. *vv.* 3, 4, also *v.* 10, also *v.* 13 with the last clause of *v.* 14.

(3) That they also state the aim or reason of each injunction, e.g. *vv.* 5—7 for the first, *vv.* 11, 12 for the third, and *v.* 14 (except the last clause) for the fourth precept.

From (1) and (2) it seems probable that these precepts may have been originally expressed more briefly on the model of *vv.* 8, 9. The additional matter noticed in (3) shews that the legislation does not belong to P; the commands in the Priestly Code are issued without comment or exhortation.

Moreover, in that code worship at the one sanctuary, which is *enjoined* in Deut., is *presupposed* (see Wellh. *Prol. H.I.* p. 35, *CH.*[3] p. 152 f., and Chapman, *Intr. to Pent.* p. 133), and it is assumed as a natural consequence that sacrifice will be offered, according to prescribed rules, to *Jehovah* alone; the command of *vv.* 8, 9 is therefore not in the spirit of P. The same may be said of *v.* 7, which denounces sacrifices to satyrs ('devils' A.V.); in the Priestly Code there is no polemic against heathen cults.

To these reasons for not assigning these precepts to P may be added others drawn from the language; a phrase like 'burnt offering and sacrifice' (Exod. x. 25, xviii. 12; 2 Kgs v. 17, etc.) is used by older writers (not by P), and does not adequately describe the more elaborate sacrificial system of the Priestly Code, in which the Sin-Offering is so prominent a feature; the varied manner in which the punishments are announced, and the use of the first person, 'I will set my face...and will cut him off,' in *v.* 10 (cp. xx. 3, 5, 6, xxvi. 17) are in contrast to the repetition of the same phrase 'that soul (*nephesh*) shall be cut off from...' and the avoidance of the direct form of speech in conveying the Divine Commands, both of which are characteristic of the Priestly Code.

But the evidence that these laws have been revised in the spirit of P is cogent: in the second verse 'unto Aaron, and unto his *sons*' is different from the description of the priests in xxi. 10 as the *brethren* of the high priest; 'This is the thing which the LORD (hath) commanded' is found only in the Priestly Code (Exod. xvi. 16, 32, xxxv. 4;

Lev. viii. 5, ix. 6; Num. xxx. 2, cp. xxxvi. 6†); the references to 'the camp' and 'the door (entrance) of the tent of meeting' are from the same source. The double indication of place in *v.* 4 should be noted; 'tabernacle' and 'tent of meeting' would not both be used by the same writer, and if 'tent of meeting' is assigned to R^P, then 'tabernacle' is from another source. In *v.* 5 the clause 'even that they may bring...the tent of meeting' seems to be an expansion, and it is more obviously redundant in the Heb. The verse reads more smoothly if it is omitted; part of the clause is certainly due to R^P, and most probably the whole should be assigned to him. The last clause of *v.* 7 is a favourite formula of P, and the ritual directions of *v.* 6 seem to be his; they have no close connexion with the context, and *v.* 7 follows naturally after *v.* 5.

The fact that these passages which bear the impress of P can be so easily eliminated raises a presumption that the remainder is not from that source, and corroborates the preceding arguments. The examination of this chapter supports the inference that an older code has been revised in the spirit of P.

When the additions referring to 'the camp' and 'the tent of meeting' are removed, the probable original form of the precept in *vv.* 3, 4 may have been:

What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, and hath not brought it before [the dwelling of] the LORD: blood shall be imputed unto that man; he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people:

and of the precept in *vv.* 8, 9:

Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, that offereth a burnt-offering or sacrifice, and bringeth it not to sacrifice it unto the LORD; even that man shall be cut off from his people.

In this form, with no reference to the place where sacrifices should be brought, the precepts are suitable to the period when 'the people sacrificed in the high places' before the high places were taken away (1 Kgs iii. 2, xv. 14, xxii. 43), and the reform under Josiah had limited worship to the central sanctuary at Jerusalem (Deut. xii. 14; and see *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 137—139).

They are also *distinct* precepts, as the repetition of the introductory clause in *v.* 8 implies: profane slaughtering is forbidden in the first, and sacrifice offered to any but Jehovah in the second. This distinction is obscured by *vv.* 5—7, for *v.* 7 anticipates the prohibition of *vv.* 8, 9. It is therefore probable that *vv.* 5—7 are an addition, and due to R^h, as it has already been pointed out that they do not belong to P. Now

R^h is later than Josiah, and is acquainted with the ordinance of the one sanctuary introduced in the reign of that king. To him is attributed by some critics the words 'the tabernacle of' (*v.* 4), intended as a reference to the temple at Jerusalem, and an adaptation of the older law to the ordinance of the one sanctuary. But, whether the words were added by him or not, he has in view the one central sanctuary, and is withdrawing the permission conceded in Deut. xii. 15, 21 to kill for food in any place. The purpose of this withdrawal seems to be explained in *vv.* 5—7. It probably arose out of the practical working of the permission accorded in Deut., and the religious condition of the people in the period immediately preceding the fall of the kingdom (see notes on the text, p. 98 f.). This condition was sufficiently grave to require drastic remedies; but the wisdom of that proposed in *vv.* 3, 4 may be questioned; it failed to produce any effect.

This explanation of *vv.* 5—7 seems the most probable if (1) the *vv.* are taken as an addition of R^h, and (2) the compilation of the Holiness Code (or at least this portion of it) be considered pre-exilic. But upon neither of these points are critics agreed: the Holiness Code is by some of them assigned to the exile, and even to post-exilic times; the precept of *vv.* 3, 4 would then be intended for those who returned; *vv.* 5—7 would refer to the irregular forms of worship observed in the past, and contain a warning for the future. But the command that all animals for slaughter should be brought to the central sanctuary would be practicable, only on the supposition that the returned exiles formed a small community which settled itself in Jerusalem and the immediate neighbourhood.

Prof. L. B. Paton (*JBL.* vol. xvi. pp. 31—37) is of opinion that the local altars to which sacrifice was brought before Josiah's reform may be considered as dwelling-places of Jehovah in virtue of the promise in Exod. xx. 24 (*l.c.* p. 37), and that the phrase 'I will set my tabernacle (dwelling) among you' in xxvi. 11 is not a reference to the temple at Jerusalem, but 'signifies simply that He [*Jehovah*] will take up His dwelling in Israel, 'in the dwelling-place which is appropriate in any given case' (*l.c.* p. 36), the words 'dwelling-place of the LORD' existing, according to him, in the original form of the precept of xvii. 4.

This original form of the precept (with or without 'the dwelling of') was probably issued to the people before the reform of Josiah. Perhaps in some cases men did not take the trouble to bring the animal that was killed for food to the local altar, though it was near, but slaughtered it in their own field, it may be with some religious ceremony. Also before Josiah's time the cult of demons was common, probably a survival from

ancient Semitic heathenism (see 2 Kgs xxiii. 12, and the note on *v.* 7 on p. 100). Thus the two practices of sacrificing 'in the open field' and sacrificing to 'the satyrs' referred to in *vv.* 5—7 would have been introduced before the time of Josiah, and the whole of *vv.* 3—7 (except the additions of R^P) would be appropriate in pre-Deuteronomic times. If in this passage the words 'the tabernacle of' (*v.* 4) be taken as an addition with intentional reference to the temple, it may be understood as the utterance of a reformer who, with a view to stop sacrificing in the open field and to satyrs (R.V. mg.), anticipated the action of the reformers in Josiah's reign. It has been conjectured that proposals to limit sacrifice to the temple had been made by reformers before Josiah, and that in *vv.* 3—7 a record of one such proposal has been preserved. It was too drastic, because it made no allowance for profane slaughtering; the reformers of Josiah's time adopted a more conciliatory attitude, and gave permission to kill for food at home. It will be seen that *vv.* 3—7 have been assigned to periods varying from pre-Deut. to post-exilic: the inference is that the indications of time are not sufficiently definite. Whichever conclusion be adopted, the supposition that the passage forms part of a collection of laws made by R^h and revised by R^p (see p. xxvi) is equally probable.

The remaining *vv.* do not call for any special comment; whether the explanations in *v.* 11 and *v.* 14 are part of the original precepts or the additions of R^h cannot be decided, and does not affect the general discussion.

(*f*) *Sources of* ch. xxiii. 1—44.

Vv. 2, 4, which form the title of the ch., as well as the subscription to the list of sacred days (*vv.* 37, 38), imply that the intermediate matter refers to holy convocations only, and *vv.* 3 and 5—8 give us what we should accordingly expect. 'Holy convocations' are appointed for the sabbath (*v.* 3, but see note there), and for the first and seventh days of the feast of unleavened bread (*vv.* 7, 8). It is true that no such direction is given for the Passover (*v.* 5), but that feast appears to be mentioned only in passing, as introductory to the seven-day feast that follows upon it. Up to this point, then, in accordance with what has been said above, we are dealing with P.

In *vv.* 9—14 we change to the other source (H). It directs the offering of a sheaf of the first fruits without any mention of a 'holy convocation,' and thus goes beyond the limits of what the title of the ch. has laid down as its contents. Moreover, it betrays itself as defective and as an excerpt from a larger code, for, as it now stands, it gives no

indication of the 'sabbath' that is meant, and that was doubtless plainly mentioned in that code. See further in note on *v.* 11.

On similar grounds we assign the main part of *vv.* 15—22 to H, *v.* 21 alone suiting the title. It will be observed that the same ambiguous expression recurs in *v.* 15; also that the offering of the wave loaves (*v.* 17) falls outside the scope of the title, as well as of the subscription (*vv.* 37, 38).

In *vv.* 23—36 we revert to P, as we are now dealing with occasions for which 'holy convocations' are ordained (viz. the first day of the year, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Booths) in accordance with the title. The subscription (*vv.* 37 f.) closes the whole.

We next have an appendix (*vv.* 39—43) dealing with the Feast of Booths and evidently having H for its source, while it has been subjected to modifications in order to harmonize with P. Such a modification seems to have been the insertion of the words 'on the fifteenth day of the seventh month' (*v.* 39). From the less definite fixing of a date by H in *v.* 10, 'when ye...shall reap the harvest thereof,' and in *v.* 15, where the reckoning is to be fifty days from the same somewhat vague starting-point, we infer that the completion of the ingathering of the fruits of the land (*v.* 39) was the only note of time originally prescribed; and that the opening words of *v.* 39 are added in order to accord with the definite days subsequently appointed by the Priestly Code, which contemplates these seasons from a different standpoint. Similarly the words (*v.* 39) 'on the first day shall be a solemn rest, and on the eighth day shall be a solemn rest' are an addition by a still later hand to make the *v.* harmonize with *v.* 36 (P), where the extra (eighth) day comes in *naturally*. Its awkwardness in *v.* 39 is evident, as in the subsequent verses (H) which deal with the same feast any such eighth day is ignored.

The wording of Neh. viii. 14 ff. and its apparent reference to *v.* 36 (P) and *v.* 39 (partly H) seem to show that the combination of H and P and consequent modifications of H by R^P had taken place before 444 B.C., the date of the Feast of Tabernacles there described.

We may illustrate the results of the foregoing analysis by the following table (*LOT.*[8] p. 54):

H		9—20	22		39*b*	40—43
P	xxiii. 1—8	21	23—38, 39*a*		39*c*	44

(*g*) *Sources of* ch. xxv. 1—55.

(*a*) In the Covenant Code (Exod. xxiii.) the Hebrew slave after ministering to the wants of his master for six years is to go free. The land also after supplying the wants of its owner for the same period is to be left alone. The year of freedom would be different for different slaves, and there is nothing in the text which implies that the fallow year is fixed for the whole land; it may have varied for different fields and for different owners. The English translation of Exod. xxiii. 11, 'let it rest' (R.V. and A.V.), suggests a closer connexion with the following precept in *v.* 12 about the sabbath than is implied in the original. The Heb. verb in *v.* 11 has nothing in common with the verb for resting on the sabbath day in *v.* 12, but is the same as that employed in Deut. xv. for the release and remission of debts in the seventh year. The rendering of R.V. mg. is therefore to be preferred—'*thou shalt release it.*'

(*b*) In the Deuteronomic Code the law for the slave is repeated with very slight alteration, but in the place of the release of the land is found a law of release from debt in every seventh year. Here the year is fixed, but there is a verbal connexion between the two ideas of a fallow year and a remitted debt; the same Heb. verb, which means *to throw down* or *let drop* (see Driver on Exod. xxiii. 10) is used for both.

(*c*) The law in Lev. xxv. 2—7 is generally regarded as a part of H; its connexion with the law in Exod. is evident; Lev. xxv. 3 is almost a transcript of Exod. xxiii. 10; the first three and last three words of these two short verses are identical. But there is a difference: in Exod. the produce of the fallow year is for the poor and the beast of the field; the right of the owner to the use of even a part of it is not expressly reserved, but the duty of giving up something for the benefit of the community is enjoined as a social obligation; in Lev. the seventh year is to be observed as a religious duty; there is no reference to the share of the poor in the produce of the fallow year, but a recognition of the owner's right to it. The prominent idea is that the land shall take part in a solemn ceremonial—it shall keep sabbath as well as the individual.

The following analysis of the sources which, as has been intimated above, must be to a certain extent tentative, is proposed in *LOT.*[9] p. 57, taken from Haupt's *SBOT.* (but see Baentsch, pp. 53—63, for a somewhat different arrangement):

H		xxv. 2*b*—7, 8—9*a*		10*a*		13—15		17—22		24—25
P	xxv. 1—2*a*		9*b*		10*b*—12		16		23	

H		35—40*a*		43		47		53		55
P	26—34		40*b*—42*		44—46		48—52		54	

* *V.* 42 adapted by the compiler from *v.* 55.

This analysis, it will be seen, distributes the ch. between the two sources in about equal proportions, and the general result is that the older jubile laws of H, it is assumed, provided (1) that land should not be sold beyond the next jubile (*v.* 13—15); and (2) contained four regulations for the relief of the impoverished Israelites: (*a*) his land might be redeemed for him (*v.* 25), (*b*) usury was not to be exacted of him (*vv.* 35—38), and (*c* and *d*) when in servitude, either with a brother Israelite (*vv.* 39—40*a*, 43) or with a resident foreigner (*vv.* 47, 53, 55), he was to be treated humanely. This law of H was afterwards incorporated into the priestly law-book P, with additions (1) containing closer definitions, especially in regard to the redemption of land (*v.* 9*b*, 10*b*—12, 23, 26—34); and (2) extending the benefits of the jubile from land to *persons* (*v.* 40*b*—42, 44—46, 48—52, 54) (*LOT. ib.*).

The repetitions of expressions, as indicative of the two sources, are specially noticeable in *vv.* 8—13, e.g. 9*a* and 9*b*, 13 and 10*b*.

Other critics are of opinion that the jubile law is a development by P of the idea of the sabbatical year contained in H. There is a further possibility: H may have contained regulations concerning a periodical redemption of the land which have been adopted and expanded by P, following the analogy of the Feast of Weeks occurring fifty days after the Passover. If either or both of these opinions be accepted, the division between H and P given above will be slightly modified; those verses in which mention of the jubile occurs will be assigned to P. The modification will be in *vv.* 8—22.

We may note that in the Deut. passage (xv. 12—18) the slave is to be released in the *seventh* year of his servitude, in Lev. (*vv.* 40 f.) that event is not to take place till the year of jubile, thus suggesting that there were practical difficulties in the way of inducing the owners to carry out the Deuteronomic provision. Cp. Jer. xxxiv. 8—16.

On the differences in the laws as set forth in the three passages, and as connected with the question of their historical sequence, see *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 125 ff.

The interpretation of 'the 50th year' presents a difficulty, which disappears if we take it as only an approximation to the actual time, viz. the last year of the seventh of a series of sabbatical periods. Otherwise we should have two years (the 49th and 50th) of suspended agricultural industry, and confusion would also ensue as to the reckoning of the commencement of the next sabbatical period.

APPENDIX II

THE PRIESTLY CODE

The source designated by P (see *LOT.*[6] pp. 10 ff., *Intr. to Pent.* 54—72 and 207 ff.) contains a narrative from the Creation to the time when the chosen nation received its promised inheritance. It deals specially with the *origins* of Institutions, such as Sabbath, Circumcision, and Passover in the earlier part, and Tabernacle, Priesthood, and Feasts in the Sinaitic portion. This narrative, which forms the *groundwork* of the whole, is generally distinguished as P^g. For the regulation of sacrifice and other ceremonial observances rules were necessary, which gradually increased in number and complexity. When these rules were first committed to writing is uncertain; there can, however, be little doubt that on the fall of the kingdom and the cessation of temple worship a serious attempt would be made to preserve the traditions of worship and ceremonial as practised before the exile. On the Return these traditions were embodied in priestly *tōrōth*, or directions for the guidance of the community, and such *tōrōth* were probably revised and enlarged during the years which followed. Three groups of *tōrōth* are preserved in Leviticus, and constitute by far the greater portion of the book, viz. the *Torah* of Sacrifice (i.—vii.), the *Torah* of Purification (xi.—xv.), and the 'Holiness' code (contained in xvii.—xxvi.). As ordinances concerning sacrifice and purification reach back to the infancy of the human race, there is good reason for supposing that chs. i.—vii., xi.—xv. include some laws of an earlier age than that of P, and that some very ancient usages have been preserved in them. The redactor who incorporated them with P^g supplied introductory and connecting clauses, and adapted the ordinances to the situation as depicted by P^g by adding references to the camp, the tent of meeting, the sons of Aaron, etc. In the present text further additions, belonging to a later stratum of P, such as those pointed out above in *Introd.* § 2 and p. 15, can be traced.

Thus three stages may be discriminated as those of (1) priority to P; (2) amalgamation with P; (3) subsequent additions. Some parts may have escaped the supplementary stage, but it is highly probable that all the laws in passing through the first and second stages have been modified in greater or less degree before assuming their present form

(cp. *Oxf. Hex.* xiii. § 7 (β) (γ) and §§ 9, 10). The additions to P^g here described are denoted by P^{g1} and P^{g2} in *Oxf. Hex.*, and are elsewhere referred to under these symbols.

It will be seen from what has been said that the groundwork (P^g) of the Priestly Code, unlike the subsequent additions, may be recognised by the fact that the institutions with which it deals are set in a historical framework. A large part of the Book of Leviticus consists of additions (P^t or P^s), even apart from the Holiness legislation (xvii.—xxvi. = H). Some of these additions are comparatively trifling in point of length. Others are more considerable. Chs. i.—vii. (carrying on chs. xxx. ff. of Exodus) are an insertion (in the main P^s) which breaks the connexion between the instructions given in Ex. xxix. (P^g) for the observances, sacrificial and other, in connexion with the installation of Aaron and his sons, and the narrative (Lev. viii.—x.) of the carrying out of these observances. It must be observed, however, that P^s is often in itself composite. Within chs. i.—vii., e.g., we have genuine old sacrificial *tôrôth*, which may be taken as representing the ritual followed in the Temple before the Exile. Another example of P^s is presented by chs. xi.—xv. On eliminating them we see from the subject matter that ch. xvi., or rather its original kernel, must have followed closely upon the corresponding parts of ch. x. An example of the evidence of the distinction between P^g and P^s is afforded by a comparison of Lev. viii. 12 (cp. xxi. 10, 12; Exod. xxix. 7, 29, etc.), where Aaron alone receives the anointing oil, with ch. x. 7 (which with the previous *v.* is an insertion by a later hand (P^s) in what is, as to its basis, P^g), where it is implied, evidently in conformity with a developed ritual, that the priesthood generally were anointed. For other examples see *Introd.* p. xiii and notes on iv. 4—7.

These insertions in the original groundwork of P must not be supposed to be the work of any single editor. Rather they bear the marks of diversity of age and handling. But, as Cornill remarks (*Introd. to the Canonical Books of the O. T.*, p. 93), although the legislation described as the Priestly Code (P) is by no means a *literary* unity, it reveals a unity of *spirit* throughout. The growth of P in its widest sense (i.e. including P^t and P^s) may cover several centuries, dealing as it does with traditions of worship as practised before the Exile. It certainly contains diverse elements, resulting in the occasional duplication of laws and inclusion of discrepancies in legislation. Nevertheless its aim throughout is to set forth the religious history and institutions of Israel,

[1] Priestly *tôrôth*, i.e. instructions as to ritual usage.
[2] *Secondary strata* incorporated with the earlier legislation.

in order that the nation might realise its ideal position as the chosen people of God. As Kennedy (*Century Bible*, Lev. p. 23) points out, the prophet Ezekiel and P had the same object in view, but they pursued it by opposite methods. 'Ezekiel projects his ideal forward into the golden age of the future (see Ezek. xl.—xlviii.); the author of P^g throws his ideal backward into the golden age of the past, the period of the Exodus and the wilderness wanderings.' The date of composition of the groundwork may be placed not many years after the Return, which took place under the leadership of Zerubbabel in B.C. 537.

For a list of characteristic expressions of P (including P^t and P^s) occurring rarely, if at all, elsewhere, see *Introd. to the Pent.* in this series, pp. 208 ff.

We may here add the following:

afflict your souls, xvi. 29, 31, xxiii. 27 (29), 32.

among (or, in the midst of), used of the Divine presence in Israel, xv. 31, xvi. 16, xxii. 32, xxvi. 11.

bear his (their, the) iniquity, v. 1, 17, vii. 18, x. 17, xvii. 16, xix. 8, xx. 17, 19, xxii. 16.

burn(t) with (in the) fire (ritually), iv. 12, vi. 30, vii. 17, 19, viii. 17, 32, ix. 11, xiii. 52, 55, 57, xvi. 27, xix. 6 (in xx. 14, xxi. 9 it means a penalty).

that (the) soul (souls, or he) shall be cut off from (among) his (their) people (Israel), vii. 20, 25, 27, xviii. 29, xix. 8, xx. 18, xxii. 3, xxiii. 29 (30).

estimations, v. 15, 18, xxvii. 2—8 (12), 15—19, 23, 25, 27; cp. to value, xxvii. 8, 12, 14.

heave (=offer, lit. take up or off, ritually, הרים), ii. 9, iv. 8, 10, 19, vi. 10, 15, xxii. 15.

male and (or) female, iii. 1, 6, xii. 7; cp. xv. 33. Cp. every male, vi. 18, 29, vii. 6; a female, iv. 28, 32, v. 6; cp. xii. 5, xxvii. 4—7.

(his) means suffice, or according to his ability, lit. he makes his hand reach, השׂיג ידו, v. 11, xiv. 21, 30—32, xxv. 26, 47, 49, xxvii. 8.

redeem (גאל), xxv. 25, 30, 33, 48, 49, 54, xxvii. 13, 15, 19, 27, 31, 33.

wash (bathe) with (in) water (רחץ במים), i. 9, 13, viii. 6, 21, xiv. 8, xv. 5, etc., xvi. 4, 24, 26, 28, xvii. 15, xxii. 6.

APPENDIX III

ON THE DATE OF H AS COMPARED WITH EZEKIEL

Apart from the details of the legislation of H as compared with that of Ezekiel, there is a certain amount of similarity as well as of contrast in the setting of the two. The legislation of H is ascribed to Moses, speaking by direct command of God, and the scene is the desert of the wanderings (xxvi. 46). Ezekiel's exhortations are communicated to him in vision, and enforced by symbolical figures and symbolical actions. In the case of Lev. the ordinances are issued by a writer, or rather a school of writers, in the name of the great Lawgiver, Moses, in the form under which we now have them. In the case of Ezekiel the legislation comes direct from himself on the authority of Divine visions.

The general character of Ezekiel's precepts, apart from details, may be illustrated from the author of Deuteronomy. Both issue rules which modify considerably the existing worship, and both draw attention to the fact that they are introducing changes (Deut. xii. 8. Cp. the legislation as to the priests, sons of Zadok, Ezek. xliv. 15 f.).

For a list comparing passages in Lev. xxvi., with extracts from Ezekiel, see *Intr. to Pent.* in this Series, pp. 246—251.

In considering that list attention may be drawn in the first place to the significant fact that the parallelisms there given include many words of comparatively rare occurrence, and that their combination produces unusual and sometimes startling phrases. Moreover, 'there is also a resemblance in the grouping together of ideas and expressions. This list of identities and resemblances is without a parallel in the rest of the Old Testament' (*op. cit.* p. 253).

Those who first observed this remarkable similarity were tempted naturally to identify the compiler of H and author of ch. xxvi. with Ezekiel[1]. But this view has been rejected by more recent investigators[2] on the ground that the hypothesis yields no adequate explanation of the *differences* which exist in ch. xxvi. (as well as in H generally) alongside of the parallelisms. Nöldeke points out that in H we never

[1] So e.g. Graf, *Gesch. Bücher d. A. T.* pp. 81—83; Horst, *Lev. xvii.—xxvi., and Ezek.* pp. 69—96.

[2] So e.g. Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 67 ff.; Wellh. *Hist.*, pp. 376–384; Smend, *Ezechiel*, pp. xxvii. 314 f.; Kuenen, *Hex.* § 15. 10. See also L. B. Paton in *Presbyt. and Refd. Review*, Jan. 1896, pp. 102—106.

find Ezekiel's favourite title for God, 'the Lord Jehovah.' Klostermann[1] adduces cases where the prophet seems to be expanding a simpler original; e.g. to 'I am Jehovah' he attaches an epithet or predicate, 'I am Jehovah your God,' or 'I Jehovah have spoken.' Moreover, ch. xxvi. contains a large number of single words found nowhere else. One further argument for rejecting Ezekiel's authorship may be mentioned, viz. that the Heb. גַּם, *also*, found in *vv.* 16, 24, 28, 39, 40, 41, 42 (twice), 44, occurs but three times in the whole Book of Ezekiel.

Thus the decided preponderance of critical opinion distinguishes the two writers, and further (see Appendix I) we may safely hold that at any rate the most characteristic *legislation* of H is prior to Ezekiel's day[2].

It is still a question on which weighty authorities differ, whether Ezekiel had the *hortatory* passages of H before him, or whether they were of later origin. The discussion of this point turns upon ch. xxvi. 3 ff. The language of *v.* 30 clearly shews that the sin there spoken of, viz. the worship of 'sun-images' in high places, such as was practised in the time of the later kings (Jer. viii. 2; 2 Kgs xvii. 16, and elsewhere), was familiar to the minds of those addressed. But it is still questioned whether the language of ch. xxvi., and in particular of *vv.* 27—45, is most naturally to be taken as referring on the one hand to impending, or on the other to actually existent exile. High authority can be quoted on both sides. Dillmann declares for the earlier (pre-exilic) date, holding that *vv.* 34, 35, 39, 40—45, which have a later character, are a subsequent addition. This view, in the face of the unity of style in the ch., is precarious. Klostermann (*op. cit.*) supports the

[1] *Der Pentateuch*, pp. 368 ff.

[2] So Kuenen (*Hex.* § 15. 10. 5), as regards the legislative enactments of Lev. xviii.—xx., and so Baentsch (*HG.* pp. 47—50, 81—91) for their hortatory parts as well, and for what he considers (see *LOT.*[9] notes on pp. 56, 57) to be the nucleus of chs. xxiii.—xxv. While the same is the case, speaking generally, in xxi., xxii., it is not absolutely so. Ch. xxi. 9—15 deals in detail with the position and restrictions imposed on the high priest. Ezek. on the other hand recognises no high priest, while the ceremonial restrictions which he places upon the whole class of priests (xxiv. 20, 22, 25) occupy an intermediate position between those imposed by H on the priests generally (xxi. 1—9) and those which it imposes on "the high priest among his brethren" (xxi. 10—15), exceeding the former and falling short of the latter. These facts, it should be noticed, have led Baentsch (108—115) to date the *compilation* of xxi., xxii., after the time of Ezekiel. He holds that the compiler (R^h) of these two chs. followed indeed older legislation, but is himself responsible for the framing of xxi. 10—15. Driver, however, points out (*LOT.*[9] p. 149 note) that this inference is somewhat precarious. There was already in the time of the later monarchy (see Driver's refs.) a priest marked out from the rest by a distinctive title, and holding apparently a distinctive position, which may have been marked by the additional restrictions of *vv.* 10—15. Driver adds that the position assigned by Ezek. to "the prince" (xliv. 3 etc.) may have made a high priest such as H legislates for no longer necessary.

pre-exilic date by another form of argument. He points out that Ezekiel's habit is to combine reminiscences from the language of his predecessors with expressions peculiar to himself. He considers accordingly that an instance of this is furnished by Ezek. iv. 17, 'pine away in their iniquity,' as a reminiscence from Lev. xxvi. 39, to which the prophet prefixes his own addition, 'be astonied one with another.' This date is also supported by Driver on the ground that Lev. xxvi. is terse and forcible in its style, while Ezekiel is diffuse, and that Lev. appears to have the advantage in originality of expression[1] and in the connexion of thought. He contrasts xxvi. 4—6, 13 with Ezek. xxxiv. 25—29. He maintains further that the certainty of *approaching* exile (which was unquestionably realised by the prophets of Jeremiah's age) would, not less than the actual exile, form a sufficient basis on which to found the promise of *vv.* 40—45, while on the other hand hardly any promise made when once the exile had become an actual fact, and least of all a promise so indefinite in its terms as that of *vv.* 40—45, could neutralise the deterrent effect of such a denunciation of disaster and exile as that contained in *vv.* 14—39[2].

On the other hand Baentsch[3], Kuenen[4], and others consider that *vv.* 40—45 belong more naturally to an age in which the penalties of national guilt are already in force.

The matter is one on which it is unsafe to dogmatize. We can, however, say confidently with Driver (*op. cit.* p. 151) that the hortatory passages of H, if earlier, can hardly at any rate be much earlier than Ezekiel. The tone of the whole is unlike that of any prophets preceding Jeremiah such as Amos or Micah, while it is still more like that of Ezekiel, while, even irrespective of the phrases common to both, it bears considerable resemblance to the prophet's style. He thus concludes that the laws of H (dating in the main from a considerably earlier time) 'were arranged in their present hortatory framework by an author who was at once a priest and a prophet, probably towards the closing years of the monarchy.'

He adds that, if we consider (as is probable on other grounds) that in Ezekiel's day H had not yet been combined with P (so as to form the present Book of Lev.), the prophet's familiarity with the former, which, though now incorporated with P, represents an earlier stage of legislation, would be thus naturally explained.

[1] He contrasts 'the pride of your power' in Lev. xxvi. 19 (where it means Israel's proud reliance on her prosperity) and in Ezek. vii. 24 (LXX.), xxiv. 21, xxxiii. 28, where it refers to the fall of Jerusalem and overthrow of the State, or in xxx. 6, 18, to Egypt.

[2] *LOT.*[8] p. 151.

[3] In Nowack's *Hand-Kommentar*, pp. 196 f.

[4] *Hex.* § 15. 9.

The general conclusion therefore is that, according as we claim priority for Lev. or Ezek., the combined legislative and hortatory settings which we term H will be assigned, in the one case to the last days of the kingdom, in the other to the exile; and the importance of this conclusion consists in the fact that not many years (at latest) after the reform under Josiah two strikingly similar modifications in detail of earlier legislation took an authoritative place, the one a formal codification of the existing law of Israel, the other taking the shape of solemn prophetic utterance.

We have hitherto discussed in the main the relation of Ezek. to Lev. xxvi. We may add here a few remarks on passages elsewhere in H which find parallels in the language of that prophet. Such passages are[1]:

Leviticus.	Ezekiel.
xvii. 8. *Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among them.* Cp. *vv.* 3, 10, 13.	xiv. 7. *Every one of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn in Israel.* Cp. *v.* 4.
xvii. 16. *He shall bear his iniquity.* Cp. xx. 17—19, xxii. 16.	xiv. 10. *They shall bear their iniquity.* See also below.
xviii. 7. *The nakedness (of thy father)...shalt thou not uncover.* The expression is frequent in chs. xviii. and xx., and is described as *wickedness*[2] (R.V. mg. *enormity*) in xviii. 17, xx. 14, cp. xix. 29.	xxii. 9, 10. *...they have committed lewdness. In thee have they discovered their fathers' nakedness.* Cp. xvi. 37, xxiii. 10, 18, 29.
xix. 8. *...every one that eateth it shall bear his iniquity, because he hath profaned the holy thing of the* LORD. Cp. xx. 25. *Ye shall therefore separate*[3] *between the clean beast and the unclean.*	xiv. 10. As above. Cp. xviii. 20, xliv. 10, 12.
	xxii. 26. Her priests have...*profaned mine holy things: they have put no difference*[3] *between* the holy and the common (A.V. profane), neither have they caused men to discern between *the unclean and the clean.*

[1] A large number of these are taken from the *Oxf. Hex.* and not from *Intr. to Pent.* pp. 251 f.

[2] Heb. *Zimmah.*

[3] The Heb. word is the same in both cases.

LEVITICUS.	EZEKIEL.
xix. 13. Thou shalt not oppress thy neighbour, nor *rob*[1] him. Cp. vi. 2, 4.	xviii. 7. Hath *spoiled*[1] none by violence. Cp. *vv.* 12, 16.
xix. 15. *Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgement.*	xviii. 8. Hath withdrawn his hand from *iniquity*, hath executed true *judgement*. Cp. xxxiii. 15, *committing no iniquity*. The substantive is found in Ezek. ten times.
xix. 16. *Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale bearer among thy people; neither shalt thou stand against the blood of thy neighbour.*	xxii. 9. *slanderous* men (men that *carry tales*, A.V.) have been in thee to shed *blood*.
xix. 26. *Ye shall not eat anything with the blood.*	xxxiii. 25. *Ye eat with the blood.* Cp. xviii. 6, *hath not eaten with the blood*[2].
xix. 35. *Ye shall do no unrighteousness...in measure*[3].	iv. 11. Thou shalt drink water by *measure*. Cp. *v.* 16.
xix. 36. *Just balances ... a just ephah...shall ye have.*	xlv. 10. *Ye shall have just balances*, and *a just ephah*.
xx. 9. Everyone that *curseth*[4] *his father or his mother.*	xxii. 7. In thee they have set lightly by[4] *father and mother.*
xxi. 1—3. *There shall none defile himself for the dead among his people; except for his kin, that is near unto him, for his mother, and for his father, and for his son, and for his daughter, and for his brother; and for his sister a virgin ... which hath had no husband, for her may he defile himself.*	xliv. 25. *And they shall come at no dead person to defile themselves: but for father, or for mother, or for son, or for daughter, for brother, or for sister that hath had no husband, they may defile themselves.*
xxi. 5. *They shall not make baldness upon their head.*	xliv. 20. *Neither shall they shave their heads.*

[1] The Heb. word is identical, and similarly in the two following cases.
[2] So Toy (in Haupt's *Sacred books of the O. T.*) *ad loc* following Rob.-Sm. *Religion of the Semites*[2], 343. But see further in Camb. Bible, *Ezekiel*, *ad loc.*
[3] The Heb. word *mis'râh* occurs only once (1 Chr. xxiii. 29) outside these passages.
[4] The Heb. word is identical.

LEVITICUS.	EZEKIEL.
xxi. 14. *A widow, or one divorced, or a profane woman, an harlot; these shall he not take: but a virgin of his own people shall he take to wife.*	xliv. 22. *Neither shall they take for their wives a widow, nor her that is put away; but they shall take virgins of the seed of the house of Israel, or a widow that is the widow of a priest*[1].
xxii. 8. *That which dieth of itself, or is torn of beasts, he shall not eat to defile*[1] *himself therewith: I am the* LORD.	xliv. 31. *The priests shall not eat of anything that dieth of itself, or is torn, whether it be fowl or beast.* Cp. iv. 14. Then said I, Ah, LORD God! behold, *my soul hath not been polluted*[1]: *for from my youth up even till now have I not eaten of that which dieth of itself, or is torn of beasts...*
xxii. 15. *They shall not profane the holy things...which they offer unto the* LORD.	xxii. 26. *Her priests...have profaned mine holy things.*
xxv. 18. *Ye shall dwell in the land in safety*[2].	xxviii. 26. *They shall dwell therein securely*[2]. Cp. xxxiv. 25, 28, xxxviii. 8, 11, 14, xxxix. 6, 26.
xxv. 36, 37. *Take thou no usury of him or increase...Thou shalt not give him thy money upon usury, nor give him thy victuals for increase.*	xviii. 8. *He that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase.* Cp. *vv.* 13, 17, xxii. 12; Prov. xxviii. 8†.
xxv. 43. *Thou shalt not rule over him with rigour*[3].	xxxiv. 4. *With rigour*[3] *have ye ruled over them.* Cp. Exod. i. 13 f.

To this remarkable collection of parallelisms may be added a reference to Exod. xxxi. 13, 14*a*, which belongs to H (see Camb. Bible there), and Ezek. xx. 12, 13, 20, 21, 24, xxii. 8, xxiii. 38.

[1] The Heb. word is identical.
[2] The Heb. word is identical.
[3] The word rendered 'rigour' does not occur outside the above passages.

APPENDIX IV

THE WAVE-OFFERING

תְּנוּפָה (*Tĕnūphah*) is a noun derived from the verb הֵנִיף (*hĕnīph*) which signifies to move something to and fro, such as an iron tool (Exod. xx. 25; Deut. xxvii. 5), a sickle (Deut. xxiii. 25), the hand (2 Kgs v. 11; Is. xi. 15, xiii. 2); and denotes the corresponding action in each case. Except in two passages (Is. xix. 16, xxx. 32) it is employed in the priestly legislation to describe the ceremony of 'waving,' which was performed with parts of certain sacrifices. These sacrifices were: (1) the Peace-Offerings; (2) the ram of consecration (which was essentially a Peace-Offering) in the inauguration of Aaron and his sons (Lev. viii.); (3) the Guilt-Offering of the leper (Lev. xiv. 12); (4) the Peace-Offering of the Nazirite (Num. vi. 19, 20). Other gifts which were 'waved' were (1) the sheaf of firstfruits at the Passover and the two loaves on the fiftieth day after (Lev. xxiii. 11, 12, 17, 20); (2) the Jealousy-Offering (Num. v. 25); (3) certain cakes which were brought with the Peace-Offering, and a log of oil with the Guilt-Offering of the leper. The gold which the children of Israel brought for the service of the tabernacle is described (in the Heb.) as a 'Wave-Offering' (Exod. xxxv. 22, xxxviii. 24), and also the brass (xxxviii. 29); so the Levites, when dedicated (Num. viii.), are described four times (*vv.* 11, 13, 15, 21) as 'waved' before the Lord. In Num. viii. R.V. has 'wave-offering,' and 'wave' in mg. for 'offer,' in the other passages 'offer' and 'offering.' A.V. has 'offer' and 'offering' in all. The most complete description of the ceremony of 'waving' is found in Lev. viii. 25—29 (with which Exod. xxix. 22—26 shonld be compared). Moses took three portions from the basket of unleavened bread and laid them upon the fat and the right thigh ('shoulder' A.V.), and placed the whole in the hands of Aaron and his sons and 'waved' them before the Lord. They were then burnt upon the altar. Moses also waved the breast for a Wave-Offering, and it was his part of the sacrifice.

On this occasion (the consecration of Aaron and his sons) the ritual was of a special character, and would not be that employed at the ordinary sacrifices. But the manner in which Aaron offered the sacrifices for the people after his consecration may be taken as a precedent for the future conduct of himself and other bearers of the priestly office. The

fat portions[1] were brought to him (Lev. ix. 19), and Aaron's sons put the fat upon the breasts, and Aaron burnt the fat upon the altar and waved the breasts and the right thigh ('shoulder,' A.V.) for a Wave-Offering before the Lord (ix. 21).

Now in the consecration service the fat and the right thigh were waved and burnt before Moses waved the breast (Lev. viii. 26—29), and in the regulations for the Peace-Offering the burning of the fat is mentioned.

From a comparison of the three passages together:

viii. 27, 29	ix. 21	x. 15
fat portions and thigh waved and burnt, breast waved	fat portions burnt, breast and right thigh waved	fat portions, breast, and thigh waved

and comparing further vii. 34 and x. 14, it may be inferred that all three were waved, and in this respect the ceremonial of the consecration service was continued for subsequent Peace-Offerings, although the accounts in vii. 30—34 and ix. 19—21 do not expressly mention the waving of the fat portions. This is the traditional view which enjoins that in all Peace-Offerings the fat portions with the breast and thigh shall be waved.

In the purification of the leper the priest waved the lamb of the Guilt-Offering with a log of oil (Lev. xiv. 12, 21, 24); the sheaf of the first-fruits was to be waved (Lev. xxiii. 11, 12); two loaves on the fiftieth day were to be waved (Lev. xxiii. 17, 20).

When the days of the Nazirite's separation were fulfilled, the priest waved the shoulder with the cakes (Num. vi. 19, 20).

We may observe with regard to חָזֶה (*Chāzeh*) the *wave breast* and שׁוֹק (*shōḳ*) the *heave thigh* (Lev. vii. 34, x. 14, 15; Num. vi. 20) that the traditional explanation as to the latter is that the thigh was 'heaved' or lifted up in a ceremonial manner corresponding to the waving of the breast. But the ceremony of waving is definitely enjoined 'that the breast may be waved for a Wave-Offering before the LORD,' while no ceremonial of 'heaving' or lifting up is prescribed for the thigh.

We are told (Num. xxxi. 26 ff.) that the spoil of Midian was divided into two parts:

½ to those who went to the war, 12,000.

½ to all the congregation, called the children of Israel's half (*v.* 30).

[1] Those portions of sacrifices other than Burnt-Offerings which were consumed upon the altar. The fat, the thigh, and the breast were all waved.

$\frac{1}{100}$ of first half is to be taken as a tribute to the Lord (יְהוָה) for the priests.

$\frac{1}{50}$ of the second half to be given to the Levites, i.e.

		tribute to the L. $\frac{1}{100}$	one in 50 for Levites = 10 times that in preceding column.
675,000 sheep	337,500	675	
72,000 oxen	36,000	72	
61,000 asses	30,500	61	
32,000 women	16,000	32	
840,000			

In this passage two contributions are indicated; viz. that of the men who went out to battle (*v.* 29) and that taken out of the children of Israel's half, and called (*v.* 41) 'the tribute, which was the LORD's heave-offering.'

We may note that in the case of the ornaments taken by the officers in the war with Midian (Num. xxxi. 48—54), תְּרוּמָה (*terūmah*, 'heave-offering') and הֵרִים (*hērim*, 'to lift up') are used, though the whole of them is there given to the Lord; but this may be considered as a part of the whole booty that was brought back. תרומה is a lifting up, with the view of removing it from the rest as a contribution.

It may be added that, while 'before the LORD' is the expression which follows הניף, 'to the LORD' is that which is used with הרים.

APPENDIX V

AZAZEL

The name Azazel occurs in the Old Testament only in Lev. xvi. 8, 10, 26. From the direction in *v.* 8 about casting lots, 'one lot for the LORD, and the other lot for Azazel,' it seems clear that some personality distinct from the Divine Being is denoted, and this interpretation of the word is accepted by most modern, and some ancient writers.

In the book of Enoch (ed. Charles 1893, or in Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. pp. 191 ff.) the brief account in Gen. vi. 1—4 concerning the union of 'the sons of God' with 'the daughters of men' is made the basis of a mythical story: the 'sons of God' become 'the angels,' who teach the daughters of men charms and enchantments, the art of working metals and making swords, knives, and ornaments.

Great violence and corruption ensue, so that the world is changed. Michael, Gabriel, and other angels accuse Azazel (Azalzel and Azael are variant forms of the name) before the Most High of being foremost in teaching all unrighteousness on earth. Azazel as the chief offender is punished: 'Bind Azazel hand and foot, and place him in the darkness: make an opening in the desert, which is in Dudael, and place him therein' is God's message to Rafael. Enoch is commissioned to announce to Azazel his punishment. There are two versions of the story; one (that given in outline here) ascribes all the sin to Azazel; in the other Azazel is tenth in order and the leader is Semjaza (see Charles, *Enoch* vi. ff. and the notes on pp. 62 ff.). Further variations are found in the book of Jubilees iv., v. The fallen angels are called 'watchers' (cp. Dan. iv. 13, 17, 23, and note in *Enoch*, p. 58).

Here is a legend in which Azazel the demon or fallen angel appears; the place of his punishment is Dudael, and the story in Gen. vi. 1—4 is the basis of the legend. Azazel is found in Lev. xvi. 8—10, 26, and references to Dudael and Gen. vi. 1—4 in the rabbinic commentaries on the passage.

According to Mishna of *Yōma* 66*a*—68*b* (Tal. Bab.) and Targ. of Ps-Jon. on Lev. xvi. 10, 22, the goat was sent to die in a rough and hard place in the rocky desert which is Beth Ḥaduda. This is the place called Dudael in the Book of Enoch, and has been identified by Schick (*Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palaestina-Vereins*, iii. 214 ff.) with the village *Bêt-ḥudêdûn*, about twelve miles E. of Jerusalem on the road to the wilderness. The place is called *Ẓōḳ* in *Yōma* (*loc. cit.*), and there described as a mountain from which the goat was pushed over on to the rocks below, and dashed to pieces before it came to the bottom. A rocky cliff near the village is no doubt the place where the scapegoat was killed.

The Targ. and Mishna describe the ceremony as performed in the time of the second temple; the former preserves the name of the place to which the goat was sent, the latter referring to it as *Ẓōḳ*, which may mean a place of *restraint* or *distress* (see Jastrow's *Lex. s.v.*), or the cliff from which the goat was thrown.

Some Jewish writers understand Azazel as the place to which the goat was sent; so Rashi (*in loc.*) and mentioned as the view of some in *Yōma* 67*b*. The latter (*loc. cit.*) quotes another explanation of the word; it denotes the sins for which the scapegoat atoned, and Rashi remarks that these sins are similar to those committed by the fallen angels, referring to the passage in Gen. vi. 1—4. R. Eliezer says that on the Day of Atonement they gave a bribe (the same word as that translated 'gift' in Exod. xxiii. 8; Deut. xvi. 19) to

Sammael, so that he should not make void their offerings, nor accuse Israel. The character attributed here to Sammael is similar to that attributed to Satan in Zech. iii., Job i., ii., where he appears as an accuser of God's servants, but under the power of the Almighty. The mention of Sammael shews that R. Eliezer did not interpret Azazel in Lev. xvi. as the being to whom the goat was sent. Ibn Ezra comments on the passage thus: 'You will get to know the secret of the word Azazel when you understand the meaning of the thirty-three verses which follow.' The thirty-third verse from that in which Azazel is first mentioned is xvii. 7, 'They shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices unto the he-goats' ('*satyrs*,' R.V.mg., '*devils*,' A.V.). Azazel is one of, or the chief of, the he-goats (satyrs or hairy ones which infest the wilderness and waste places), and to him sacrifice must not be made. But the goat sent away is no sacrifice, for it is not slaughtered. Neither is the bribe offered to Sammael to be considered as a gift, but the goat sent away is sent by God's command to him who is one of God's servants. It is as if one prepared a banquet for a king and the king commands that a portion should be given to one of his servants; the preparer of the banquet gives nothing by way of honour to the servant, but solely to the honour of the king. So the priest sets both the goats before the Lord, both are presented to Him, and the priest does not determine which is for the Lord and which for Azazel, but it is determined by lot, and God appoints which goat is to be sent to Azazel (Prov. xvi. 33). Thus by a parable the Jewish commentator explains the whole ceremonial of the Day of Atonement as sacrifice and offering presented to Him, to Whom alone may sacrifice and offering be brought.

Christian writers also have insisted on the fact that both goats are presented to the Lord, and that together they exhibit the effect of Atonement, as signifying the pardon of sin and reconciliation with God, and also the complete removal of guilt. The scapegoat is the visible sign that 'as far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us' (Ps. ciii. 12).

Although these explanations adequately vindicate the majesty of God as the One object of worship, the introduction of the scapegoat and of a spirit or demon distinguished from, if not opposed to, the Supreme Being, are elements to which parallels can be found among primitive peoples in different parts of the world. The question arises: Is there here a survival of an ancient, and possibly a superstitious, rite which has been adopted and transformed into an element of pure worship?

For man, in an elementary stage of his development, the world around is peopled with spirits and demons: thus forces which he cannot control,

shewn in the lightning and the thunder, in disease and famine, are attributed to unseen powers. The Semites regarded the desert, which was not far from them, not only as the abode of wild beasts which they could see, but of the jinn which they could not see, picturing them to themselves as hairy beings generally of animal form, with power to injure those who dared to intrude into their domain (*Rel. Sem.*[2] pp. 120 f.). These spirits of the wilderness were known to the Israelites as *sĕ'īrīm*, *hairy beings*, inhabiting along with wild beasts, desolate places. In Is. xiii. 21, xxxiv. 14, the Heb. word is translated 'satyrs'; no shepherd would venture to lead his flock where they congregate (xiii. 20); they associate with wild beasts, wolves, and jackals. In xxxiv. 14, Lilith, 'the night-monster' (R.V., 'screech-owl,' A.V.) who figures in many weird stories of Jewish folklore, is their companion. It is expressly stated in Lev. xvii. 7 that the children of Israel have done sacrifice to them, and according to 2 Chr. xi. 15, Jeroboam appointed priests for their service (in both these passages R.V. translates 'he-goats,' mg. 'satyrs,' A.V. 'devils'). If in 2 Kgs xxiii. 8 we adopt[1], instead of 'the high places of the gates,' the rendering 'the high places (or house) of the 'satyrs,' there is evidence that the cult of these demons survived in Jerusalem till the last days of the kingdom.

That this cult may have been of long standing in Israel, and perhaps borrowed from their predecessors, the Canaanites, will not appear improbable to those who know how deeply the belief in the presence of malignant spirits has been impressed upon the primitive mind. The reader may be referred to Frazer, *G.B.*[2] iii. p. 41 f. for illustration of this fact.

The idea that guilt, pain, or sickness may be transferred from one person to another, or to an animal or thing, is also widely prevalent among primitive societies. Divers means employed to effect such transference are given in Frazer, *loc. cit.* 1—39. Among them are the following: A Malagasy, in order to avoid a bloody death, was advised to mount upon the back of a bullock, to spill blood from a small vessel which he carried on his head upon the bullock's head, and then send the animal away into the wilderness (p. 14 f.). In Southern India the sins of a dead man are laid upon a buffalo calf, which is set free and never afterwards used for common purposes. In India, Turkistan, and even in Wales, cases are reported of men taking upon them the sins of a deceased person (Frazer, *op. cit.* pp. 15—19). A peculiar ceremony is described on pp. 104 f. A thick rope of grass is stretched from the top of

[1] With most moderns after Hoffmann (*ZATW.* ii. 175).

a cliff to the valley beneath, and a saddle is placed on it, on which a man sits and slides down the rope into the valley. Men are waiting at the bottom to catch him, and break the force of his descent. Formerly, if he fell from the rope he was killed by the spectators, but this practice has been forbidden by the English Government. The fact, however, that under some circumstances he was put to death seems to indicate that the whole ceremony is a mitigation of a more cruel rite in which he was thrown down from the cliff. A kid is sacrificed before the man makes the descent. The resemblance to the scapegoat of the Bible is close; the instances which have been given, and many others to be found in Dr Frazer's book, show conclusively that the scapegoat is a very ancient institution.

Thus both the scapegoat, and its destination to Azazel, may be recognised as elements of religious observance in many parts of the world which can be traced back to early times. It is not improbable that they have been included as a survival in the Levitical legislation with a view to teach through familiar symbols the truth about sin and forgiveness which is set forth in the ritual of the Day of Atonement. It may be said that if observances of this kind had been prevalent in Palestine in ancient times some mention of them would be found. But how little is really known of the life of the Israelite before the exile? Even that little is sufficient to shew that he was not averse to borrowing rites from his neighbours; not till after the exile was the exclusive character of Judaism developed.

In Europe, after centuries of professed adherence to the Christian religion, belief in witchcraft and demons survives, and superstitious practices are still observed[1]. In the East these beliefs have maintained a firmer hold, and it is more than probable that when Israel was in its own land much superstition prevailed side by side with purer prophetic teaching. The writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel afford ample evidence of corruption in the last days of the kingdom, and in earlier times the chosen people 'mingled themselves with the nations, and learned their works' (Ps. cvi. 35). The significant imagery of the scapegoat is not impaired by the consideration that similar symbolical actions may have been familiar to Israel and the surrounding nations before the Day of Atonement was instituted.

[1] See p. xxxiv.

INDEX

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY JOHN CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

GENERAL EDITORS:

A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Dean of Ely

R. ST JOHN PARRY, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College

With Introductions, Notes and Maps. Cloth. Extra fcap. 8vo.

An Introduction to the Pentateuch. By the Rev. A. T. CHAPMAN, M.A. *3s. 6d. net.*

The Book of Exodus. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D. With 11 Illustrations and 4 Maps. *3s. 6d. net.*

The Book of Numbers. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. A. H. McNEILE, D.D. With 2 Maps. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Book of Joshua. Edited by the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D. With 2 Maps. *2s. net.*

The Book of Judges. Edited by the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. With Map. *2s. net.*

The Book of Judges. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. G. A. COOKE, D.D. With Map. *2s. net.*

The Book of Ruth. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. G. A. COOKE, D.D. *1s. net.*

The Books of Judges and Ruth. In the Revised Version. As above, in one volume. *2s. 6d. net.*

The First Book of Samuel. Edited by the Very Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D. With Map. *2s. net.*

The Second Book of Samuel. Edited by the Very Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D. With 2 Maps. *2s. net.*

The First Book of the Kings. In the Authorised Version. Edited by the Rev. J. R. LUMBY, D.D. With 3 Maps. *2s. net.*

The Second Book of the Kings. In the Authorised Version. Edited by the Rev. J. R. LUMBY, D.D. With 3 Maps. *2s. net.*

The First and Second Books of the Kings. In the Authorised Version. Edited by the Rev. J. R. LUMBY, D.D. In one vol. With 5 Maps. *3s. 6d. net.*

The First Book of the Kings. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. W. E. BARNES, D.D. With Map. *2s. net.*

The Second Book of the Kings. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. W. E. BARNES, D.D. With 2 Maps. *2s. net.*

The First and Second Books of the Kings. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. W. E. BARNES, D.D. In one vol. With 2 Maps. *3s. 6d. net.*

The First and Second Books of Chronicles. Edited by the Rev. W. E. BARNES, D.D. With 2 Maps. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Edited by the Right Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D. With 3 Maps. *3s. net.*

The Book of Esther. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. A. W. STREANE, D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Book of Job. Edited by the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, LL.D., D.D. *3s. net.*

The Psalms. Edited by the Very Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.

Book I. 1—41. *2s. net.*

Books II. and III. 42—89. *2s. net.*

Books IV. and V. 90—150. *2s. net.*

The Book of Proverbs. Edited by the Ven. T. T. PEROWNE, B.D. *2s. net.*

Ecclesiastes; or, the Preacher. Edited by the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D. *3s. net.*

The Song of Solomon. Edited by the Rev. ANDREW HARPER, D.D., Edin. *1s. 6d. net.*

Isaiah. Vol. I. Chapters I—XXXIX. Edited by the Rev. J. SKINNER, D.D. With Map. *2s. 6d. net.*

Isaiah. Vol. II. Chapters XL—LXVI. Edited by the Rev. J. SKINNER, D.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Book of Jeremiah together with the Lamentations. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. A. W. STREANE, D.D. With Map. *3s. net.*

The Book of Ezekiel. Edited by the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D. *3s. net.*

The Book of Daniel. Edited by the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D. With Illustrations. *2s. 6d. net.*

Hosea. Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Books of Joel and Amos. By the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D. With Illustrations. *2s. 6d. net.*

Obadiah and Jonah. Edited by the Ven. T. T. PEROWNE, B.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

Micah. Edited by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D. *1s. net.*

Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. Edited by the Rev. A. B. DAVIDSON, LL.D., D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. Edited by the Ven. T. T. PEROWNE, B.D. *2s. net.*

The New Testament complete

The Gospel according to St Matthew. Edited by the Rev. A. CARR, M.A. With 2 Maps. *2s. net.*

The Gospel according to St Mark. Edited by the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D. With 4 Maps. *2s. net.*

The Gospel according to St Luke. Edited by the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. With 4 Maps. *3s. net.*

The Gospel according to St John. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D. With 4 Maps. *3s. net.*

The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by the Rev. J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D. With 4 Maps. *3s. net.*

The Epistle to the Romans. Edited by the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D. With Map. *2s. 6d. net.*

The First Epistle to the Corinthians. Edited by the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. With 2 Maps. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle to the Galatians. Edited by the Rev. A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, B.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle to the Ephesians. Edited by the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle to the Philippians. Edited by the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. Edited by the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Epistles to the Thessalonians. Edited by the Rev. G. G. FINDLAY, D.D. With Map. *1s. 6d. net.*

The Epistles to Timothy and Titus. Edited by the Rev. A. E. HUMPHREYS, M.A. With Map. *2s. net.*

The Epistle to the Hebrews. Edited by the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle of St James. Edited by the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D. *1s. net.*

The Epistles of St Peter and St Jude. Edited by the Very Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D. *2s. net.*

The Epistles of St John. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D. *2s. net.*

The Revelation of St John the Divine. Edited by the Rev. WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX, M.A. *2s. net.*

The Book of Psalms. With Introduction and Notes by the Very Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt top. *6s. net.*

The edition of the Psalms prepared by Dr Kirkpatrick for the "Cambridge Bible for Schools" having been completed and published in three volumes, the whole work is now also published in a single volume. The page is larger than in the separate volumes, and, a thinner paper being used, this edition will be found convenient in size, and it is thought that many readers will prefer it to the separate volumes.

The Wisdom of Solomon. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. J. A. F. GREGG, M.A. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach or Ecclesiasticus. In the Revised Version. Edited by the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D. *6s. net.*

The First Book of Maccabees. In the Revised Version. By the Rev. W. FAIRWEATHER, M.A. and J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, LL.D. With Map and Illustrations. *2s. 6d. net.*

In preparation (completing the series of the books of the Old and New Testaments)

Genesis. Edited by the Right Rev. H. E. RYLE, D.D., Dean of Westminster.

Leviticus. Edited by the Rev. A. T. CHAPMAN, M.A., Fellow of Emmanuel College.

Deuteronomy. Edited by the Rev. G. ADAM SMITH, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow.

THE REVISED VERSION FOR SCHOOLS

Edited with Introductions, Notes and Maps.
Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 6d. net each

The Book of Joshua. Edited by the Rev. P. J. BOYER, M.A.

The First Book of Samuel. Edited by the Rev. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.

The Second Book of Samuel. Edited by the Rev. R. O. HUTCHINSON, M.A.

The First Book of the Kings. Edited by the Rev. H. C. O. LANCHESTER, M.A.

Isaiah I—XXXIX. Edited by the Rev. C. H. THOMSON, M.A. and the Rev. J. SKINNER, D.D.

St Matthew. Edited by the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.

"The most approved results of recent biblical criticism are embodied in the splendid notes; but independent of its intrinsic value, there are three artistic maps incorporated in the text. An edition as remarkable for its elegance as for its high utility."—*School World*

St Mark. Edited by Sir A. F. HORT, Bart., M.A., and MARY DYSON HORT (Mrs George Chitty).

"Altogether helpful, suggestive, clear, and valuable."—*School World*

St Luke. Edited by the Rev. E. WILTON SOUTH, M.A.

St John. Edited by the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.

"A valuable contribution to Biblical study."—*Spectator*

The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by the Rt Rev. C. WEST-WATSON, D.D.

The First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. Edited by the Rev. S. C. CARPENTER, M.A.

The Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Romans. Edited by the Rev. H. W. FULFORD, M.A.

The Epistles to the Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon. Edited by the Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, M.A.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians, Timothy and Titus. Edited by the Rev. H. W. FULFORD, M.A.

The General Epistle of James and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Edited by the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.

The Epistles of Peter, John and Jude. Edited by the Rev. CLAUDE M. BLAGDEN, M.A.

The Revelation of St John the Divine. Edited by the Rt Rev. G. H. S. WALPOLE.

THE SMALLER CAMBRIDGE BIBLE FOR SCHOOLS

Revised and enlarged edition

With Introductions, Notes and Maps. 1*s. net each*

The Book of Joshua. Edited by J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, LL.D.

The Book of Judges. Edited by J. SUTHERLAND BLACK, LL.D. And **The Book of Ruth.** Edited by the Rev. A. W. STREANE, D.D. In one volume.

The First Book of Samuel. Edited by the Very Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.

The Second Book of Samuel. Edited by the Very Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.

The First Book of the Kings. Edited by the Rev. T. H. HENNESSY, M.A.

The Second Book of the Kings. Edited by the Rev. T. H. HENNESSY, M.A.

The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Edited by the Right Rev. HERBERT EDWARD RYLE, D.D.

The Book of Proverbs. Edited by the Rev. J. R. COATES, B.A.

The Books of Joel and Amos. Edited by the Rev. J. C. H. HOW, M.A.

The Gospel according to St Matthew. Edited by the Rev. A. CARR, M.A.

The Gospel according to St Mark. Edited by the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D.

The Gospel according to St Luke. Edited by the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D.

The Gospel according to St John. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D.

The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by the Rev. H. C. O. LANCHESTER, M.A.

The Gospel according to St Mark. The Greek Text. Edited with Introduction and Notes for Beginners by Sir A. F. HORT, Bart., M.A. With 2 Maps. 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

The Gospel according to St Luke. The Greek Text. Edited with Introduction and Notes for Beginners by the Rev. W. F. BURNSIDE, M.A. With 2 Maps. 3*s. net.*

In preparation, uniform with the above.

The Acts of the Apostles, in Greek for beginners.

THE CAMBRIDGE GREEK TESTAMENT FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

GENERAL EDITOR: R. ST JOHN PARRY, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College

With Introductions, English Notes and Maps
Extra fcap. 8vo, cloth

New *net* prices from January 1, 1913

The Gospel according to St Matthew. Edited by the Rev. ARTHUR CARR, M.A. *3s. 6d. net.*

The Gospel according to St Mark. Edited by the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D. *3s. 6d. net.*

The Gospel according to St Luke. Edited by the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. *4s. 6d. net.*

The Gospel according to St John. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D. *4s. 6d. net.*

The Acts of the Apostles. Edited by the Rev J. R. LUMBY, D.D. *4s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle to the Romans. Edited by R. St J. PARRY, D.D. *3s. 6d. net.*

The First Epistle to the Corinthians. Edited by the Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle to the Galatians. Edited by the Rev. A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, B.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Epistle to the Philippians. Edited by the Right Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon. Edited by the Rev. A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, B.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Epistles to the Thessalonians. Edited by the Rev. GEORGE G. FINDLAY, D.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Pastoral Epistles. Edited by the Very Rev. J. H. BERNARD, D.D. *3s. net.*

The Epistle to the Hebrews. Edited by the Very Rev. F. W. FARRAR, D.D. *3s. net.*

The General Epistle of St James. Edited by the Rev. ARTHUR CARR, M.A. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Second Epistle General of St Peter and the General Epistle of St Jude. Edited by M. R. JAMES, Litt.D. *2s. 6d. net.*

The Epistles of St John. Edited by the Rev. A. PLUMMER, D.D. *3s. 6d. net.*

The Revelation of St John the Divine. Edited by the late Rev. WILLIAM HENRY SIMCOX, M.A. Revised by G. A. SIMCOX, M.A. *4s. 6d. net.*

The Cambridge Companion to the Bible. Containing the Structure, Growth, and Preservation of the Bible, Introductions to the several Books, with Summaries of Contents, History and Chronology, Antiquities, Natural History, Glossary of Bible Words, Index of Proper Names, Index of Subjects, Concordance, Maps, and Index of Places.

Pearl Type, 16mo. from 1*s.* net; Ruby Type, 8vo. from 2*s.* 6*d.*; Nonpareil Type, 8vo. from 3*s.* 6*d.*; Long Primer Type, 8vo. 5*s.*, or without Concordance, 4*s.* 6*d.*

A Concise Bible Dictionary, based on the Cambridge Companion to the Bible, and containing a Bible Atlas consisting of 8 maps, and a complete Index.

Crown 8vo. 1*s.* net. (Post free, 1*s.* 3*d.*)

The Concise Bible Dictionary is based upon the Cambridge Companion to the Bible, the principal materials, which in the Companion are presented as a number of articles, written by different scholars, being rearranged in the form of a brief dictionary.

The History of the English Bible. By JOHN BROWN, D.D. Royal 16mo. With 10 plates. 1*s.* net in cloth, 2*s.* 6*d.* net in lambskin.

A Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period. By R. L. OTTLEY, D.D. Crown 8vo. With seven maps. 5*s.*

The Religion of Israel. A Historical Sketch. By R. L. OTTLEY, D.D. Second edition. Crown 8vo. 4*s.*

A Short Syntax of New Testament Greek. Second Edition. By the Rev. H. P. V. NUNN, M.A. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d. net.*

The Elements of New Testament Greek. By the same author.

Scripture Teaching in Secondary Schools. Papers read at a Conference held in Cambridge 10—13 April, 1912. First Year. Edited by N. P. WOOD, M.A., B.D. With a Preface by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., F.B.A. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d. net.*

Scripture Teaching in Secondary Schools. A Report of a Conference held at Oxford 22—23 April, 1913. Second Year. Edited by H. CRADOCK-WATSON, M.A. Crown 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d. net.*

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
C. F. CLAY, MANAGER
LONDON: FETTER LANE, E.C.
EDINBURGH: 100, PRINCES STREET