





IS
SEP
KIP
V.I





A
HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL
COMMENTARY
ON
THE OLD TESTAMENT,
WITH
A NEW TRANSLATION,
BY
M. M. KALISCH, PHIL. DOC., M. A.

LEVITICUS.

PART I.

CONTAINING CHAPTERS I TO X,
WITH TREATISES ON SACRIFICES AND THE HEBREW PRIESTHOOD

ENGLISH OR ABRIDGED EDITION.

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.

1867.

PRINTED BY CARL B. LORCK IN LEIPZIG.

P R E F A C E.

NINE years have elapsed since the publication of the second volume of this Commentary. But the author trusts that he has with some advantage adhered to the severe rule of the old master, "nonum prematur in annum". For though he devoted a considerable portion of the interval to the composition of his Hebrew Grammar, he never lost sight of the continuation of the work which he has made the task of his life, and which forms the centre of his studies and his reading. However, delay appeared to him, in one important respect, even more than desirable; it seemed to him almost imperative. For a survey of the intellectual history of England during the last decennium will render it manifest that a change has been wrought which it is not too much to describe as an intellectual revolution. The highest questions that concern mankind were discussed in works, which fell upon the public mind with the force of decisive battles, roused a spirit of regenerating enquiry, and tended perceptibly to alter the entire current of national thought. In general history, a new impulse was given by the labours of Buckle, who, ignoring the idea of a supernatural education of our race, attempted consistently, if too sweepingly, to deduce the stages of human progress from psychological principles no less unfailing in their operation than the laws

which govern the physical world. In the natural sciences, something like an overpowering shock was produced by the fearless and penetrating investigations of Darwin, Huxley, and Lyell, who, striving to exhibit man and the planet he inhabits, as organic parts of universal creation, courageously pierced into the mystery of the very genesis of men and things, and arrived at results startling by their boldness and incalculable in their scope and final bearing. And in the sphere of theology, an almost unprecedented commotion was caused by the "Essays and Reviews", moderate as they are in tendency and reserved in enunciation, by the acute and incisive demonstrations of Colenso, unsettling and in many cases uprooting long-cherished opinions or prejudices, and by the writings of Rénan and Strauss, which, thanks to the close literary intercommunion that has sprung up between the continent and England, found here a no less powerful echo than in the countries to which they owed their origin. Thus traditional views are questioned in every branch of science and learning; and habits of logical thought, trained and fostered by works like those of John Stuart Mill, prove an invaluable auxiliary to comprehensive and trustworthy inferences. Our own time, disdaining to receive opinions from the past as an unalterable heirloom and with unsuspecting reliance, is determined to assert the right of forming its own convictions with unfettered independence.

This general fermentation of minds, which the author could not but watch with intense interest, appeared to him peculiarly propitious for the reception of the conclusions to which he has been led by his Biblical researches. He would fain hope that he has furnished a few available stones for that new edifice which it is the labour of our age to erect; that he has aided, however humbly and modestly, in supporting by arguments derived

from his special department of study, the philosophical ideas which all genuine science at present seems eager to establish; and that he has in some slight degree succeeded in assigning to the Biblical documents their proper place in the future phases and struggles of our civilisation.

But he ventures to prefer a double request to those into whose hands this volume may fall. First, he begs them not to judge of the results unless they have patiently followed him through the chain of arguments by which the conclusions were obtained; for he has endeavoured so to arrange the facts and proofs that an attentive perusal will, he trusts, disclose their force and cogency, whereas desultory reading must lead to hasty and unjust opinions. The second request he cannot make better than in the words with which Spinoza concludes the Introduction to his *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*: "To those who are not accustomed to think rationally, I do not desire to recommend this book, since I have no reason to hope that they will in any way be gratified by it. For I know how stubbornly the mind clings to those prejudices which it has adopted under the appearance of religion. I know moreover, that it is as impossible to free the mass of men from superstition as it is to free them from fear... These therefore and all those who obstinately insist upon preconceived opinions, I do not invite to read this book, nay I would much rather wish them to leave it unnoticed, than to call forth strife by interpreting its contents perversely, and while gaining no advantage for themselves, to cause injury to others who would argue with greater freedom if they were not checked by the one fatal belief that reason must be the handmaid of theology."

It may be expedient to add a few explanations with regard to the economy of this volume.

The Biblical text may be considered from three distinct points of view:

(1.) It may be explained simply in a *positive* or *objective* manner: the expositor investigates how the last compiler or reviser understood the meaning of the parts and the connection of the whole, and he endeavours to point out both the one and the other with the utmost care and completeness; he owes this tribute of respect and reverence especially to the superior genius of the man who conceived so vast a plan as that of the Pentateuch, and who must be allowed to have possessed the ability of logical thought and style. This task has been chiefly attempted in the *general* notes of the Commentary.

(2.) Or the text may be explained *critically* and *analytically*: the expositor resolves the entire composition into its component parts; he examines and compares them, decides whether they contain differences in the conceptions or discrepancies in the statements, pursues the traces of older sources or original documents, which he distinguishes from later additions or modifications, and searches after the date and authorship of each portion; and then, on the basis of these enquiries, he draws conclusions with regard to the gradual development of religious culture among the Hebrews, and to the epoch when it attained the stage revealed in the section under consideration. This has mainly been undertaken in the *philological* remarks of the Commentary.

(3.) Or, lastly, the text may be explained *philosophically* and treated *constructively*: the expositor analyses the *absolute* truth and the *absolute* value of the records; he ascertains how far the facts are historically reliable, and how far the religious notions are philosophically true; he compares the Biblical documents with the historical traditions and religious systems of other nations; and he tests them especially by the most recent discoveries of science and the best results of speculative thought; thus he is enabled to determine to what extent

they deserve authority, and in what degree they are binding on his own time; and then he may venture, as a last step, to build up the political or spiritual history of the Bible on its own intrinsic probability, and to propound religious and philosophical truths in harmony with all the scientific and literary aids at his disposal. This has principally been aimed at in the *Treatises*, which therefore form, in a certain sense, the most important and distinctive portions of the book; and for this reason, the great extent which they occupy will neither be found surprising nor require justification; though they have rendered it impossible to compress the commentary on the whole of Leviticus into one volume.

By separating these three methods, the author believes to be enabled to do full justice to the Hebrew writers, without curtailing the claims due to science, history, and philosophy.

As of the preceding volumes, so of this one also, a larger edition is published simultaneously with this abridged one; it contains, besides the Hebrew text, philological observations and copious classical and other references, and is designed for a critical study of the subjects discussed in the volume; and though the smaller edition embodies all the main results, and will, it is hoped, be found adapted for cursory reading, the author would strongly recommend the use of the larger work to all those who desire to be acquainted with the sources of his facts and the critical evidences of his opinions. — The next volume which will conclude Leviticus, and will comprise, besides the Commentary, essays on the dietary precepts, the ordinances of purification, the marriage-laws, the festivals, and the moral teaching of the Bible, will, it is anticipated, be issued in the course of the following year, as it is in an advanced stage of preparation.

The author has every reason to feel grateful for the encouraging reception accorded to the earlier parts of this work; if, on a fair and dispassionate examination, their present successor meet even approximately with a like approval, he will be fortified hopefully to continue his labours, for the success of which he is chiefly anxious because he is convinced that the purpose to which they are devoted is intimately allied with our progress, our happiness, and even the practical regulation of our lives.

M. KALISCH.

London, April 22, 1867.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.	Page
I. The Connection between Exodus and Leviticus . . .	XI
II. Division of Leviticus	XII
III. Its illogical Arrangement	XV
IV. Its component Parts	XXI
V. Chronological Order of the Laws contained in the first ten Chapters	XXV
VI. The Name of the Book	XXXI
VII. Its Importance	—
PRELIMINARY ESSAY: ON THE SACRIFICES OF THE HEBREWS AND OF OTHER NATIONS.	
I. The Origin of Sacrifices	1
II. Relative Age of Animal and Vegetable Sacrifices . . .	8
III. History of Sacrifices among the Hebrews	11
IV. Purer Notions on Sacrifices	40
V. The Hebrew Appellation of Sacrifice and its Meaning. .	54
VI. General Survey and Classification of the Hebrew Sacrifices	57
VII. Animals and Vegetables offered	59
VIII. Qualification of the Offerings	68
IX. Symbolical Meaning of Objects connected with Sacrifices	79
1. Salt	—
2. Oil	82
3. Wine	84
4. Frank-incense	85
5, 6. Wheat and Barley	86
7. Blood	87
8. Fat	92
9. Leaven	94
10. Honey	96
11. Typical Explanation	100
X. Sacrificial Ceremonies and their Meaning	120
1. Preparation	—
2. The Time	123
3. The Place	—
4. Imposition of the Hand	126
5. Killing the Animal.	129
6. Receiving of the Blood	131
7. The Sprinkling of the Blood	132
8. The Flaying of the Animal	135
9. Dissecting the Animal	136
10. Washing the Parts of the Victim	137
11. The Rite of Waving	—

	Page
12. The Rite of Heaving	139
13. The Burning of the Offering	140
14. Sacrificial Meals	142
XI. The Bloodless Offering	148
XII. The Drink-Offering	154
XIII. The Burnt-Offering	157
XIV. The Thank-Offering	162
XV. The Sin-Offering and the Trespass-Offering	166
XVI. The Offering of Jealousy	189
XVII. The Paschal Sacrifice	190
XVIII. The Doctrine of Vicarious Sacrifice	192
XIX. The Christian Sacrifice	199
XX. The Sacrifices of the Hebrews compared with those of other Nations.	202
XXI. On Human Sacrifices in general	213
1. The Occasions on which they were offered	214
2. The Persons selected	222
3. The gradual Abolition of Human Sacrifices	225
XXII. The various Forms of Idolatry adopted by the Hebrews	232
XXIII. Human Sacrifices among the Hebrews	248
XXIV. The Views of the Pentateuch and the Hebrew Prophets on Idolatry and Human Sacrifices	257
XXV. Conclusions and general Remarks on the Theology of the Past and the Future	263
1. The Creation	265
2. Miracles	—
3. Prayer and other Devotions	274
4. Revelation	279
5. Inspiration	283
6. Prophecy	285
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY — Chapters I to VII	297
ESSAY ON THE HEBREW PRIESTHOOD	343
I. Survey of the Ordinances of the Pentateuch with respect to Priests and Levites	—
II. An Estimate of the legislative Value of these Ordinances	362
III. Fluctuations within the Pentateuch in reference to the Laws of the Priesthood	368
IV. Deviations from the Levitical Laws found in the historical Books of the Old Testament	385
V. A historical Sketch of the Origin and Growth of the Order of Priesthood among the Hebrews	395
TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY — Chapters VIII to X	407

INTRODUCTION.

I. THE CONNECTION BETWEEN EXODUS AND LEVITICUS.

THE ordinances concerning the public worship of the Hebrews which were commenced in the Book of Exodus, are continued, and in some respects completed, in Leviticus. They related, in the former Book, chiefly to the construction of the Sanctuary, and to the vestments and consecration of its ministers; while they refer in the latter, to sacrifices deemed to form the principal means of religious service, and to the duties and privileges of the priests. But the third Book unfolds, moreover, the laws and institutions designed to embody and to realise Israel's mission as "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."¹ It culminates in the doctrine "You shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy."² Thus its scope is immeasurably extended. It points out the means by which the covenant before concluded between God and Israel may be perpetually preserved and renewed. It impresses by manifold commands and symbols that the covenant can only be maintained by obedience and piety on the part of Israel, and by grace and forgiveness on the part of their God. It shows that this lofty aim is attainable, first and directly, by diligent service at the Sanctuary, by the absolute rejection of idolatry, and by the removal of every external impurity; but more unfailingly still, though less directly, by a life of virtue and rectitude. Therefore, the sacrificial and priestly regulations are followed by denunciations against every form of idolatry and superstition; by precepts upon purity in diet and in the general intercourse of life; by statutes on festivals and

¹ Exod. XIX. 6.

² Lev. XIX. 2; comp. XI. 46; XX. 7, 8, 26; XXII. 32.

holy seasons; by rules settling the relations between God, the invisible King, and the persons or the land of the Israelites¹; by commands relating to men or things sanctified by a vow; and especially by a series of laws directing the moral conduct of individuals, both in reference to their families and their fellow-men generally, defining the ties of consanguinity and the rights of property, and securing the protection of the poor and the helpless: and all these injunctions are properly concluded by a solemn blessing promised to attend their observance, and a vehement curse certain to follow their transgression. The Book, therefore, carries onward all the chief objects introduced in the preceding portion — the religious and theocratic, the political and civil, and the purely ethical. It was evidently intended as a complete and organic work, twice wound up as it is by a formula of conclusion.² It was meant to serve as a spiritual code both for individuals and the chosen people as a community. The election of Israel by Divine grace was to be justified and merited by Israel's zealous devotion. The covenant mercifully offered by God was to be converted into a covenant yearned for and treasured by Israel. Jehovah had manifested Himself as the God of the Hebrews; the Hebrews were now to prove themselves the people of God, by deed and thought, in life and faith.

II. DIVISION OF LEVITICUS.

HOWEVER, the execution of the composition falls very considerably short of its conception. The arrangement discloses indeed, in general outlines, the three great divisions of *Sacrifices*, *Purity*, and *Morals*: but the details are desultory and often illogical. Statutes which should form one division, are scattered throughout the Book, and laws belonging to different sections, are agglomerated rather than combined. The Book possesses, therefore, in many respects, a fragmentary character. It leaves to the reader the laborious task of effecting, by

¹ The year of release and of jubilee.

² Comp. XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34.

constant separation and connection of its elements, a unity of design, the absence of which painfully strikes him on careful examination. This will be obvious from the following classified survey.

I. Laws concerning Sacrifices and public Worship, Ch. I to X.

A. The principal Sacrifices, ch. I to VII.

a. First Code, ch. I to V.

1. Burnt-Offering, ch. I.
2. The Bloodless Offering, ch. II.
3. The Thank-Offering, ch. III.
4. Expiatory Offering, ch. IV and V.
 - α.* Sin-offering, ch. IV. 1—V. 13.
 - β.* Trespass-offering, ch. V. 14—26.

b. Another Code, Ch. VI and VII.

1. On the Service of the Altar of Burnt-Offering, ch. VI. 1—6.
2. On Bloodless Offerings, ch. VI. 7—11.
3. On the Bloodless Offering of the High-priest on the Day of his Initiation, ch. VI. 12—16.
4. On Sin-Offerings, ch. VI. 17—23.
5. On Trespass-Offerings, ch. VII. 1—7.
6. The Portions of Burnt-Offerings and Bloodless Offerings to be left to the Priests, ch. VII. 8—10.
7. Regulations regarding Thank-Offerings, ch. VII. 11—21.
8. Prohibition against eating the Blood and Fat of Animals, ch. VII. 22—27.
9. The Portions of Thank-Offerings falling to the Share of the Priests, ch. VII. 28—34.
10. Conclusion of this Code, ch. VII. 35—38.

B. The Consecration of the Sanctuary and its Utensils, and of Aaron and his Sons as Priests, ch. VIII to X.

- a. Consecration of the Sanctuary and of Aaron and his Sons, ch. VIII.
- b. The first public Sacrifices performed by Aaron and his Sons, ch. IX.
- c. Offence of Aaron's two eldest Sons against the sacrificial Precepts; their Death; and Commands regarding the Holiness of the Priests and their Functions, ch. X.

II. Precepts respecting Purity in Diet and Person, ch. XI to XV.

- A. Distinction between clean and unclean Animals, and Commandments with respect to them, ch. XI.

- B. On the Purity of Persons, their Garments, and their Houses, and the Means of Purification, ch. XII to XV.
- a. Impurity of Women by Childbirth, ch. XII. 1—8.
 - b. Impurity by Leprosy, ch. XIII and XIV.
 1. Leprosy of Persons, ch. XIII. 1—46.
 2. Leprosy of Garments and their Purification, ch. XIII. 47—59.
 3. Purification of a leprous Person, ch. XIV. 1—32.
 4. Leprosy of Houses and their Purification, ch. XIV. 33—53.
 - c. Uncleanness in Consequence of sexual Issues, ch. XV.
 1. Running Issue of Men, ch. XV. 1—15.
 2. Spontaneous or accidental Emission of Semen, ch. XV. 16, 17.
 3. Sexual Intercourse, ch. XV. 18.
 4. Regular Menstruation of Women, ch. XV. 19—24.
 5. Irregular or protracted Menstruation of Women, ch. XV. 25—30.
- III. Supplementary Laws respecting Sacrifices, ch. XVI. 1—XVII. 14.
- A. The Sacrifices on the Day of Atonement, ch. XVI.
 - B. Ordinances as to the Place of Sacrifice, ch. XVII. 1—9.
 - C. Repeated Prohibition of Blood, ch. XVII. 10—14.
- IV. Supplementary Ordinances regarding Purity, ch. XVII. 15, 16.
- V. Moral and civil Laws, ch. XVIII—XX.
- A. On the forbidden Degrees of Matrimony, and other Laws on sexual Intercourse, ch. XVIII (with the exception of ver. 21 treating of the Sacrifices of Moloch).
 - B. Various moral Precepts, irregularly intermixed with religious, ceremonial, and sacrificial Ordinances, ch. XIX and XX; viz.
 - a. On the Sabbath, ch. XIX. 3, 30 first half;
 - b. On idolatrous Worship and Witchcraft, ch. XIX. 4, 26 second half, 31; XX. 6, 27;
 - c. On Thank-Offerings, ch. XIX. 5—8;
 - d. On mixing different Species of Beasts or different Seeds, ch. XIX. 19;
 - e. On the Produce of young Fruit-trees, ch. XIX. 23—25;
 - f. On the Eating of Blood, ch. XIX. 26 first half;
 - g. On the Inviolability of the human Body, ch. XIX. 27, 28;
 - h. Holiness of the Sanctuary, ch. XIX. 30 second half;
 - i. Against Sacrifices offered to Moloch, ch. XX. 1—5;

- k. Repetition of some Laws regarding the forbidden Degrees of Matrimony, and sexual Intercourse in general, ch. XX. 10—21; and
- l. Repetition of the fundamental Command concerning clean and unclean Animals, ch. XX. 25.
- VI. Supplementary Precepts respecting the Priests, their Qualifications, Rights, and Duties, ch. XXI. 1—XXII. 16.
- VII. Other supplementary Laws relating to Sacrifices, the Qualification of the Victims, their Age, and other Points, ch. XXII. 17—33.
- VIII. On the Sabbaths and the Festivals — Passover, Pentecost, the Day of Memorial, the Day of Atonement, and Tabernacles, ch. XXIII.
- IX. Supplementary Laws on the Service of the Sanctuary — the Light of the Candlestick and the Shew-bread, ch. XXIV. 1—9.
- X. An Incident and Law regarding Blasphemy, ch. XXIV. 10—16.
- XI. Some Laws — mostly repetitions — concerning Violence committed against Persons or Property, ch. XXIV. 17—21.
- XII. On the Year of Release and Jubilee, and the Right of Persons and Property in Connection therewith, ch. XXV (except vers. 35—38 which refer to Usury practised against the Poor).
- XIII. Renewed Injunctions against Polytheism and Idol-worship (XXVI. 1), and Repetition of a Precept concerning the Sabbaths and the Sanctuary (XXVI. 2).
- XIV. Blessing for the Observance, and Curse for the Neglect of the Divine Commandments, ch. XXVI. 3—15.
- XV. Some supplementary Laws, ch. XXVII; viz.
- a. On Persons hallowed by a Vow, vers. 1—5;
 - b. On Animals or other Property consecrated or devoted to God, vers. 9—29; and
 - c. On Tithes, vers. 30—33.

III. ITS ILLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT.

LET the reader carefully examine this digest, and he cannot fail to be struck by bounds and gaps, repetitions and interpolations almost too numerous to point out. The precept with regard to the hides of burnt-offerings stands entirely isolated.¹ The laws on the portions of bloodless offerings to be left to the priests are dismembered.² The injunction which forbids the eating of fat and blood,³ which should conclude the laws of sacri-

¹ VII. 8.

² VI. 7—11 and VII. 9, 10.

³ VII. 22—27.

fice, interrupts the regulations on thank-offerings,¹ and is later repeated in an unexpected context.² The interdiction of the worship of Moloch occurs in the midst of ordinances relating to unlawful marriages;³ and a renewed enactment against wizards and necromancy⁴ is so abrupt in the place which it occupies, that it has given offence even to orthodox writers. The introductory section on sacrifices⁵ is repeatedly supplemented, after commands on totally different subjects.⁶ The same irregularity is observed in the laws concerning the priests,⁷ and the service of the Sanctuary.⁸ The acts and means of purification ordained for lepers,⁹ are, by an intervening clause,¹⁰ unsymmetrically disjoined from the description of leprosy.¹¹ But above all, the portion designed to treat of moral and civil laws,¹² is perplexingly intermixed with a vast variety of heterogeneous precepts destroying all unity, nay every trace of continuity;¹³ it is impossible that a thoughtful legislator should have composed and promulgated such an agglomeration of laws, from which he could hardly expect any practical effect. It is of no avail to attempt a systematic classification; all efforts, however able and laborious, so far from successful, prove the incongruity still more strikingly by the forced expedients which they necessitate. Some combinations might, at first glance, recommend themselves, as for instance, the connection of the Day of Atonement¹⁴ with Purification,¹⁵ because that Day was intended to cleanse the whole nation from impurity; and so also might laws on forbidden marriages¹⁶ be brought into proximity with those on purification.¹⁷ But a closer scrutiny proves that these proposals create new difficulties which more than counterbalance the supposed advantages: for the Day of Atonement was intended to remove not only all kinds of external impurity, which were, in fact, expiated by special sacrifices throughout the year, but

¹ VIII. 11—21 and 28—34.

² XVII. 10—14.

³ XVIII. 21.

⁴ XX. 27.

⁵ Ch. I to VII.

⁶ XVI. 1—XVII. 14; XXII. 17—33.

⁷ XXI. 1—XXII. 16. ⁸ XXIV. 1—9.

⁹ XIV. 1—32.

¹⁰ XIII. 47—59.

¹¹ XIII. 1—46. ¹² Ch. XIX and XX.

¹³ See *supra* sub V. B.

¹⁴ Ch. XVI.

¹⁵ Ch. XI to XV.

¹⁶ Ch. XVIII.

¹⁷ Comp. XVIII. 24 *sqq.*

chiefly all moral defilement.¹⁸ Again, some have urged a correspondence between the Day of Atonement¹⁹ and the Year of Release and Jubilee,²⁰ which institutions they supposed to form the crowning points of the two series of laws contained in Leviticus; but this correspondence is more specious than real; for the first series also²¹ includes not only sacrificial precepts of various kinds, but also very important injunctions regarding the "impurity" of life, as on forbidden marriages, which perhaps more than any other offence fell within the operation of the Day of Atonement. It is, therefore, bold indeed to speak of "the internal unity of the laws of Leviticus", and more hazardous still to assert "their organic arrangement." The mode in which other apologists attempt to prove a systematic sequence, although establishing a few plausible connections, is too artificial and strained to convince; in order to effect even apparent relations, they are compelled to have recourse to the subtlest artifices of dialectic ingenuity. Nor is it permitted to palliate the confusion of the arrangement by observing, "The Book exhibits the *historical* progress of the legislation; consequently we must not expect to find the *laws* detailed in it in a systematic form"; for all the laws of Leviticus were, according to its own statements, promulgated in mount Sinai²² within one month, from the first day of the first month to the first day of the second in the year after the exodus.²³ The inevitable result which forces itself upon the mind of the attentive reader, coincides with that which historical and internal evidences force upon the critic, namely, that the Book of Leviticus cannot possibly be the work of one author and of one age; but that it is composed of various portions written, enlarged, and modified by different authors, in harmony with the necessities and altered conditions of their respective times. The desultory character of the Book will appear more manifestly still by the following synopsis of the portions arranged with reference to their matter, and proving at a glance, how numerous transpositions are required to

¹⁸ XVI. 21, 30, 34.

²² VII. 38; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34.

¹⁹ Ch. XVI.

²⁰ XXV.

²³ Compare Exodus XL. 17 and

²¹ Viz. that which precedes ch. XVI. Numbers I. 1.

effect even a tolerable sequence, and how many omissions are desirable to avoid useless redundancy.

I. Laws concerning Sacrifices.

1. Burnt-Offering, I. 1—9; VII. 8; I. 10—17; VI. 1—6.
2. Bloodless Offering, II. 1—3; VI. 7—11 (with the necessary modifications); II. 4—16; VII. 9, 10; VI. 12—16.
3. Thank-Offering, III. 1—16; VII. 11—21, 28—34; XIX. 5—8;¹ XXII. 29, 30.²
4. Expiatory Offering, IV. 1—5, 26; VI. 17—VII. 7.
5. General Injunctions, XVI. 1, 2; XVII. 1—9; XXII. 17—28; 31—33 (a general conclusion).
6. Prohibition of Fat and Blood,³ III. 17; VII. 22—27; XVII. 10—14; XIX. 26 (first half).

II. Laws on the Priests and the Sanctuary, VIII to X; XXI. 1—XXII. 16; XIX. 30; XXVI. 2 (second half);⁴ XXIV. 1—4,⁵ 5—9,⁶ followed by Ordinances on Vows and Sacred Property, XXVII. 1—33.⁷

III. Laws on Purity.

1. Clean and unclean Animals, and unlawful Food, XI. 1—47; XVII. 15, 16;⁸ XX. 25.⁹
2. Impurity by Childbirth, XII. 1—8.
3. Impurity by Leprosy, XIII. 1—46; XIV. 1—32; XIII. 47—59; XIV. 33—53.
4. Impurity of the Body, XV. 1—33.

IV. Civil and Moral Laws.

1. Unlawful Marriages and Intercourse, XVIII. 1—20; 22—30; XIX. 20—22; XX. 10—21.¹⁰

¹ Repetition of VII. 16—18.

² Also partial repetition of the same laws.

³ Four times repeated. The efforts made to justify these repetitions are unavailing. ⁴ Repetition of XIX. 30.

⁵ On the oil of the candlestick and the perpetual light, almost verbally repeated from Exod. XXVII. 20, 21.

⁶ Comp. Exod. XXV. 30, where the second command (on the shew-bread), though but briefly stated, stands more fitly.

⁷ Comp. Num. XXX. 3—16. — Lev. XXVII. 26, 27, ordaining the redempt-

ion of the firstborn unclean animals for their value increased by one fifth, is at variance with Exod. XIII. 13 and XXXIV. 20, which prescribe the redemption by a lamb, and with Num. XVIII. 15, which fixes the price of redemption simply at five shekels; see p. 375.

⁸ Partly repetition of XI. 39, 40; Exod. XXII. 30; comp. Deut. XIV. 21.

⁹ Comp. Exod. XXIII. 20; XXXIV. 26; Deut. XIV. 21 — threefold repetition of the same law concerning the kid and its mother's milk.

¹⁰ Comp. Exod. XX. 13; XXII. 15, 16.

2. Various Moral Precepts, XIX. 1—3 (first half),¹¹ 9; XXIII. 22;¹² XIX. 10—18,¹³ 29, 32—37;¹⁴ XX. 7—9, 22—24, 26; XXIV. 17—21;¹⁵ XXV. 35—38.
 3. On the Holiness of God, XXIV. 10—16.¹⁶
 4. Against Idol-Worship and Witchcraft, XIX. 4, 26 (second half), 31; XX. 6 and 27;¹⁷ XXVI. 1.¹⁸
 5. Against the Worship of Moloch, XVIII. 21; XX. 1—5.
 6. Inviolability of the human Body, XIX. 27, 28.
 7. On the Produce of young Fruit-trees, XIX. 23—25.
 8. On mixing Beasts or Seeds, XIX. 19.
- V. On the Sabbath and Festivals, XIX. 3, 30; XXVI. 2 (first half);¹⁹ XXIII. 1—21,²⁰ 23—44; XVI. 3—34; XXV. 9.²¹
- VI. On the Sabbath-Year and the Year of Jubilee, XXV. 1—34, 39—55.²²
- VII. Blessing for the Observance, Curse for the Transgression of the Law, XXVI. 3—46.

It is, therefore, unwarranted to affirm that “the individual laws are grouped in larger classes in which the kindred portions are placed together.” This is decidedly not the case with respect to any of the chief divisions of the Book. Its imperfect arrangement appears in still stronger light if we consider that the fourth and fifth Books contain numerous Levitical ordinances which ought logically to have been joined to the analogous regulations set forth in the third, namely

1. Election and Census of the Levites, Num. III. 5—39.
2. Substitution of Levites for firstborn Israelites, III. 44—53.
3. Service of the Priests and Levites at the Sanctuary, ch. IV.
4. A comprehensive Ordinance on Trespass-Offerings, V. 5—10.
5. The “Offering of Jealousy”, V. 11—31.

¹¹ Comp. Exod. XX. 12; XXI. 15, 17.

¹² Almost verbally repeated from XIX. 9, 10. ¹³ Ad ver. 12 comp. Exod. XX. 15. ¹⁴ Ad ver. 31 comp. Exod. XXII. 20; XXIII. 9.

¹⁵ Ver. 21 is almost a repetition of vers. 17 and 18; ad vers. 17 and 21 on murder comp. Gen. IX. 5, 6; Exod. XX. 13; XXI. 12—14: vers. 19, 20 on retaliation of limb for limb, are a close repetition of Exod. XXI. 23—25; comp. also Exod. XXII. 21—26; XXIII. 1—8.

¹⁶ Comp. Exod. XX. 7; XXII. 27.

¹⁷ Repetitions of XIX. 26.

¹⁸ Comp. Exod. XX. 3—5; XXII. 19; XXIII. 24, 25. ¹⁹ Repetition of XIX. 30.

²⁰ Ver. 18, on the victims to be killed at Pentecost, at variance with Num. XXVIII. 27—30.

²¹ Comp. Exod. XII. 1—20, 43—49; XVI. 23*sqq.*; XX. 8—11; XXIII. 12, 14—18; XXX. 10; Num. IX. 6—14.

²² Vers. 39—46, a law on Hebrew slaves, at variance with Exod. XXI. 1—11; comp. also Exod. XXIII. 10, 11; Lev. XXVII. 17—24.

6. Once more an Account of the Erection, Anointing, and Consecration of the Tabernacle and its Utensils; and Sacrifices of the Chiefs of the twelve Tribes in Honour of the Dedication of the Altar, VII. 1—88.
7. On the Candlestick and its Lights, VIII. 1—4.
8. Initiation of the Levites, VIII. 5—22.
9. On the Period of Life during which the Levites are bound to do active Service at the Sanctuary, VIII. 23—26.
10. On the Drink-Offering, XV. 1—16.
11. The "Firstfruit of the Dough", XV. 17—21.
12. The Sin-Offering of the Community and of Individuals, XV. 22—31.
13. Functions and relative Position of Priests and Levites, XVIII. 1—7.
14. Revenues of Priests and Levites, XVIII. 8—32.¹
15. The Ordinance of the "Red Cow" and Laws of Purification, ch. XIX.
16. The Sacrifices to be presented on Week-days, New-moons, and the five great Festivals, ch. XXVIII and XXIX.
17. On Levitical Towns, XXXV. 1—8.
18. Sacrifices at the central Sanctuary, Deut. XII. 11—18, 26, 27.
19. Laws of Tithes, XIV. 22—29 (comp. XXVI. 12—15).
20. Laws on Firstborn Animals, XV. 19—23.
21. On Festivals (Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles), XVI. 1—17.
22. On Faultlessness of the Victims, XVII. 1.
23. Priestly Revenues, XVIII. 1—8.
24. On Vows, XXIII. 22—24.
25. Directions of Priests to be obeyed in cases of Leprosy, XXIV. 8.
26. Offering of the Firstfruits, XXVI. 1—11.

It will be seen that these portions would also demand very considerable transpositions to produce anything like systematic sequence among themselves; while in order to insert them into their fit places in the code of Leviticus, they would require to be totally disjoined. These circumstances throw light on the origin and peculiar composition of the whole Pentateuch, which will be discussed in its due place.

¹ Comp. Exod. XXII. 28, 29; XXIII. 19.

IV. ITS COMPONENT PARTS.

INDEED the Book of Leviticus may be recognized, with sufficient distinctness, as a compilation of various smaller collections or treatises, mostly introduced under separate headings, and often terminated by proper conclusions. Thus

1. The general ceremonial of the older classes of sacrifice — holocausts, bloodless oblation, and thank-offering (ch. I to III) — formed evidently a complete section by itself, introduced by the words, "And the Lord called to Moses, and spoke to him out of the Tent of Meeting, saying, Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them", etc. So also

2. The portion treating of the fourth and latest class of sacrifice — the expiatory offerings — (ch. IV and V), headed by almost exactly the same terms (IV. 1, 2), and sub-divided into sin-offering and trespass-offering, the latter beginning with the words, "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying" (V. 14), and these again distinguished into those presented for intentional and violent offences, and those offered for inadvertent sins, both being separated by the same formula, "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying" (V. 20), entirely in harmony with the history and gradual development of expiatory offerings.

3. A section containing general precepts with regard to sacrifices (ch. VI and VII), written from a different point of view, but also facilitating, by separate headings, the subdivision into the four classes — holocausts (VI. 1), bloodless oblations (VI. 12), expiatory sacrifices (VI. 17), and thank-offerings (VII. 28).²

4. A special prohibition of fat and blood with an initial phrase (VII. 22—27). But all the parts just reviewed (ch. I to VII) were no doubt intended as a complete sacrificial code, as is clearly proved by the general conclusion, "This is the law of the burnt-offering, of the bloodless offering, and of the sin-offering, and of the trespass-offering, and of the offering of consecration, and of the sacrifice of the thank-offerings, which the Lord

² Comp., however, VI. 7—11; VII. 11—21.

commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that He commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations to the Lord in the wilderness of Sinai" (VII. 37, 38).

5. Then follow accounts of the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and of their first official acts (VIII and IX) with a heading (VIII. 1);

6. The death of Nadab and Abihu and some laws brought into connection with it (ch. X, comp. vers. 8, 12); and

7. Dietary laws (ch. XI) with heading (ver. 1) and conclusion (vers. 46, 47);

Then the commandments relating to impurity (ch. XII to XV), namely

8. On women in childbirth (XII. 1—8, comp. ver. 1);

9. On leprosy, whether of persons or of garments and houses with a heading (XIII. 1) and comprehensive conclusion, "This is the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and scall, and for the leprosy of a garment and of a house, and for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright spot; to teach when it is unclean, and when it is clean: this is the law of leprosy" (XIV. 54—57); and

10. On running issues of various kinds similarly introduced (XV. 1) and finished (vers. 32, 33).

11. Next comes, in a separate section, the law respecting the Day of Atonement, with heading (XVI. 1) and conclusion (ver. 34); then follow

12. Some sacrificial precepts (XVII), to which is joined the prohibition of blood (vers. 10—14), with heading (ver. 1);

13. Injunctions against illicit marriages and intercourse (XVIII), with heading and introduction (vers. 1—5), and with conclusion and emphatic final warning (vers. 24—30); but the prohibition of the worship of Moloch is inappropriately inserted (ver. 21);

14. A group of laws, chiefly of moral import but interspersed with various other precepts (ch. XIX); it was evidently written independently of the preceding portions, as is proved by the manifold repetitions of anterior commands; and it has its own heading and introduction (vers. 1, 2), and a distinct conclusion, "Therefore shall you observe all My statutes, and all My judgments, and do them; I am the Lord" (XIX. 37); then

15. Another and similar group (ch. XX) with analogous beginning (ver. 1), but without conclusion (ver. 27);

16. Various pontifical laws (XXI. 1—XXII. 16) with several headings (XXI. 1, 16; XXII. 1) and unmistakable though vague conclusion (XXI. 24);

17. Some additional sacrificial laws (XXII. 17—33), with heading (vers. 17, 18) and full conclusion and peroration (vers. 31—33);

18. Copious ordinances concerning the festivals (XXIII) with headings and introductions (vers. 1, 2, 4, 23, 26, 33), and a comprehensive conclusion, "So Moses declared to the children of Israel the feasts of the Lord" (ver. 44), and

19. Once more precepts on the service of the Sanctuary (XXIV. 1—9), with heading (ver. 1). Then follow

20. An episode concerning the theocratic offence of the son of a Hebrew woman and an Egyptian man, with which some moral and civil ordinances are coupled (XXIV. 10—23), and

21. A section upon the Sabbath-year and the year of Jubilee (ch. XXV), with heading (ver. 1) and conclusion (ver. 55).

22. After some isolated moral and religious injunctions (XXV. 35—38; XXVI. 1, 2), we find

23. A portion containing the blessing and the curse complete in itself (XXVI. 3—45).

Here the whole collection was at first concluded as is evident from the last words, "These are the statutes, and the judgments, and the laws, which the Lord made between Him and the children of Israel in mount Sinai by the hand of Moses" (XXVI. 46). Nevertheless

24. Another section is appended concerning vows and devoted property (ch. XXVII) with a separate heading (ver. 1); after which another conclusion follows, though not so full and comprehensive as the former one, "These are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in mount Sinai" (XXVII. 34).

We are far from contending that the Book of Leviticus was compiled of the 24 portions, as of so many fragments, and composed at so many different times: on the contrary, some sections treating of distinct subjects,

and even some treating of analogous matters, may have been and probably were written at about the same period, and are possibly the productions of the same author; and the frequent occurrence of the same phrases, as "I am the Lord"¹ or "I am the Lord your God",² possibly permits the inference of an identity of authorship. But a careful examination of the whole context compels the conclusion that a few older portions formed the ground-work of the Book; that this collection of laws was enlarged and qualified by the addition and insertion of new sections or single precepts dating from later periods, till the Book finally assumed the chequered and heterogeneous form in which it was received into the canon.

Now, the questions arise, which are those older sections that may be considered the foundation or nucleus of Leviticus? When were they composed? when were the other portions added? and when was the Book closed and finally revised? It lies in the nature of the subject that questions like these can, in detail, be answered with the greatest caution only; not even the finest critical tact and intuition can guard the scholar from error; for the criteria are eminently subtle and fluctuating, and the matter is ramified with a thousand complications of Hebrew history and antiquities. For the latter reason especially, we shall here confine ourselves to a chronological analysis of the first ten chapters on which the present volume contains the commentary, and in it the arguments in support of our opinions; it seems undesirable to state results without being able to refer to the proofs which the notes on the various sections can alone adequately unfold; and the arrangement of the whole Book and the discussion on the date of its composition will, therefore, more appropriately be reserved for the next volume. The reader will, however, find scattered in the essays on Sacrifices and the Priesthood, numerous facts and arguments which will almost enable him to decide

¹ XVIII. 5, 6, 21; XIX. 12, 14, 16, 18, 28, 30, 32, 37; XXII. 2, 3, 8, 9 and 16, 30—33; XXVI. 2; comp. Num. III. 13, 41, 45.

² XVIII. 2, 4, 30; XIX. 2, 3, 4, 10, 25, 31, 34, 36; XXIII. 12, 43; XXIV. 22; XXV. 38, 55; XXVI. 1.

for himself upon these important points.³ On the first part of the Book we may propose the following conjectures with some degree of confidence.

V. CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF THE LAWS CONTAINED IN THE FIRST TEN CHAPTERS.

I. Chapters VIII to X: Consecration of Aaron and his sons as priests, and the sanctification of the Tabernacle and its vessels, in close connection with the command in Exodus (XXIX), to which, no doubt, it was originally joined as a continuous composition:⁴ the consecration (ch. VIII) is succeeded by a record of the sacrifices offered for the priests and the people on the first day after the conclusion of that ceremony, and meant to complete the preparations for the permanent service of Aaron and his sons; the last verses (23 and 24), the account of fire miraculously descending from heaven to burn the sacrifices on the altar, was appended, on the whole unskilfully and inappropriately, from an earlier document or tradition;⁵ then follows the notice of the death of Aaron's sons Nadab and Abihu in consequence of unlawful fumigation, their burial, and some laws occasioned by the event (vers. 1—7); then a fragment (vers. 8—11) containing one very special ordinance respecting abstinence from wine and other strong drink and a very comprehensive statement of sacerdotal duties; next commands concerning the priestly portions in thank-offerings (vers. 12—15); and lastly, a remarkable argument between Moses and Aaron in reference to the meat of the people's sin-offering which had been presented on the day after the consecration (vers. 16—20), an addition manifestly borrowed from another source older than that of the preceding chapter (comp. IX. 15), because it shows the sacrificial laws in a less advanced stage of development,⁶ while Moses appears in greater independence of action, and not as a mere agent absolutely guided by a higher will.⁷

³ Comp. esp. pp. 35—37, 395—406.

⁶ See notes on IX. 5—21.

⁴ See notes on VIII. 1—5.

⁷ See notes on X. 16—20, the con-

⁵ See notes on IX. 22—24.

cluding observations.

II. Chapter VI. 1—11: a short and first sketch of the sacrificial ritual, especially of the *public* burnt-offerings, written for the guidance of the *priests* and probably by a priest,¹ comprising 1. Regulations on the ceremonies to be observed at the daily holocausts, and on the perpetual fire to be maintained on the brazen altar (vers. 1—6); and 2. Directions as to the bloodless offerings (or the *minchah*, vers. 7—11) probably with some additions in both parts made by the same writer who subjoined the next portions.² This section contains therefore nothing but what concerned the proceedings and privileges of the priests, without alluding to the duties devolving upon the offering Israelite, and it refers merely to the two oldest classes of sacrifice — the holocaust and the *minchah*.

III. Chapter VI. 12—16: likewise an ordinance of a specifically sacerdotal character, relating to the bloodless offering of the High-priest on the day of his consecration, possibly of the same date as the preceding verses; it is, no doubt, of early origin; for half an omer, or the twentieth part of an ephah of flour, sufficed for a *minchah*, while later at least one tenth was demanded, and the ritual is infinitely more simple than that afterwards described (in ch. VIII).³ But considerably later is the following section,

IV. Chapter VI. 17 to VII. 7. It consists of two divisions, each introduced by the words "This is the law of", namely 1. VII. 1—7 on the trespass-offering, and 2. VI. 17—23 on the sin-offering; both are added as first injunctions on these new and later classes of sacrifice, and from the same point of view as the previous precepts concerning the holocaust and *minchah* (VI. 1—11), namely, as directions for the priests; but the section concerning the trespass-offering is older; and it illustrates the regulations respecting this latter class by reference to the primitive holocausts.⁴

V. Chapter VII. 8—10. A subsequent compiler who found the sacrificial code completed so far (VI. 1—VII. 7), appended a few ordinances on the burnt-offering and the *minchah* which appeared to him important, and he

¹ Comp. VI. 2, 18.

² See notes on VI. 1—11.

³ See notes on VI. 12—16.

⁴ See notes on VI. 17—23 and VII. 1—7.

did so from the same point of view, which pervades the whole code, namely, in the interest of the priests, determining their share in those two kinds of offering. These additions are probably even later than chapters I and II, as they claim the hides of the holocausts for the priest, and classify the priestly shares in the *minchah* on a more advanced principle.⁵

But now it was found that enactments concerning a chief class of sacrifice were entirely wanting, namely respecting the thank-offerings or *shelamim*: as these were earlier in origin than the expiatory sacrifices, they ought to have been treated of immediately after the holocaust and *minchah*; but as the latter series of laws was concluded, nothing was left but to append the ordinances on thank-offerings at the end, and in order to establish some kind of connection with the preceding series, they were likewise introduced with the words; "this is the law of"; these laws form the next portion

VI. Chapter VII. 11—21: but meanwhile a considerable period had elapsed, during which sacrifices had been habitually and numerously offered, and the sacrificial system had developed itself under the influence of an increasing priesthood; therefore the injunctions respecting the *shelamim* are much more elaborate and more detailed than those concerning the other kinds of sacrifice; the class is separated into two subdivisions, "the praise-offering" and the "vow and free-will offering"; but in spite of the external connection by "and this is the law of", the principle of the preceding commands, namely the exclusive reference to the priesthood, is not maintained; the precepts relate partly to the mode of sacrifice and the manner of the disposal of the flesh by the Israelites; the "most holy" character of the meat is enjoined with excessive severity; and everything breathes a later and rigorously Levitical character.

VII. Chapter VII. 22—27: two very old laws against eating blood and fat, founded on long usage, and added at the same time as the preceding portion or somewhat later; it was evidently desired that these prohibitions

⁵ See Comm. in loc.

should be expressly and emphatically enforced, though they were probably familiar to everyone.

Now it might be supposed that, after so many additions and appendices, the first code was finally completed. But a later priest discovered that the share of his order in the thank-offerings was not mentioned, and he supplied the omission by another appendix, in which he either recorded, fixed, or extended the actual usage of his time in that respect, and thus endeavoured to secure for his class one of the most important sources of its revenue; this is

VIII. Chapter VII. 28—34. Now he believed that the whole system of sacrifices was indeed fully treated of, and he concluded the collection of laws with a formula which it is impossible to conceive more general or more comprehensive (vers. 35—38).

Independently of the code just analysed and, on the whole, contemporaneously with it, another one was composed by a different hand (ch. I to III); it embraces, like the first, the oldest and principal sacrifices: but the point of view from which it is compiled is different; it is intended as much for the guidance of the *people* as of the priests, and is mainly confined to *private* offerings. This collection contains indeed but few contradictions if compared with the preceding one, but they are sufficient to prove the distinct origin of both. In the former, a perpetual fire on the altar is ordained (VI. 2, 5, 6), the other does not suppose such a fire to be entertained (I. 7);¹ and in the former, the hides of the holocausts are assigned to the priests (VII. 8), in the other this is at least not expressly mentioned, and the whole animal appears to have been burnt (I. 6, 9). This code begins

IX. Chapter I. 1—13, with laws on private and voluntary burnt-offerings consisting of quadrupeds; they date, on the whole, from a comparatively early time; they are indeed less Levitical than the corresponding section in the other code (VI. 1—6), as the contradict-

¹ See notes in loc.

ions just pointed out prove, but the language and general character argue their later origin. They were placed at the beginning of the Book because, in connection with the next chapters, they contain an apparently coherent system of the principal sacrifices. Then follows,

X. Chapter II. 1—13, a series of laws on bloodless oblations, much more elaborate and detailed, and manifestly evincing larger experience than the analogous ordinances in VI. 12—16; and

XI. Chapter III. 1—16, on thank-offerings if not more minute, certainly more logical and systematic than VII. 11—21.

To each of these three chapters later additions were made, it may be from the same hand, namely

XII. Chapter I. 14—17, on the burnt-offerings of birds, that is of pigeons and turtle-doves, which were but gradually admitted for such sacrifices;²

XIII. Chapter II. 14—16, of the firstfruit-offering, and the use of salt, leaven, and honey, in connection with sacrifices; though the special ordinance with respect to the firstfruit-offering would more logically have been inserted before the general regulations with regard to all classes of the *minchah* (or after ver. 10); and

XIV. Chapter III. 17, the prohibition of fat and blood, appended as abruptly as in the former code.³

At a considerably later period, the next portion concerning expiatory sacrifices⁴ was added. This complicated section must be subdivided on the following leading principles: 1. At first, intentional sins alone were deemed to require atonement, but later unintentional transgressions likewise;⁵ 2. The expiatory offerings had, for a long time, a civil and political no less than religious character, and were presented especially for offences connected with the right of property;⁶ and 3. The sheep and goat were originally the specific victims of expiatory offerings, later only and exceptionally, the young bullock was added to them, and almost exclusively for the purpose of theocratical grada-

² See notes on I. 1—9.

⁴ Chapters IV and V.

³ VII. 22—27.

⁵ See p. 169.

⁶ See p. 180.

tion.¹ By applying these principles we obtain the following arrangement.

XV. Chapter V. 20—26: on trespass-offerings in cases of intentional and violent encroachments upon the right of property; the sacrifice is a ram, besides restitution of the property increased by one fifth of its value;

XVI. Chapter V. 14—19, on trespass-offerings in cases of unintentional offences against property, whether of the Sanctuary or of private persons; the victim, the restitution, and compensation are as in the preceding instances;

XVII. Chapter V. 1—13: in the course of time the Hebrews advanced to a new class of expiatory sacrifices, the sin-offerings, which were endowed with a purely religious character, and were, as a rule, only presented for unintentional transgressions; the victim was a goat; but the separation between the trespass- and the sin-offering was as yet in its beginning; both were still approaching each other in their nature and designation, and the distinction between designed and unintentional offences was not yet strictly maintained.² Then follow, lastly,

XVIII. In chapter IV, systematic and nicely graduated ordinances respecting the sin-offering; unintentional offences alone were capable of expiation, and the victim was in certain cases a young bullock; which points argue the very late date of the section.

Three of the four subdivisions of the two chapters just discussed (IV and V) are introduced with special headings; and the four were evidently arranged by the compiler according to the relative holiness of the sacrifices, which was exactly in an inverse ratio to their antiquity; the most sacred class (ch. IV) was the latest, and the most worldly (V. 20—26) the earliest in origin.

When the second code (Chapters I to V) was thus placed before the former one (Chapters VI and VII), the comprehensive conclusion (VII. 35—38) could well

¹ See pp. 33, 34.

² Vers. 2 *sqq.*

be considered to refer to the entire collection or to the double series of laws, and the whole could therefore be looked upon as the Book of Sacrifices.

VI. THE NAME OF THE BOOK.

As the third Book of the Pentateuch contains numerous ordinances which concern the High-priest and the priests, or mark out and regulate their activity, but treats much less of the "Levites" in the stricter sense, it was rather inappropriately inscribed *Leuitikon* by the Septuagint, and hence *Leviticus* by the Vulgate. The Talmud called it more aptly, though not much more exhaustively, "The Law of the Priests" or "The Law of Sacrifices", while the Masorah designated it, without any reference to the contents, merely *Vajikra* (*and He called*), from the first word of the Hebrew text.

VII. ITS IMPORTANCE.

THE peculiar significance of Leviticus in the system of the Pentateuch is obvious. The sacrifices, constituting the centre of public worship, were the principal bond of union between the Israelites and their God; they formed a powerful agency of moral and religious training; and they helped, more effectually than any other institution, to keep alive within the nation the consciousness of its unity and its mission. But the importance of Leviticus in the economy of the New Testament is hardly less manifest: the notions of vicarious suffering and sacrificial death as a means of expiation and grace, in which the later dispensation is centred, cannot be thoroughly understood without an exact knowledge of the spirit of the Levitical laws; hence the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews exerted himself, by every effort of sagacity and dialectic ingenuity, to point out the analogy between the sacrificial doctrines of the Old and the New Covenant; for he felt how much was gained by making the precepts of Leviticus the foundation of the new creed of atonement.³

³ Whether this justifies the *typical* has been examined in its due place, acceptance of the Hebrew sacrifices, pp. 100—119.

Laws are the concrete expression of a nation's life; they reflect both its history and its political struggles; but the religious statutes reveal with singular distinctness its spiritual aspirations and higher aims; and they reveal them even if they should virtually be nothing else but proposals, and should long remain no more than ideal demands.



LEVITICUS.

I.

LAWS CONCERNING SACRIFICES AND PUBLIC WORSHIP.

CHAPTERS I TO X.

A. THE PRINCIPAL SACRIFICES.

CHAPTERS I. TO VII.

PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

ON THE SACRIFICES OF THE HEBREWS AND OF OTHER NATIONS.

I. THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICES.

WHEREVER the rite of sacrifice existed, it was the principal and most significant means of manifesting piety. It formed the centre and kernel of religious worship. It mainly called forth altars, temples, and priests. But sacrifices were offered by nearly every nation of antiquity. Their origin must, therefore, be intimately connected with the very essence of religion.

Indeed it appears that the earliest sacrifices were presented, as holocausts, from motives of *awe* and *fear*. They were designed to appease the terrible beings that were imagined to sway nature and its elements, and arbitrarily to rule over the life and death of man. They disclosed the offerer and the deity in the relative position of *slave* and *master*.

When gradually the powers of the universe were understood and partially subdued; when the fields, however reluctantly, yielded their produce, and herds and flocks multiplied on fertile pastures: an emotion of *reverential gratitude* stimulated the agriculturist and the breeder of cattle to devote the firstlings and choicest fruits of their labour to those divinities who had blessed their work, and whose future favour was implored. A feeling as between *father* and *child* prompted the offerings.

But when men finally triumphed in the hard struggle for material existence, and secured a life of ease and comfort; they were induced,

by a sentiment of *joy*, to *share* with the gods to whom they owed it, the best part of their property: sacrificial repasts were held, over which presided a spirit akin to familiarity, though exalted by veneration. It was essentially the relation between *friend* and *friend* which characterised this class of sacrifice.

Few nations proceeded beyond the three classes just specified: they presented either fear-offerings, or thank-offerings, or joy-offerings. They had indeed made most important progress in their religious education, when their feelings towards the deity had from those of the slave been refined into those of the child and of the friend; and within this circle they moved with ample freedom. Occasionally they combined two classes of sacrifice. If they had achieved a success which they attributed, not to their own strength and ability, but to the aid of a god; they devoted to him a part of their gain with mingled feelings of gratitude and submission. Thus, after military victories, they presented the most honourable part of the spoil, and not unfrequently the first captives of war. It is this frame of mind that gave existence to an important class of religious offerings — to *vows*: a person engaged in some uncertain but momentous enterprise, or menaced by some impending danger, pledged himself, in case of good fortune and deliverance, to do homage, by a self-imposed sacrifice, to the deity that had assisted him.

Yet, though vows are most valuable as a manifestation of religious sentiment, they do not advance beyond the sphere of worldliness: like the three classes of sacrifice above described, they contain an element of calculating selfishness. Two most essential steps remained to be made. It was felt in the process of time, that the worshipper must not simply pray for and accept benefits, but that he must try to deserve them; that he places a barrier between himself and the divine favour by *guilt*, which much be expiated before the altar can be approached. Thus originated *sin-offerings* and *purifications*. A last effort crowned and concluded the system of sacrifices: it centred in the consciousness of the frailty of human nature, of the “deceitfulness” of the human heart, of its evil desires and propensities. Now it appeared no longer sufficient to offer sacrifices for individual sins by which the mind felt oppressed. It was deemed necessary, incessantly to invoke the mercy of heaven to shield the heart from transgressions. Thus *humility-offerings* were presented. In this disposition, the mind yearns to realise the injunction, “you shall be holy; for I the Lord your God am holy”; it passes even to the extreme boundary of sacrifice, which it might overstep with one resolute effort, to enter the purer spheres of elevation by *prayer*. The two last classes of sacrifice, the sin- and humility-

offerings, have a tendency entirely different from that of the three former categories. They convert the altar into a tribunal, to which the offerer spontaneously submits: but while, in the sin-offering, God bears to him, the transgressor, the relation of *Judge*; in the humility-offering, the majesty of the Law itself appeals to his conscience and the divine part of his nature. Both prevailed, therefore, among nations in proportion to the refinement of their views and the spiritualisation of their religion; they were unknown to many uncultivated tribes lost in egotism and sensuality; and even the Israelites had to pass through several intermediate stages before they arrived at the highest form of expiatory offerings. But the ancient Hebrews were not permitted to proceed farther. Even the most enlightened among them, regarding, in common with the mass of the people, the oblation of material gifts as an efficient means of Divine worship, were content with preventing, as much as was in their power, the gross abuses to which that practice is liable; and with framing sacrificial laws in which they embodied their own better notions. It was reserved for a later development of religion to recognise the ceremonies as the "shadows" of the Law; though even that dispensation retained the idea of sacrifice, and made it the very centre of its scheme of redemption.

Such appears, in general outline, to have been the origin and succession of the different kinds of sacrifice. Hence it is evident that not thank-offerings, and much less sin-offerings, can have been the earliest species of sacrifices. Burnt-offerings seem, in fact, for long periods, to have been the only form of sacrifice; they appear to have been offered on all occasions, and to have included the various classes later separated and distinguished. But it must be admitted, that the infinite variety of crude conceits entertained with respect to the nature of the gods by different tribes and races, gave rise to numerous other conceptions of sacrificial worship which seriously impeded religious progress.

Some regarded the offerings simply as *presents* given to the gods in order to secure their good graces: just as in many primitive polities, subjects are not allowed to approach their *king* without a gift, that they may constantly be reminded that all their possessions properly belong to *him*. It was an old aphorism, "Presents win gods as well as kings". The ancient Hebrews were not strangers to a similar notion; they were commanded "not to appear before God empty";¹ the Hebrew names for sacrifice in general mean properly *gift* or *present*; and writers in the

¹ Exod. XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 20; Deut. XVI. 16, 17; comp. Gen. IV. 3, 4; see also XXXII. 21; Ps. XLV. 13.

latest periods warned the people not to offer faulty or valueless animals, such as, if presented to a prince or a governor, would fail to secure his gracious reception; ¹ though, of course, enlightened men proclaimed that God, the Lord of the universe, does not *require* man's poor offerings. ² Hence arose the idea that the richer the gift, the greater the favour which it secured. The Athenians could never understand why the gods so often allowed them to be defeated by the Lacedaemonians, since they always offered the fairest and most numerous, their enemies scanty and paltry sacrifices. In every invocation to the gods, an allusion to generous offerings previously presented, was deemed most efficacious, and to determine the final issue. Roman authors attributed the security and growth of the empire to the scrupulous observance of sacrificial and other rites; while, on the other hand, it is reported that the Thoës, a tribe at the confines of Thrace, who entirely neglected sacrifices, vanished utterly from the earth with their towns and property. It was made a matter of calculation or barter, how much was required to attain a certain end: for, observes Lucian, "the gods do nothing gratuitously; they sell their goods to men; health might be purchased by a calf, wealth by four oxen; a royal crown costs a hecatomb; while more trifling bounties might be acquired by a cock, a wreath of flowers, or even a handful of frankincense." On ordinary occasions, and when no great boon was demanded, no efforts were made to offer valuable gifts. The Greeks often appropriated to the gods insignificant, if not absolutely worthless parts of the victims; they were therefore taunted and ridiculed by the comic poets for the folly and selfishness which expected benefits for nothing. But when important objects were to be gained, or great events to be signalised, the *number* of sacrifices was deemed most essential. It became a matter of ambition and self-interest to slaughter hecatombs. Marius vowed one in the Cimbric war, Aemilius Paulus in the Macedonian. After the discomfiture at Lake Thrasymene, 300 bulls were sacrificed to Jupiter; white cattle to many other gods of the first rank; and to the rest victims of less value. On one occasion, the Syracusans offered 450 oxen to Jupiter. The Athenians killed annually, in commemoration of the battle of Marathon, 500 goats in honour of Artemis Agrotera. Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, offered a thousand animals of every domestic kind. At the death of Tiberius and the accession of Caligula, it is computed that about 160,000 victims, principally oxen and calves, were slaughtered in Rome. In fact, the opulent, however wicked, believed that they possessed the power of obtaining from the gods whatever they desired, and of thus triumphing over the poor or the thrifty.

¹ Mal. I. 5.

² Ps. L. 8-13; Isai. XL. 16.

From this conception there is but one step to the idea that the gods can be *forced* into compliance with the petitions of the worshippers, and this idea frequently occurs in the Hindoo mythology of later periods. The Hebrews also occasionally carried the number of sacrifices to an excess. It is reported that David, when conveying the Ark of the Covenant from the house of Obad-Edom to Jerusalem, killed an ox and a fatling after every sixth step;³ that Solomon, when his succession was secured, offered 1,000 animals;⁴ when he was anointed, 1,000 bullocks, 1,000 rams, and 1,000 lambs;⁵ and when he consecrated the Temple, 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep.⁶ It is indeed more than probable that most of these numbers are largely exaggerated; as, in fact, Solomon is finally related to have killed animals "that could not be told nor numbered for multitude."⁷ But they prove at least that the Hebrew historians not only regarded them as possible, but wished them to be considered as historical, for the greater glorification of their heroes and of the events which they recorded.

In other cases, the sacrifices were conceived as real *food* presented to the gods, who were supposed actually to consume the offering, either by eating it bodily, or by inhaling the smoke when burnt. "The gods", says Lucian, "feed on ambrosia and nectar; but they delight most in the steam of the fat that rises with the smoke of the sacrifices, and in the blood of the victims poured by the offerer round the altar." This notion has by many antiquarians been considered the first origin of sacrifices. The *lectisternia* of various ancient nations require but a passing allusion. They generally consisted of tables covered with the most delicious viands, and of sumptuous couches on which the images of the gods were placed reposing, as if actually partaking of the dainties. They were customary among the Persians. They occur in the apocryphal narrative of Bel and the Dragon in Babylon. They have been noticed among some Tartar tribes. They were familiar to the Greeks and Romans. In Homer, Neptune is described as "sitting down to the sacrificial meal and enjoying it." The gods were even considered to eat the flesh of human sacrifices; and Dionysos bore distinctive names descriptive of that attribute. The early Romans offered to Jupiter Dapalis a piece of *roast* pork with wine. We have a detailed description of the first grand *lectisternia* prepared, at Rome, in honour of Apollo, Mercury, and Neptune, Latona, Diana, and Hercules.⁸ On the Capitol, the Romans gave annually to Jupiter a banquet or *epulum*, to which Juno and Minerva

³ 2 Sam. VI. 13. ⁴ 1 Ki. III. 4. Ezra VI. 17; VIII. 35; 2 Chr. XV. 11;

⁵ 1 Chr. XXIX. 21. XXIX. 32, 33; XXX. 24; XXXV. 7 *sqq.*

⁶ 1 Ki. VIII. 63; 2 Chr. VII. 5; comp. ⁷ 1 Ki. VIII. 5. ⁸ *Lic.* V. 13.

were invited, and at which the gods reclined on a couch, while the goddesses, in accordance with Roman views of propriety, sat in chairs. Some ordinances and expressions of the Old Testament compel us to suppose, that similar notions were, in early times, entertained by the Hebrews also. The shew-bread table with the constant and regularly renewed loaves, the type of the ordinary and daily sustenance in the East, points unmistakeably to the cereal food primitively placed before the deity, though, of course, in the Pentateuch, that origin is effaced as much as was at all possible. Animal sacrifices were to be accompanied by vegetable and drink-offerings, and all oblations whatever were to be presented with salt; evidently because human repasts consist not of meat alone, but of bread and wine, and salt is indispensable in the preparation of food. The term "an offering made by fire to the Lord," used in reference to every class of sacrifice,¹ is in some passages explained by the phrase "food of the offering made by fire to the Lord",² or "food of the offering made by fire for a sweet odour";³ and the offering itself is repeatedly called *food of God*.⁴ These phrases undeniably betray the rude conceptions held by the people in its earliest stages: and even, while in exile at Babylon, the Jews, imitating the custom of the land, "prepared tables to God, and filled the goblet for Meni."⁵ But it is equally indisputable that the terms in question were gradually understood in a more spiritual or refined sense, and that they were so taken in the Pentateuch. For it is evident, that the expression an offering "for sweet odour" must have originated when the chief sacrifices consisted of incense and other fragrant substances; yet in the Pentateuch, it is retained for the most offensive smell of burnt meat and fat, hides, feathers, and flour; while, on the other hand, it is never employed with reference to the burning of frankincense. It took indeed such deep root in the language that even Josephus spoke of sacrifices as the "daily food" of God; and the apostle Paul described the voluntary gifts sent to him by the congregations as "an odour of sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God."⁶

Viewing the matter in this light, we are enabled to do justice to

¹ Lev. II. 3, 10, 11, 16; VII. 27; Num. XV. 3, 13, 11. ² Lev. III. 11.

³ Lev. III. 16; Num. XXVIII. 24; comp. Exod. XXIX. 18; Lev. I. 9, 13, 17; II. 2, 9, 12; III. 5; IV. 31; VIII. 21; XXVI. 31; Num. XV. 7, 10, 13, 14; XXVIII. 6, 13; XXIX. 2, 6; comp. also Gen. VIII. 21; 1 Sam. XXVI. 19; Ezra VI. 10; Ephes. V. 2; and Judg. IX. 13.

⁴ Lev. XXI. 6, 8, 17; XXII. 25; Ezek. XLIV. 7; especially Num. XXVIII. 2 and Mal. I. 7, 12.

⁵ Venus; Isai. LXV. 11; comp. Jer. VII. 18; Ezek. XVI. 18, 19; XXIII. 41; Daniel Sept. XIV. 3—15; Baruch. VI. 27.

⁶ *Philipp.* IV. 18; comp. Ephes. V. 2; Wisd. III. 6 (God receives the souls of the pious as a burnt-offering).

the progress of the Hebrew mind without forcing the spirit of the Pentateuch. Though acknowledging that the incense-offering burnt to Jehovah every morning and every evening in the sanctuary, corresponds with the Eastern custom of fumigating the apartments and of honouring the guests by perfumes; we are not tempted to attribute this meaning to the precept in the Levitical law. A critical knowledge of the date and origin of the latter removes the prejudices against the purity of its teaching. At the time of its compilation, the stage of gross anthropomorphism was passed. It exhibits a high degree of abstract thought in its conceptions of the deity.⁷ All admit that the Pentateuch, in the form handed down to us, shows indeed few traces of a materialistic theology; but it is asserted that most of them were carefully removed by "the revisors of the Old Testament". It is evident that a safe advance is impossible on such shifting ground: for we cannot by any possibility hope to discover the supposed original readings. Had the framers of the sacrificial laws started from anthropomorphic views, they would not have forbidden the use of leaven and honey, since leaven was considered to render the bread more palatable and more nutritious, and honey is in the East regarded as one of the choicest delicacies; while, on the other hand, instead of appointing the blood as the chief means of atonement, they would have rigorously excluded its use, because it was an abomination to taste it. Indeed the very opposite doctrine has been pronounced by a Hebrew writer of so early a date as Asaph. "I will", says God, "take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds . . . Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?"⁸ and it cannot be urged with too great emphasis, that in the expiatory or holiest class of sacrifices, the most important ritual was not the burning of the fat or of other parts of the victim, but the sprinkling of its blood.

However, the two theories just discussed, viz. that the first sacrifices were intended as *resents*, or as *food*, offered to the gods, though correct as matters of fact and experience during long periods, are so entirely unconnected with true emotions of religion, that they could form no first links in a history of the progress of sacrifices. They necessarily remained barren and isolated. For as the culture of the nations that entertained them, advanced, they were refined, modified, and improved, to be finally superseded by a very different train of ideas. They may have formed the original basis of the Hebrew holocausts and thank-offerings; but they had certainly no share in the introduction of the Hebrew sin-offerings, which were prompted by a higher disci-

⁷ Comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 136.

⁸ Ps. L. 9, 13.

pline both with regard to the requirements of the soul and the attributes of the deity.

II. RELATIVE AGE OF THE ANIMAL AND VEGETABLE SACRIFICES.

It is not devoid of interest to enquire, in what order the two great classes of sacrifice, the animal and vegetable, were originally introduced and cultivated. The question might seem capable of a summary decision from the simple consideration that vegetables were the first and most natural food of men in the earliest generations; and that hence vegetable offerings preceded all animal sacrifices. This view might derive support from that narrative in Genesis which represents the elder brother Cain as offering a bloodless, the younger Abel as slaying an animal sacrifice. It has indeed, at first glance, an appearance of probability, and has been advocated by ancient and modern authorities.

However, it is open to discussion, if not objection, from various points. First, it rests on the questionable assumption that sacrifices were presented in the very first stages of primitive existence. But the idea of sacrifices offered up to immortal beings who govern the world, presupposes a degree of culture and experience hardly acquired in the course of centuries. A decisive epoch is reached when the terrors and blessings of nature are traced to a supernatural cause, and the variable chances of human events disclose the direction of a higher wisdom: from that point again, long periods must elapse to the dawn of the notion of a divine power to be worshipped and appeased by acts of submission and self-denial — periods certainly protracted enough to allow the first attempts at breeding of cattle, and to secure the first successes. When, therefore, the impulse was felt to honour the gods by gifts, the choice was open between the produce of the fields and orchards, and the increase of the flocks and herds. What decision was most likely to be taken by untutored worshippers? Guided by the principle that the offerings were acceptable to the deity in proportion to their value, they naturally gave the preference to animal sacrifices; and they were confirmed in this view, when in the process of time, the blood was invested with the power of expiation.

Accordingly, the bloody classes of sacrifice are found, nearly everywhere, to have been in special honour. Their superiority was repeatedly and distinctly proclaimed. The emperor Julian said, "the animal sacrifice is more pleasing to the living god than the vegetable and cereal oblations"; and the acceptance of Abel's and the rejection of Cain's sacrifice have been thus accounted for. The history of antiquity

records but few deviations. Some religious systems, chiefly in middle and western Asia, in Babylonia, Syria, and Phoenicia, encouraged the vegetable offerings. They favoured especially the burning of frankincense. The Syrian goddess, at Hierapolis, was, in the spring, honoured by trees burnt in the court of her temple. The Hebrew sect of the Essenes rejected bloody sacrifices. Before the Erechtheum in Athens, there stood an altar of Jupiter, and at Delos one of Apollo Genetivus, on which no victim whatever was killed; solemn prayers alone were offered; that of Delos was hence called "the altar of the pious"; and there only Pythagoras is related to have worshipped as on an unstained spot. The altar of Venus at Paphos, and that of Mylitta or Beeltis in Babylon, were not permitted to be sprinkled with blood; they were honoured "by supplications alone and the pure flame." It was deemed inappropriate to bring blood upon the altar of the goddess of Peace, because she abhorred slaughter, or upon that of *Terminus*, because he was the guardian of concord and the witness of justice, and should, therefore, remain clean from murder. It is supposed that, at first, the anniversary of Rome's foundation was celebrated by vegetable offerings, because it was deemed right to keep that festival pure, and unpolluted by bloodshed. Most of the offerings ordained by Numa were bloodless, consisting of flour, wine, and other simple gifts. The Syrians in early times, the Pythagoraeans, some castes of the Hindoos, and a few tribes of southern Asia, that abstained from all animal food, considered vegetables alone as pious offerings. Asclepiades held animal offerings to be unnatural, and regarded, therefore, an express prohibition superfluous. Eusebius contended that the early Greeks offered vegetables only, because they did not regard the "soul" or "life" of animals as essentially different from that of men, and hence viewed the killing of beasts in the light of carnage. It was an old Attic custom, to accuse all those of murder who had taken part in an animal sacrifice, those who had fetched the water, sharpened the knife, and performed the slaughtering; till at last the instrument was declared guilty of the crime and thrown into the sea. A similar rite was observed in Athens at a sacrifice in honour of Zeus Polieus, the protector of the city: the priest who had killed the victim was obliged to flee, while the axe which he had used was brought to judgment and condemned.

However, all these instances are isolated exceptions. Nations which presented vegetable offerings exclusively to some deities, devoted animal sacrifices to others. So Bel, the god of the sun and of fire and of all animal life, received in his temple in Babylon, on two altars, old and young animals. The Hindoo sect of the Shivaites, in almost impla-

cable opposition to the Vishnuites, offered only animal sacrifices; for they looked upon Shiva as the principle of fire and of animal existence and generation. Among the Hindoos, therefore, both classes were evidently of equal antiquity: the "horse sacrifice" or Asvamedha was their chief and noblest offering; and the Vedas contain distinct precepts with regard to animal sacrifices. It is stated that though the Pythagoreans abstained from animal food, yet, if they offered an animal for themselves, they partook of its flesh: it is, therefore, manifest that they did offer, at least occasionally, animal sacrifices. The observation of Eusebius, evidently too vague to be correct, is unsupported by conclusive evidence; and the frequency of animal offerings among the Greeks requires no proof. The tradition that animals were first killed for sacrifices on the behest of an oracle, when their vast increase began to be dangerous to the fruits and fields, is utterly untrustworthy: for men offered to the gods not what they wished to destroy, but what they prized most. Porphyry indeed collects elaborate arguments against all bloody sacrifices, which he would permit exclusively for appeasing the *demons*, whether good or bad; and he contends that the gods accept more readily frank-incense, cakes, flour, and especially the firstfruits, than the most splendid animal sacrifice, especially as for this purpose not the noxious, but just the most harmless and most useful animals are killed. But the testimony of Porphyry must be received with extreme caution, since, as a strict Pythagorean, he deemed the killing of animals criminal, and was biassed by his uncompromising advocacy of an absolute abstinence from animal food, which he regarded as injurious to the body and hostile to the elevation of the soul.

It seems, therefore, safest to conclude that vegetable and animal offerings were nearly coeval in origin; that both were presented promiscuously; that agriculturists naturally offered more frequently the former, breeders of cattle more especially the latter; while the poor of either class were of course compelled to limit themselves to the former alone. The narrative in Genesis regarding the first offerings may with equal propriety be used in support of this view, since Cain and Abel are represented as *brothers*.

But the worshippers knew a sacrifice more precious still than animals, that of their fellow-men or of themselves. Hence we find human sacrifices of every form and variety practised among nearly all ancient nations. Their origin is evidently of a comparatively later date. They seem to imply a development of religious feeling carried to an enthusiastic excess, and hence to belong to a period, when the principle of sacrifice, natural, if not laudable, from certain points of view, became

pernicious and detestable by its blind and irrational exaggeration. It has indeed been supposed that the first bloody sacrifices consisted of human beings for whom animals were in later time substituted: but this view seems to involve a bound contrary to the nature of the human mind and its laws of advancement.

It will be clear from the preceding remarks that all efforts made to point out successive stages in the materials used for vegetable oblations, must be artificial. They are legitimate on the supposition only that sacrifices were nearly contemporaneous with the existence of men on earth. But this supposition has been proved to be erroneous; the first vegetable offering must, therefore, have been composed of the best and most valuable products of the earth that could be procured, the more so as even these were commonly considered as a poor substitute for the more acceptable, because more costly, sacrifice of animals. Yet it may be interesting to consider the gradations conjecturally adopted by a thoughtful ancient writer. According to Porphyry, the vegetable oblations consisted successively of herbs burnt with their leaves and roots, and often with their stalks; the fruits of trees, especially acorns presented with the leaves of the oak; of cereals, chiefly barley, coarsely ground and sprinkled over the altar, of dishes prepared from crushed barley, and burnt on the altar, or of wheat and cakes baked from wheaten flour; of the firstlings of other productions, especially flowers, consumed on the altar, whether singly or tied in wreaths; of other objects distinguished for beauty or fragrance; of wine, honey, and oil: and then only, after a long interval, and as a proof of horrid degeneracy, animals were sacrificed, killed at first from ignorance, then from wild bloodthirstiness or cowardly fear; whence men received and deserved the epithets of "godless, evil-minded, and irreligious." It is manifest that these and similar views are poetical rather than historical. They are evidently based on the legendary traditions of a golden age when men subsisted on vegetable food alone, and the whole animal creation lived in harmony and peace.¹

An order or succession with regard to the origin of sacrifices can only be proved in reference to their internal significance and tendency; and the proof has been attempted in the preceding Section.

III. HISTORY OF SACRIFICES AMONG THE HEBREWS.

It is needless to observe that the Hebrews, from very early times, offered sacrifices to their gods or God. Indeed, almost as far as their annals reach into the past, they record pious offerings designed to

¹ See Comm. on Genes. pp. 63—67.

express either submission or thankfulness. The Bible represents the first brothers as the first sacrificers, and attributes to them the two chief classes of oblations, the animal and vegetable.¹ The patriarchs are stated to have offered sacrifices on every suitable opportunity. When Noah had escaped the dangers of the Deluge, he evinced his gratitude by a magnificent offering consisting of "every clean beast and every clean fowl."² Not only did Abraham, Isaak, and Jacob build altars on various occasions when they "invoked the name of the Lord";³ but Jacob sacrificed when he had effected a reconciliation with Laban, his incensed pursuer;⁴ and again when he finally left Canaan to settle with his family in Egypt.⁵ In fact, sacrifices were considered to have been so firmly established, even in those remote generations, that a command given to Abraham for offering up his own son, was deemed possible.⁶ The patriarchal oblations comprised not only the bloodless kind,⁷ but also holocausts⁸ and animal thank-offerings.⁹ They did not, however, include the expiatory sacrifices — a significant fact which has been accounted for elsewhere.¹⁰ Moreover, sacrifices accompanied by appropriate and symbolical rites, seem from primitive times, to have been employed for the conclusion of treaties and the confirmation of solemn promises or vows.¹¹

The patriarchal sacrifices were offered on temporary altars which, as a rule, were constructed "of earth",¹² that is, of the fresh, green turf, or frequently of simple, unhewn stones "unpolluted" by the application of iron tools.¹³ For it seems that the ancients avoided the destructive metals as much as possible in connection with sanctuaries. The altars were not restricted to particular localities; it may be, that if a choice was left, hills or shady trees or groves were preferred. Among the Greeks and Romans, the altars of the upper gods were higher structures, those of the lower gods only grates not of stone, or originally holes dug in the ground and covered with wicker-work; because the sacrifices of the former deities were mostly performed on heights, those of the latter in caverns. Such distinction was of course impossible among the Hebrews. The place where the opportunity for

¹ Gen. IV. 3, 4; see pp. 8, 10.

² Gen. VIII. 20.

³ Comp. Gen. XII. 7, 8; XIII. 4, 18; XXI. 33; XXVI. 25; XXXIII. 20; XXXV.

7. On prayer in connection with sacrifice see Sect. X. 4.

⁴ Gen. XXXI. 54.

⁵ XLVI. 1. ⁶ XXII. 1—19.

⁷ Gen. IV. 3.

⁸ VIII. 20; XXII. 13.

⁹ XXXI. 54; XLVI. 1.

¹⁰ See Sect. I, pp. 2, 3.

¹¹ See Comm. on Gen. p. 234, 235, 286; comp. Deut. XXVII. 2—8; Josh. VIII. 30—35; Ps. L. 5.

¹² Exod. XX. 24.

¹³ Exod. XX. 25; Deut. XXVII. 5; see Comm. on Exod. p. 287.

the offering arose, was unhesitatingly chosen for its performance.¹⁴ God is distinctly represented to have proclaimed the principle, "In all places where I shall let My name be mentioned, I will come to thee, and I will bless thee;"¹⁵ a principle worthy of being coupled with the noble utterance, "Thus says the Lord, The heaven is My throne, and the earth My footstool: where is the house that you can build to Me? and where is the place of My rest?"¹⁶ The prophets describe the happy time when all nations of whatever clime will worship God in any place. "In that day", says Isaiah, "there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border of it to the Lord; . . . and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day and shall offer sacrifices and oblations, and shall make vows to the Lord and perform them."¹⁷ Nor was this conception foreign to other ancient nations. The Hindoos presented their chief offering of the juice of the *soma*¹⁸ in their dwellings, in a chamber appropriated to the purpose, in which a perpetual light was maintained; in fact, "there is no mention of any temple, or any reference to a public place of worship, and it is clear that the worship was entirely domestic."¹⁹ The Greeks sometimes simply laid out in the streets or hung up before their houses the firstfruits, or other fruits, or pots with dressed vegetables intended as offerings to the gods. The old Teutons did not consider it compatible with the majesty of the gods to enclose them in the walls of temples, and hence worshipped them freely in groves, as was especially the case with the goddess Hertha or Tanfana. The Scythians were not accustomed to erect images, altars, and temples, except to Mars. The Syrians in Hierapolis permitted no images of the Sun and the Moon; since these deities were manifest to every one by their splendour in the skies, and required no visible representation. The Persians sanctioned no statues and altars whatever, but "considering the heaven as Jupiter, sacrificed on a high place"; they looked upon such erections even as folly, because "they did not believe the gods to have the same nature with man", as the Greeks did. If it is, besides, remembered that, in the history of the Hebrew patriarchs, no peculiar or fixed ritual of sacrifices is prescribed; that evidently the mode of offering was left to custom or individual option; that every Hebrew was permitted to perform the rites, though these sacred functions were commonly entrusted to the most authoritative members, as the

¹⁴ Gen. VIII. 20; XXXI. 54; XLVI. 1; Exod. XXIV. 4; comp. Gen. XXVIII. 18, 19.

¹⁵ Exod. XX. 24.

¹⁶ Isai. LXVI. 1; comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 27; 2 Chr. II. 4, 5; VI. 18.

¹⁷ Isai. XIX. 19, 21; comp. vers.

22—25; Zeph. II. 11; Mal. I. 11; Zech. XIV. 20, 21; 1 Tim. II. 8; see, however, Isai. II. 2, 3; Ps. LI. 18, 21.

¹⁸ See Sect. VII. B.

¹⁹ *Wilson*, Rig-Veda I. pp. XXIII. XXIV.

chiefs of the family or the firstborn of the house;¹ and that even the Midianite priest Jethro is related to have offered to Jehovah holocausts and eucharistic sacrifices, in which Moses, Aaron, and the elders of Israel participated, because he had learnt to revere the power of the Deliverer of Israel:² it will be admitted that the allusions contained in the earlier portions of the Pentateuch with reference to primitive sacrifices, imply nothing that needs to be contested; they refer to a state of simplicity in religious worship, which bears the stamp of probability and truth. They exhibit, indeed, one very important distinction from the usages of the rest of the ancient world. The sacrifices are invariably stated to have been presented to Jehovah, the only God of heaven and earth;³ whereas it is indisputable that the belief in Jehovah wavered among the Hebrews for many centuries;⁴ that idols were made and adored even by men of pure and pious intentions;⁵ that images and religious symbols of pagan gods were placed in the very Temple of Jehovah, an act of detestable pollution;⁶ that their inveterate propensity to idolatrous iniquities was prevalent up to the time of the Babylonian captivity,⁷ when it was a well-founded complaint, "The people of Israel, with their kings, their princes, their priests, and their prophets, say to the block, Thou art my father, and to the stone, Thou hast brought me forth";⁸ and when they were reproached with surpassing in every crime and perversity even the ill-famed people of Sodom;⁹ that the fearful rites of Moloch which had contaminated the land throughout all previous periods of their history,¹⁰ were hardly abandoned at the termination of their national life, so that Ezekiel still was compelled to exclaim, "Thus says the Lord God, How? do you pollute yourselves after the manner of your fathers? and fornicate after their abominations? For when you offer your gifts, when you make your children pass through the fire, you pollute yourselves with all your idols, *even*

¹ See the Treatise on Priesthood before chapt. VIII; Sect. V.

² Exod. XVIII. 12; see Comm. on Exod. p. 237.

³ Comp. also Genes. XIV. 18—20.

⁴ Hos. IX. 1, 4, 5; X. 9; Am. II. 4; Zeph. I. 4, 5; Isai. XLVIII. 5; Jer. II. 4—9; etc.

⁵ Judg. VIII. 27; XVIII. 14, 17—19, 24; comp. Exod. XXXII. 1—6.

⁶ Jer. VII. 30; XXXII. 34; Ezek. V. 11; XXIII. 38; 2 Ki. XXI. 4, 5, 7; XXIII. 4, 7, 11, 12; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 33; comp.

Jer. VII. 9, 10; Zeph. I. 5 ("they swear by the Lord and swear also by their idol"); Ezek. VIII. 6, 10—12; 2 Ki. XVII. 33, 40; 2 Chr. XXXVI. 14.

⁷ Ezek. II. 3; V. 6, 7; XXIII. 35; Isai. LXV. 1—7.

⁸ Jer. II. 26—28; comp. IX. 13; XVI. 11; XIX. 13; XXIII. 25—27, 30 *sqq.*; XXXII. 32; Ps. CVI. 36.

⁹ Ezek. XVI. 47, 48.

¹⁰ 1 Ki. XI. 5, 7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Jer. III. 24; VII. 30, 31; XXXII. 35; Ps. CVI. 37, 38.

to this day.”¹¹ But the authors of the Book of Genesis intended to delineate the patriarchs as the special favourites of God, whom He deemed worthy of His familiar communion, guided in His truth, and shielded from the common errors of their time and people. Duly balancing this fundamental peculiarity of the narrative, we shall be bound to admit that, in its references to sacrificial acts, it judiciously abstains from introducing features not in harmony with the practice of primitive generations.

But the case is totally altered when we enter on the Biblical records of subsequent periods. The Books of Exodus and Leviticus are replete with statements which defy the laws of national development, imply a bound in religious progress destructive of all regular continuity, and strikingly contrast with the impartial testimony of history.

1. All sacrifices were thenceforth to be offered at one place exclusively, first “at the door of the Tabernacle before the Lord”, where the altar of burnt-offerings stood (Exod. XL. 6), and God was expected to “meet” the people;¹² and afterwards in the Temple to be erected in Jerusalem.¹³ Contravention of this command was considered a heinous crime. It was certain to bring down upon the offender the severest vengeance of God. Nay, later, when the Levitical system was developed in its full rigour, the injunction was extended even to animals destined for food: he who killed a beast for this purpose, whether within or without the camp, was guilty of a deed of iniquity; “Blood shall be imputed to that man; he has shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people.”¹⁴ It is, then, evident that the law in question was deemed of the utmost consequence. It was indeed regarded as one of the most effectual safeguards against heathen abuses.¹⁵ It placed the sacrifices under the direction and supervision of the appointed priests. It was designed to cement the unity and mutual good-will of the people, since all met for the holiest ends. But it is equally manifest that the precept involved insuperable obstacles which rendered its strict observance impossible.

It may be doubted whether it could be fully obeyed even during the wanderings in the desert, when the Tabernacle formed the centre of the Hebrew hosts. We have the distinct authority of the Book of Deuteronomy

¹¹ Ezek. XX. 30, 31; comp. XVI. 20, 21; XXIII. 37, 39; and in general 2Ki. XVII. 7—23; XXIII. 4—20, 24; especially Sect. XXII. where the subject is discussed in all its bearings.

¹² Exod. XXIX. 42; Lev. I. 3; IV. 4; XII. 6; XV. 14, 29; XVI. 7; XVII. 2—6;

XIX. 21; or simply “before the Lord”, as Lev. III. 1, 7, 12; IX. 2, 4, 5.

¹³ Dent. XII. 5—7, 11, 12.

¹⁴ Lev. XVII. 3—5; comp., however, Dent. XII. 15; see *infra* and Introduction.

¹⁵ Comp. Lev. XVII. 7, in connection with the preceding verses.

that such was not the case; for after commanding that no offerings should be presented at any other place but the common Sanctuary, it continues, "You shall not do after all the things which we do here this day, every man whatever is right in his own eyes."¹ But the ordinance was absolutely impracticable after the conquest of Canaan, when the people were scattered over the length and breadth of the country, both in the east and west of the Jordan. Was it possible to carry out even the comparatively limited command that bid every male Israelite to appear, with his offerings, three times annually at the national Temple?² Could one town accommodate and support such vast numbers of pilgrims? For though the males only are mentioned as the sacrificers and the offerers of festive gifts, *the whole nation* was supposed to congregate at that hollowed spot, "And thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy man-servant, and thy maid-servant, and the Levite who is within thy gates, and the stranger, and the orphan, and the widow, that are among you, in the place which the Lord thy God has chosen to let His name dwell there."³ This explicit statement is made with regard to Pentecost and the Feast of Tabernacles; it naturally applies to Passover also; for this was emphatically a domestic festival; the peculiar commands regarding the paschal lamb had the one object of symbolically impressing the *unity* of the families and of the entire people;⁴ it was to be sacrificed in no other place but at the national altar;⁵ therefore not the males alone, but entire families were obliged to attend: this is so clearly involved in the spirit of the law that it might have appeared superfluous expressly to state it. It is not easy to understand how those who lived in distant parts of the country could perform the journey from Jerusalem home, and thence again to the capital, within the short interval of the six weeks intervening between the conclusion of Passover and the Feast of Pentecost. It is incredible that they should have left their homes just within the period of the harvest and at the most pressing season of agricultural labours and duties. Could the commonwealth exist if all the citizens, abandoning their avocations and leaving their abodes, gave themselves up to periodical festivities, twice every year protracted during seven days?⁶

But the difficulty increases if we consider that sacrifices were

¹ Deut. XII. 5; see *infra*.

² Exod. XXIII. 17; Deut. XVI. 16, 17.

³ Deut. XVI. 11; comp. vers. 14, 15; and 1 Sam. I. 21 ("And the man Elkanah and all his house went up to offer to the Lord the yearly sacrifice and his vow").

⁴ Exod. XII. 3—10, 46; Deut. XVI. 4—7; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 134, 135, 137, and the notes on the special ordinances of Passover.

⁵ Deut. XVI. 5—7.

⁶ Deut. XVI. 8, 15.

ordered for many special occasions in the life of individuals. Every woman who had given birth to a child, whether male or female;⁷ whoever was healed of leprous diseases;⁸ whoever had lived in a house infested by leprous impurities;⁹ whoever had suffered from certain "running issues out of his flesh";¹⁰ was ordered to offer particular sacrifices regulated by the Law, in the Tabernacle or Temple. Can it be seriously entertained that in all these cases the injunction was literally complied with? Who can imagine the inconvenience and trouble that militated against it in the first named emergencies alone?

Again, if a man felt an internal impulse to do homage to God as the Ruler of his destinies and the Judge of his deeds, he had to travel to Jerusalem to offer a holocaust.¹¹ If he wished to evince his gratitude for Divine blessings and benefits, he could not perform his devotion by a eucharistic sacrifice at home, but was obliged to delay it till he was able to undertake the journey, whether near or distant.¹² If, oppressed by sin in its thousandfold forms, he was anxious to make atonement before God and to restore his peace of mind, he was forbidden, unless happening to live in the capital, to satisfy at once his spiritual craving.¹³ Hebrew tradition maintains that persons who lived in the provinces, offered all private sacrifices on the first great festival following the vow or obligation; but more than four months elapsed between Pentecost and Tabernacles, and nearly six months between the conclusion of Tabernacles and Passover: therefore, granted even that this arrangement is in accordance with the spirit of the law (as in many instances it certainly is not), must not the sacrifices have lost much of their beneficent influence, when after such intervals the pious frame of mind which at first prompted the sacred acts, was weakened or changed? Would not, therefore, the ordinances in question have checked, rather than promoted, the growth of religious life? Were they not calculated almost to compel the people to the erection of altars in greater proximity to their abodes, or to make them join the worship of the heathens by whom they were surrounded? The compilers of the Levitical laws cannot have been blind to this danger. If they yet insisted on their statutes with unmitigated severity, they evidently considered the effects of a scattered worship, beyond the controlling power of the priests, as even more fatal. They preferred the possibility of a less active sacrificial service to the certainty of idolatrous degeneracy. They would rather lessen the ardour, than imperil the purity of public devotion.

⁷ Lev. XII. 1—8.

⁸ XIV. 1—32.

⁹ XIV. 33—57.

¹⁰ XV. 1—15, 25—30.

¹¹ Lev. I.

¹² Lev. III.

¹³ Lev. IV. V.

But to arrive at this view, and to act accordingly, they required the guidance of long and varied experience. They saw that the Hebrews, despising the reproof and admonition of occasional teachers, were constantly leaning towards every pagan rite. They found this propensity prevailing not only during the time of the conquest and during the period of the Judges, but even after the completion of Solomon's Temple. They perceived with sorrow, that scarcely any of the lofty expectations that had been attached to that national centre, were realised. The religious and moral elevation of the people, as a whole, had not advanced. The political animosities of the tribes did not abate. On the contrary, almost immediately afterwards, an event happened — the secession of the Ten Tribes, with their adoption of the Apis-worship — which perpetuated both the political and religious rupture of the nation. The Levitical reformers were of opinion that too great laxity had up to their time been tolerated in religious matters. They were no doubt aware that the unsettled condition of the preceding epochs had not permitted severer measures. But they believed that the influence of the priests supported by the power of theocratic kings, allowed, in their age, a more peremptory course. They clung to the opinion that the *idea* of a national Sanctuary was radically sound and even imperative; and they indulged in the hope, that by a rigorous injunction of its exclusive sanctity, they might at last secure those religious and political benefits which had, at the outset, been anticipated. Hence the Deuteronomist repeatedly and distinctly enforced the command, "Take heed that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place that thou seest;"¹ "thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn . . . or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flocks" etc.;² and he extended the injunction to all vows and free-will gifts, and to the celebration of the great festivals.³ But he significantly added, "You shall not do after all the things which we do here this day, every man whatever is right in his own eyes."⁴ To what period in the history of the Israelites does this remark refer? If we consider the natural context of the narrative, it would relate to the time of the Hebrew wanderings in the desert;⁵ for the chief contents of the Book of Deuteronomy profess to have been pronounced by Moses, in the east of the Jordan, in the land of Moab, before the entrance of the people into Canaan.⁶ But that is impossible. How could the author suppose that sacrifices were offered at all places

¹ Deut. XII. 13.² *Ibid.* ver. 17.⁴ Deut. XII. 8.³ Comp. Deut. XII. 11, 14, 26, 27; XIV. 22—27; XV. 19, 20; XVI. 2, 5—7, 11, 15, 16; XXVI. 2; see also XVII. 8.⁵ Vers. 1, 9, 10.⁶ Deut. I. 1, 5; XXXI. 1 *sqq.*; see *infra* p. 38.

promiscuously, while Moses, the ostensible proclaimer of the Levitical laws, the zealous and inflexible champion of the new faith, watched and directed the people, and while the Tabernacle formed the very heart and life of the Hebrew journeys and encampments? Therefore, although not denying to that statement a certain historical value with regard to the period prior to the conquest of Palestine,⁷ we must regard it to point chiefly to the time of the Deuteronomist himself, that is, to a very late phase in the history of the Hebrew commonwealth. It almost seems to imply that the idea of one common Temple for the whole nation was, at his time, a recent and unpopular proposal which it was deemed necessary to enforce with firmness. It is an incidental admission, on his part, that priestly authority had, not even in the long interval between the age of Moses and his own, succeeded in establishing that unity of Hebrew worship which he considered the strongest support of a pure religion of Jehovah. Therefore, the final author of Leviticus, tenaciously pursuing the same idea and discarding the leniency of the Deuteronomist, interdicted sacrifices at all other places except the common Sanctuary under the awful penalty of excision;⁸ and living in an era of a complete hierarchical organisation, he could venture, from that point of view, to frame his sacrificial laws with uncompromising stringency.⁹

The history of sacrificial offerings among the Hebrews, from the time of Moses to the destruction of the first Temple, may, therefore, be sketched as follows. Whether the Hebrews performed any sacrifices in Egypt, and if so, whether they observed the traditional rites of their race, or adopted the deviating practices of the Egyptians, we have no means of ascertaining. For the Hebrew records pass over the long period of four hundred years with a few rapid outlines, while the statements of heathen writers are fanciful, contradictory, and mostly fabulous.¹⁰ However, according to national traditions, the Hebrews were, in Egypt, addicted to idolatry.¹¹ If they offered sacrifices at all, they probably, in the progress of time, imitated more and more those of the people among whom they lived. Indeed the author of the Book of Exodus considered others as dangerous and unfeasible.¹² Hence the only sacrifice attributed in the Pentateuch to the Israelites in Egypt, that of the paschal lamb, is intrinsically improbable. Not only would it pre-suppose, on the part of the Hebrews, a degree of religious culture not warranted by their

⁷ See *supra* p. 16. ⁸ Lev. XVII. 16.

⁹ Comp. p. 16 and *infra* p. 35.

¹⁰ See Comm. on Exod. pp. XVI. *sqq.*

¹¹ Josh. XXIV. 14 ("Put away the gods which your fathers served on the

other side of the stream, and in Egypt"; Ezek. XX. 7, 8; XXIII. 3, 8; comp. Exod. XXXII. 4; Lev. XVII. 7; Deut. XII. 5.

¹² Exod. VIII. 21—24; comp. V. 1—3; VIII. 1.

abject condition; but it could not possibly have been carried out in one night and before the eyes of the Egyptians. The author of the Book of Exodus introduced it as the prototype of the paschal sacrifice common in his days, which he desired to invest with sanctity and importance, and he adroitly blended it with the main thread of his narrative.¹

It is possible that, during their migrations in the desert, the Hebrews were more accustomed to the rites of sacrifice.² The zeal of Moses and his brother Aaron contributed to enforce the observance of religious ceremonials. The construction of a portable Tent, in which sacrifices were performed, as a part of the regular service, may have exercised an influence in the same direction. But it would be hazardous to conclude from these circumstances too much. The accounts of the Pentateuch prior to the occupation of Canaan, are derived from vague traditions: they require extraneous confirmation to be received as historically reliable. But this confirmation is nowhere supplied; on the contrary, everything points strongly to opposite inferences. The Pentateuch sets down the duration of the wanderings at forty years, but it barely relates the events of two. The hosts of the Israelites which, according to the Bible, amounted to upwards of two millions of souls, could not be supported, for any length of time, in a small peninsula, mostly composed of barren tracts, and ordinarily affording scanty subsistence to no more than a limited fraction of that number: the ingenuity incessantly lavished in attempts to prove such a possibility, has yet been unable to produce convincing arguments. How, then, could the multitude of beasts required by the ordinances of the Pentateuch, have been obtained and spared for the manifold classes of sacrifice? Would not the regular and daily offerings alone have absorbed more cattle than the pasturage of the district of Sinai was able to feed? At the consecration of the Tabernacle, the chiefs of the tribes are said to have offered, besides costly vessels of silver and gold, 252 animals.³ The *public* burnt-offerings amounted to no less than 1245 victims annually.⁴ The paschal festival as described to have been celebrated in the second year after the exodus, would, on a very moderate computation, have demanded between 50,000 and 60,000 lambs.⁵ How could animals be procured for the various other offerings above enumerated? Indeed the prophet Amos,⁶ generally measured and moderate in his expressions, lets God distinctly say, "Have you offered to Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, o house of Israel? But you have borne

¹ See Sect. XVII.

² Comp. Exod. XVIII. 12; XXIV. 5; etc.

³ Num. VII. 12—SS.

⁴ See Sect. XIII.

⁵ Num. IX. 1—14.

⁶ V. 25, 26.

the tabernacle of your king (idol)⁷ and the statues of your images,⁸ the star of your god which you made to yourselves." He thus corroborates by a clear and comprehensive testimony what spontaneously offers itself on a simple examination of the facts, namely, that in the desert, the Hebrews so far from offering the sacrifices later known as Mosaic, abandoned themselves to every form of Sabaeen idolatry.⁹

From the conquest of Canaan to the building of the Temple by Solomon, all sacred functions are supposed to have been performed at the Tabernacle, whether this was the magnificent and complex structure described in the Book of Exodus, or simply a portable shrine sufficient for the requirements of wandering tribes.¹⁰ Now, the Book of Joshua relates not only that the Tabernacle, which contained the Ark with the Cherubim and the two tablets of the Law,¹¹ and in which a sacred light burnt from evening to morning,¹² was by that leader brought to Shiloh and kept there;¹³ but that it was considered the only legitimate sanctuary for the performance of sacrifices: the erection of an altar at any other place was deemed revolt against Jehovah and hostile treachery against His people; the mere suspicion roused against the east-jordanic tribes, almost plunged the nation into a civil war.¹⁴ But these statements of the Book of Joshua must be subjected to very essential modifications. It is true, that at Shiloh stood a time-honoured Tent or Tabernacle of the Hebrews.¹⁵ It was, for protracted periods, probably during the whole time of the Judges up to Samuel, the chief centre of public worship.¹⁶ There, at regularly recurring seasons of the year, religious festivals were celebrated; thither the Hebrews repaired with their families, but generally not more than once a year, to perform sacrifices and vows; and there the people or their delegates assembled for national deliberations.¹⁷ But on the other hand, it is indisputable that, during the whole of this epoch, not only were public convocations held in many towns except Shiloh; but sacrifices were frequently performed at other places where the Tent did not then stand, whether these localities were believed to have been hallowed by

⁷ Perhaps Moloch, so Acts VII. 43.

⁸ Understood to mean the images of Saturn, to whom offerings were presented by the old Arabians on the seventh day, and who was conciliated by human sacrifices also.

⁹ Comp. also Isai. XLIII. 23, 24. On Ezek. XX. 25, 26 see Sect. XXI.

¹⁰ See Exod. XXXIII. 7.

¹¹ 1 Sam. IV. 3, 4; 1 Ki. VIII. 9.

¹² 1 Sam. III. 3.

¹³ Josh. XVIII. 1; XIX. 51; XXII. 9.

¹⁴ Josh. XXII. 16, 19, 22, 23, 26—29.

¹⁵ Ps. LXXXVIII. 60; comp. Josh. XVIII. 1; XIX. 51; Judg. XVIII. 31; 1 Sam. I. 7, 9, 21; II. 22; III. 3; 2 Sam. VII. 6.

¹⁶ Judg. XVIII. 31; 1 Sam. III. 3; XIV. 3; especially Jer. VII. 12.

¹⁷ Judg. XXI. 12, 19; 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; II. 19; comp. XX. 6; see Comm. on Genes. p. 506, in the explanation of the last address of Jacob.

the presence of the patriarchs, or had long been sacred spots among the Canaanites, or simply happened to offer themselves opportunely for the occasions. For we are informed that the people met also in Shechem,¹ where even a "Sanctuary of the Lord" is mentioned, certainly distinct from the Tabernacle which was then in Shiloh.² They assembled at Mizpah in Gilead,³ where Jephthah addressed his adherents "before the Lord", and at Mizpah in Benjamin,⁴ where the whole people came together "to the Lord;"⁵ at Gilgal⁶ and at Hebron.⁷ They habitually went to Bethel, Gilgal, and Beer-sheba to obtain oracles or to offer sacrifices.⁸ In some of the towns there were no doubt ancient temples or houses of worship, as is certain with respect to Bethel, Hebron, and Mizpah in Benjamin.⁹ The Israelites are expressly mentioned to have there met "before the Lord." Again it is recorded that the people *sacrificed* at Bochim¹⁰ and Bethel.¹¹ Individual households offered, in their homes, regularly private sacrifices, as the family of Jesse in Bethlehem¹² or that of Ahithophel at Giloh in Judah;¹³ though the assistance of Levites seems from comparatively early periods to have been deemed desirable.¹⁴ Gideon the Manassite presented an offering at Ophrah;¹⁵ Manoah the Danite at Zorah;¹⁶ Samuel, whether an Ephraimite or Levite, did the like at Mizpah, Ramah, Gilgal, and Bethlehem;¹⁷ Saul at Gilgal¹⁸ and during his pursuit of the Philistines;¹⁹ David in Jerusalem and on the threshing-floor of Araunah;²⁰ Absalom, with David's sanction, in Hebron;²¹ Adoniah, the son of David, near En-rogel;²² Solomon and the people, before the completion of the Temple, "in high places."²³ Elisha did not remonstrate at Naaman's avowed intention of sacrificing to Jehovah in his Syrian home;²⁴ and later prophets, as Isaiah, Zephaniah, and even Malachi hopefully predicted the time when sacrifices

¹ Josh. XXIV. 1, 26.

² XVIII. 1; XXII. 9.

³ Judg. XI. 11. ⁴ XX. 1.

⁵ Comp. XXI. 1, 5, 8; 1 Sam. VII. 5, 6; X. 17; 2 Ki. XXV. 23, 25; 1 Macc. III. 46.

⁶ 1 Sam. XI. 15; XIII. 8; XV. 21.

⁷ 2 Sam. V. 3.

⁸ Am. IV. 4; V. 5; VIII. 14; comp. Gen. XXI. 33; XXVI. 25; XLVI. 1.

⁹ Comp. Judg. XX. 18; 2 Sam. XV. 7—9; 1 Macc. III. 46.

¹⁰ Judg. III. 5.

¹¹ XXI. 4.

¹² 1 Sam. XX. 6.

¹³ 2 Sam. XV. 12; comp. Job I. 5; XLII. 8.

¹⁴ Judg. XVII. 4—13.

¹⁵ Judg. VI. 11—20, 26 *sqq.*

¹⁶ XIII. 16, 19, 20.

¹⁷ 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10, 17; IX. 12, 13; X. 8; XI. 15; XVI. 2, 5.

¹⁸ 1 Sam. XIII. 9 *sqq.*

¹⁹ XIV. 32—35; although at this time the *Ark* of the Covenant was with him in the camp; see ver. 18.

²⁰ 2 Sam. VI. 17 (comp. ver. 13); XXI. 25; comp. XV. 32.

²¹ 2 Sam. XV. 7—9.

²² 1 Ki. I. 9.

²³ 1 Ki. III. 2, 3. See Comment. on Gen. pp. 506—508.

²⁴ 2 Ki. V. 17, 19.

would be performed at all places.²⁵ Moreover, we find, after the age of Eli, the principal Tabernacle, with a regular service, at Nob, in the territory of Benjamin;²⁶ and after the bloodshed there committed by the direction of Saul,²⁷ we meet it again, in David's and Solomon's reign, at Gibeon, where it was erected on "the great height."²⁸ But during these periods, sacrifices were freely performed at other places also, without any derogation from the piety of the offerer or the acceptableness of his gift. By command of "the angel of the Lord", David himself built, on the threshing-floor of Araunah or Arnon the Jebuzite, an altar where he "offered burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and invoked the Lord, and He answered him from heaven by fire upon the altar of burnt-offering."²⁹ But even if sacrifices had then been exclusively performed at Nob and Gibeon, they would not have possessed the sanctity with which they were invested by the laws of the Pentateuch: for during the whole of this period, comprising the time of Samuel's leadership, of Saul's and David's, and partly of Solomon's reign, the Tabernacle was deprived of its most essential part, the Ark of the Covenant, containing not only the tablets of the Law, or the "testimony" of a supernatural revelation, but also the mysterious figures of the Cherubim, the emblems of God's watchful presence, and the holy mercy-seat, the pledge of His grace and forgiveness: indeed, without the Ark, the Tabernacle, like a body without a soul, lost its significance as the chosen abode of Jehovah; it was virtually not more hallowed than any ordinary place of worship.³⁰ Now, the Ark was, in the time of Eli, taken by the Philistines,³¹ and brought to Ashdod, where they placed it in the temple of Dagon.³² Seven months later,³³ they removed it to the territory of the Israelites, to the boundaries of Beth-shemesh.³⁴ Shortly afterwards, it was by the inhabitants of this town sent to Kirjath-jearim, where it was received into the house of Abinadab, and guarded by his son Eleazar.³⁵ There it remained "a long time", considerably more than "twenty years";³⁶ and from thence Saul took it occasionally to accompany him on his war-expeditions, to serve him as a Divine oracle, and to enhance the sanctity of his altars and his sacrifices.³⁷ Then David, surrounded by a large concourse of people, fetched it from the

²⁵ See *supra*, p. 13.

²⁶ 1 Sam. XXI. 1—10; XXII. 10.

²⁷ XXII. 16—19.

²⁸ 1 Ki. III. 4; 1 Chron. XVI. 39; XXI. 29; comp. Comm. on Exod. pp. 461, 462.

²⁹ 1 Chr. XXI. 18, 26; 2 Sam. XXIV. 18, 25.

³⁰ Comp. 1 Sam. IV. 3—22; V. 6, 7; VI. 20; etc. See Comm. on Exod. pp. 368, 375.

³¹ 1 Sam. IV. 11.

³² V. 1, 2.

³⁴ VI. 12—20.

³⁵ VII. 2.

³⁶ VII. 2. ³⁷ 1 Sam. XIV. 18, 34, 35; comp. XV. 34.

³³ VI. 1.

³⁵ VII. 1.

³⁷ 1 Sam. XIV. 18,

house of Abinadab, to remove it to Jerusalem; but terrified by a fearful accident, he left it, on the way, in the house of Obed-Edom, where it was preserved for three months;¹ then, however, David carrying out his resolve, transported it to Jerusalem,² where it thenceforward remained.³ And when in the eleventh year of Solomon's reign, after the completion of the Temple, the Tabernacle with its vessels was brought from Gibeon to Jerusalem, the Ark was deposited, in its due place, in the Holy of Holies of the new Sanctuary.⁴ Therefore, from the time of Eli, the Tabernacle was incomplete, and could not, according to the injunctions of the Pentateuch, be considered a true "Tent of Meeting." It cannot, therefore, be surprising to find, during this period, holy acts performed and sacrifices offered, in places neither sanctified by the presence of the Ark nor of the Tabernacle, as the instances above referred to abundantly prove.⁵ It is true, that the Books of Chronicles furnish different accounts in nearly all the points just discussed; and as they are frequently adduced in support of the current views, it is advisable briefly to characterise their nature and tendency. The alterations are the more striking by their systematic consistency; they breathe throughout a Levitical and theocratic spirit; and to this spirit facts and events are unscrupulously rendered subordinate. Thus the Chronist introduces Levites when the Ark was brought to Zion by David,⁶ on which occasion he makes them sing a hymn of praise manifestly borrowed from various Psalms of the period of the exile.⁷ He represents Solomon acquainted with the "Mosaic" Tabernacle,⁸ the regulations of the Book of Numbers with respect to its

¹ 2 Sam. VI. 2—11.

² Vers. 12—17; comp. 1 Chr. XV. 28.

³ 2 Sam. XV. 24, 25, 29.

⁴ 1 Ki. VIII. 1—6. We may thus briefly complete the history of the Ark. In the time of the divided empire, it was taken away, probably by some idolatrous monarch, though it is unknown by whom, and on what occasion; it was ultimately restored to its place by the pious king Josiah (2 Chr. XXXV. 3), and probably destroyed or lost at the demolition of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar; but according to an old tradition, Jeremiah, at the command of God, took it, together with the Tabernacle, to Mount Pisgah, and concealed it in a cavern, which he closed and fastened, and which will

not be discovered before the appointed time of Israel's restoration (2 Macc. II. 4—8); therefore, the Holy of Holies of the later Temples was empty or, as Jewish authorities state, had instead of the Ark an altar-stone raised three digits above the ground, and used, on the Day of Atonement, by the High-priest, to put the censer upon it.

⁵ Comp. 1 Sam. VII. 5, 6, 9, 10, 17; IX. 12, 13; X. 17; XI. 15; XIII. 9 *sqq.*; XX. 6; 2 Sam. XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. I. 9; III. 2, 3.

⁶ 1 Chr. XV. 26; comp. 2 Sam. VI. 13.

⁷ 1 Chr. XXVI. 8—36; comp. Ps. CV. 1—15; XCVI. 1—13; CVI. 1, 47, 48.

⁸ 2 Chr. I. 2—6 (where even Bezaleel is mentioned); comp. 1 Ki. III. 2—4.

transport,⁹ and the sacrificial ritual of the Pentateuch,¹⁰ familiar also to Abijah, the son of Rehoboam.¹¹ He describes the Book of the Law "found" in Josiah's time distinctly as the work of Moses.¹² He reports the slaughter of an enormous number of sacrifices, contrary to all probability,¹³ to which may be added his statement that king Jehoshaphat levied in Judea alone an army of 1,160,000 men,¹⁴ which was probably more than the entire population of the province: indeed he does not seem always to have realised to his mind the figures he mentions; for he contends that David had laid aside for the building of the Temple "100,000 talents of gold, and 1000,000 talents of silver", besides brass and iron "beyond weight";¹⁵ and again that his body guard consisted of 288,000 men, while in the older account it is stated at 600 men.¹⁶ He amply adorns his narrative with miracles,¹⁷ and with additions, alterations, and expansions in the Levitical sense to such a degree that the very spirit of his sources is perverted, which, in the main, were probably an enlarged and augmented edition of the canonical Books of Samuel and Kings.¹⁸ He refers the institutions mentioned in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, or in Ezekiel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, to the earlier times, especially those of David and Solomon. He describes the service of the Tabernacle, with store-houses, treasuries, and an organised system of officials, in a manner evidently betraying the combined features of various later epochs.¹⁹ He connects genealogically celebrated men of subsequent times, as Samuel, Heman, and Asaph, with the patriarchs, especially Levi;²⁰ in fact, he considers the whole caste of the Levites as holy, and continually represents them as exercising decisive influence on the course of history. As a rule, he is anxious to vindicate the

⁹ 1 Chr. XXIII. 26; comp. Num. III. IV. VII.; but see also 2 Chr. XXXV. 3.

¹⁰ 2 Chr. II. 3; comp. 1 Ki. V. 15 *sqq.*

¹¹ 2 Chr. XIII. 11; comp. 1 Ki. XV. 1—8.

¹² 2 Chr. XXXIV. 14; comp. 2 Ki. XXII. 8.

¹³ 2 Chr. XV. 11; XXIX. 32, 33; etc.; see p. 5.

¹⁴ 2 Chr. XVII. 14—18.

¹⁵ 1 Chr. XXII. 14; comp. also XXIV. 4—7.

¹⁶ 2 Sam. XV. 18; comp. 2 Chr. XIII. 3, 7; XIV. 8, 9; XXV. 5; XXVI. 13; etc.

¹⁷ 1 Chr. XXI. 26, 28; XXVIII. 1—19 (where it is related that David received "in writing by the hand of God" the model of the Temple with all its ac-

cessory buildings and utensils; comp. Exod. XXV. 9); 2 Chr. VII. 1—3; XXVI. 16—21.

¹⁸ See 1 Chr. XV. 12, 13 (comp. 2 Sam. VI. 6, 7); 1 Chr. XXI. 29, 30; 2 Chr. I. 3—5 (comp. 1 Ki. III. 4); 1 Chr. XXII. 2—5 (comp. 1 Ki. V. 20, 23); XXII. 8 (comp. 1 Ki. V. 17); XXIX. 17, 18; 2 Chr. III. 4 (comp. 1 Ki. VI. 3); VIII. 11 (comp. 1 Ki. VII. 8); IX. 14 (comp. 1 Ki. X. 5; 2 Ki. XVI. 18); XV. 10—15 (comp. 1 Ki. XV. 12, 13); XXIV. 13, 14 (comp. 2 Ki. XII. 13, 14); XXIX. 7 *sqq.* (comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 10 *sqq.*); XXXI. 3—11; XXXIII. 4, 5, 11—13 (comp. 2 Ki. XXI. 4, 5); XXXVI. 6, 7 (comp. 2 Ki. XXIV. 1, 2).

¹⁹ 1 Chr. IX. 1—31.

²⁰ 1 Chr. VI. 1—15, 18—32.

kings of Judah, in opposition to the statements of earlier historians.¹ But he fictitiously attributes every variety of idolatry to king Joram,² evidently because his wife was the daughter of Ahab, king of *Israel*.³ For untheocratic kings, as Joash and Ahaz, he invents punishment and misfortune.⁴ On the other hand, he omits injuring traits in the history of his favourites. He is silent about David's unlawful use of the ephod,⁵ his concubines,⁶ and his crimes against Bathsheba and Uriah;⁷ he suppresses all mention of his cruelty against the Ammonites,⁸ and of his infamous surrender of five of Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites to be "hung up before the Lord";⁹ he passes over the fearful and unnatural confusion in David's family;¹⁰ and makes no allusion to the foreign wives and idolatry of Solomon. The result of all this may be thus summed up. The Books of Chronicles are the work of *one* author; for they disclose throughout the same systematic re-arrangement of history. They were written at a time when the eloquence of the prophets had been succeeded by the direction of the priests. The author, a Levite, anxious to glorify his tribe and to secure its material prosperity, may, in modifying the earlier records, have undertaken a task congenial and acceptable to his contemporaries, who had themselves undergone a signal change; yet his work is a grave offence against the spirit of truth and honesty. He shows neither the ability nor the desire for writing an impartial and faithful history. Recognising no higher, scarcely knowing another, interest than that of Levitical priesthood, he is betrayed into the most obvious and invidious prejudices against all other classes and intellectual pursuits. He, therefore, deserves no authority whatever as a source of history, at least on points connected with public worship; and disavowing his statements, we resume our sketch.

It may naturally be expected that the building of Solomon's Temple materially augmented the splendour of the sacrificial service. Large numbers of worshippers were no doubt attracted by the fame of the king's wealth, power, and wisdom. The magnificence of the sacred edifice, exaggerated by report, contributed to allure visitors not always prompted by the purest motives of devotion, and often utterly

¹ Comp. 2 Chr. XII. 1 and 1 Ki. XIV. 22—24; 2 Chr. XIII. 2 and 1 Ki. XV. 2—5; 2 Chr. XIV. 2, 4; XVII. 6 and 1 Ki. XV. 14; XXII. 44; 2 Chr. XXIV. 2 *sqq.* and 2 Ki. XII. 3 *sqq.*; 2 Chr. XXV. 2 and 2 Ki. XIV. 3, 4; etc.

² 2 Chr. XXI. 11.

³ 2 Ki. VIII. 18.

⁴ 2 Chr. XXIV. 23—25, comp. 2 Ki.

XII. 18; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 20—24, comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 8 *sqq.*

⁵ See Sect. XXII. init.

⁶ 1 Chr. XIV. 3; comp. on the other hand, 2 Sam. V. 13.

⁷ 2 Sam. XI. 2—XII. 26.

⁸ 2 Sam. XII. 31.

⁹ 2 Sam. XXI. 1—9.

¹⁰ 2 Sam. XIII—XX.

estranged from a religious life.¹¹ But the Temple was by no means the only and exclusive place of worship. Solomon himself set the example of defying all hierarchical institutions. He not only himself, though no Levite, offered three times every year burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, and incense, upon the holy altars;¹² but he built "a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, on the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon": he adopted, in fact, the religious rites of all his foreign wives.¹³ It may be, that the exclusion of non-Levites from priestly functions in the Temple, could gradually be enforced, as the power of the Levites became, in the course of time, more commanding, and their spirit more rigorous.¹⁴ But it was certainly impossible to insist upon the absolute unity of worship, and to compel the Hebrews to sacrifice in Jerusalem alone. From Solomon's immediate successors to the very termination both of the empire of Ephraim and of Judah, we find kings and people, and often prophets and priests, inveterately addicted to all pagan rites, which they performed at whatever place they chose, as will be proved by the unreserved admissions of the Hebrew writers themselves.¹⁵ Additions and modifications in the service of the Temple were unscrupulously introduced not by priests alone but by worldly rulers, evidently unfettered by the existence of binding laws. Solomon occasionally offered the sacrifices, not on the brazen altar, but in the Court of the Temple generally.¹⁶ When king Ahaz (B. C. 743—728), zealously intent upon the improvement of religious institutions, had seen, at Damascus, a new altar, he sent an exact model of it to the priest Uriah, who without hesitation reproduced the heathen fabric, placed it in the Court of the Temple, for which purpose he removed the old brazen altar to another position: the king himself sacrificed on the new structure, ordered Uriah to use it thenceforth for all offerings and libations, and reserved to himself the decision with regard to the old altar: a Mosaic ordinance on the subject seems to have been entirely unknown.¹⁷ Nay, the heights, long used for sacrifices throughout the land, were left untouched even by some of those pious kings who sincerely desired to establish a pure worship in harmony with the views of the best and most enlightened teachers, by the kings Joash, Asa, and Jehoshaphat, Amaziah, Azariah, and Jotham.¹⁸ This significant fact irresistibly suggests

¹¹ Comp. Isai. I. 11—13; XXIX. 13; etc.; see Sect. IV.

¹² 1 Ki. IX. 25; see the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. V. ¹³ 1 Ki. XI. 7, 8.

¹⁴ Comp. 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

¹⁵ See Sect. XXII; comp. p. 14.

¹⁶ 1 Ki. VIII. 64.

¹⁷ 2 Ki. XVI. 10—16: the Chronist takes care not to mention the new altar (2 Chr. XXVIII. 20—24).

¹⁸ 1 Ki. XV. 14; XXII. 44; 2 Ki. XII. 4; XIV. 4; XV. 4, 35; comp. 1 Ki. III.

the conclusion, that, in the age of those kings, either the prohibition of worship on heights formed no part of the Law, or the Law was so imperfectly diffused that its ordinances were little known even to theocratic kings. How completely institutions supposed to have originated in the time of Moses, and to have been enjoined by him in writing, were neglected for centuries, is manifest from that remarkable occurrence in the reign of Josiah, when "the Book of the Law"¹ or "the Book of the Covenant"² was "found" in the Temple, when the king learnt, with mingled surprise and consternation, the curse-laden illegality of idolatrous worship,³ and when he ordered a celebration of the Feast of Passover, such as had not been kept "from the days of the Judges who judged Israel, and all the days of the kings of Israel and of the kings of Judah."⁴ Finally, the regular pilgrimages to Jerusalem supposed to have been undertaken three times annually, were never, and in fact could never be, carried out in the manner ordained by the Pentateuch. The extraordinary sacrifices commanded by the same code could, in most cases, not be offered up in Jerusalem. Hence, there remained, for the service in the Temple, besides occasional visits of the pious from near and far, chiefly the celebration of the festivals⁵ and the performance of the daily sacrifices by the appointed priests.

2. We can, therefore, hardly be surprised at various minor discrepancies between the sacrificial ordinances of the Pentateuch and the practice of pious leaders in later times. The Law prescribes *male* victims for burnt-offerings;⁶ yet on an occasion of peculiar solemnity and importance, the people assisted by the Levites sacrificed *cows* as holocausts.⁷ Samuel killed a sucking lamb for a burnt-offering,⁸ although the lawful age was above one year old.⁹ According to the Pentateuch, a holocaust accompanied by a bloodless offering was to be presented both morning and evening;¹⁰ but in the time of Elijah, one chief daily sacrifice seems to have been performed at noon, while the morning sacrifice was not necessarily an animal, but simply a bloodless oblation;¹¹ even in the reign of Ahaz it was probably the practice to present a holocaust in

2, 3; 2 Chr. XV. 17; XX. 33; XXXIII. 17. On the discrepancy between 1 Ki. XV. 14 and 2 Chr. XIV. 2, 4; between 1 Ki. XXII. 44 and 2 Chr. XVII. 6, see Sect. XXII; on the alterations of the Books of Chronicles, *supra*.

¹ 2 Ki. XXII. 8,

² XXIII. 2, 21.

³ XXII. 11, 13; XXIII. 4—20, 24.

⁴ XXIII. 21. Nehemiah (VIII. 17) mentions a similar neglect of the Feast of

Tabernacles from the time of Joshua down to his own. These points, together with the momentous inferences they involve, will later be examined with greater minuteness.

⁵ Comp. 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; IX. 25; etc.

⁶ Lev. I. 3, 10; see Sect. VIII. 2.

⁷ 1 Sam. IV. 14, 15.

⁸ 1 Sam. VII. 9.

⁹ See Sect. VIII. 3. ¹⁰ See Sect. XIII.

¹¹ 1 Ki. XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20.

the morning and a bloodless offering in the evening.¹² Libations consisted, in earlier times, not only of wine, but also of oil or water.¹³ It seems to have been customary that the priests received their due portions of meat *boiled*, and not *raw*; but in the former case, they could not so easily choose the pieces at their pleasure; therefore the sons of Eli demanded the raw flesh,¹⁴ as is alone lawful according to the Pentateuch.

But in some instances, the very nature of the sacrifices is different in the Pentateuch and in history. The thank-offerings (*shelamim*) are in the Law distinctly characterised as "offerings of safety" or as "praise-offerings"; and their specific features cannot possibly be mistaken.¹⁵ But in earlier times, they were, like the holocausts, employed for the confirmation of compacts and treaties, of mutual vows and solemn pledges. Thus, when the Israelites at Mizpah promised by an oath never to intermarry with the tribe of Benjamin, because it was convicted of detestable immorality, "they built there an altar, and offered up burnt-offerings and *shelamim*":¹⁶ the repast connected with the latter and forming their distinctive peculiarity, was deemed a bond of union and brotherhood.¹⁷ A similar meaning must no doubt be assigned to the *shelamim* which, not long before the same date, the Israelites offered at Bethel: repeatedly defeated by the Benjamites, and oppressed with bitter grief, they resolved to persevere in the just warfare, and concluding an alliance of determined and unyielding resistance, they presented "holocausts and *shelamim*".¹⁸ Again, in earlier periods, *shelamim* or "safety-offerings" seem to have been customary when help or rescue was *prayed for*. Saul, terrified at an expected attack of the Philistines, offered *shelamim*, besides holocausts;¹⁹ and so David when a pestilence raged.²⁰ Later, however, they were confined to occasions when deliverance *had been obtained* and was *thanked for*; and thus exclusively they appear in the Levitical Law.

Again, the expiatory offerings, themselves of later adoption, obtained the development exhibited in the Pentateuch, only by gradual stages: at first, trespass-offerings, generally including pecuniary restitution, were introduced, chiefly for offences connected with the rights of property; then the sin-offerings, for all transgressions inadvertently committed; but for some periods they were accompanied by a proportionate fine paid to the priests; till at last they were offered alone, and rendered more impressive by the solemnity of their ritual.²¹

¹² 2 Ki. XVI. 15. ¹³ See Sect. XII. ¹⁸ Comp. Judg. XX. 26. Comp. also

¹⁴ 1 Sam. II. 15—17; comp. also Exod. XXIV. 5.

Judg. VI. 18, 19. ¹⁹ 1 Sam. XIII. 9.

¹⁵ See Sect. XIV. ²⁰ 2 Sam. XXIV. 25.

¹⁶ Judg. XXI. 4. ¹⁷ Comp. ver. 5. ²¹ See Sect. XV.

The question, then, arises: Did Moses lay down any distinct laws with regard to religious worship? and if so, are the precepts embodied in the three middle Books of the Pentateuch traceable to his authority? If it is difficult to reply categorically to the first point, history gives an unequivocal denial to the second. It proves that, for many centuries after Moses, the Levitical ordinances were neither practised nor known; that primitive notions and institutions prevailed for protracted periods; that a long and severe struggle was fought between monotheism and pagan idolatry; till gradually and late, theocratic views conquered, and revolutionized the religious life of the nation. It is true that sacrifices were offered at all times with some fixed though simple ceremonies;¹ they were regarded as acts of piety and virtue; and while their neglect was denounced as wickedness and revolt,² their compulsory suspension appeared as a dire curse and visitation;³ they always formed a prominent feature in the picture of perfect and godly excellence,⁴ and were hence expected to be most abundant in the days approaching the Messianic age.⁵ The prophet Joel, who lived about B. C. 800, lamented that, at the time of the locust plague, "bloodless offerings and drink-offerings were cut off from the house of the Lord, and the priests, the Lord's ministers, mourned";⁶ and with greater vehemence still, he exclaimed, "Gird yourselves and moan, ye priests; wail, ye ministers of the altar; come, be all night in sackcloth, ye ministers of my God: for the bloodless offering and the drink-offering is withheld from the house of your God"⁷ — which offerings, as a rule, formed the accompaniments of animal sacrifices. But it is equally certain, that even the regular sacrificial service was neglected at all times. The king Hezekiah (B. C. 728—699) commanded the priests and Levites, "Hear me, ye Levites, sanctify now yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place: for our fathers have trespassed . . . and have turned away their faces from the habitation of the Lord . . .; also they have shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps, and have not burnt incense nor

¹ Compare Judg. II. 5; VI. 18—21, 25—27; XIII. 16, 19; XX. 26; XXI. 4; 1 Sam. I. 3, 21; II. 13—17, 28; III. 14; VI. 14, 15; VII. 6, 9; IX. 13; X. 8; XI. 15; XIII. 9; XV. 15, 22; XVI. 3—5; XX. 6; XXI. 5—7; 2 Sam. VI. 13, 17, 18; XV. 12; XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. I. 9, 25; III. 4; VIII. 5, 63; IX. 25; X. 5; XII. 32; XIII. 1 *sqq.*; XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20; esp. 2 Ki. XVI. 13—15; Hos. V. 6; VI. 6; Ps. XX. 4; XXVII. 6; L. 8, 9;

LXVI. 15; CX. 3; CXVI. 17; CXLII. 2; 1 Chr. XXIII. 31; Ezra III. 4; Sir. XXXVIII. 11; Matth. VIII. 4; Acts XXI. 26.

² Eccl. IX. 2; Isai. XLIII. 23, 24; comp. Matth. XXIII. 18.

³ Comp. Hos. III. 4; Joel. I. 9, 13, 14; II. 14, 17.

⁴ Comp. Jer. XVII. 26; XXXIII. 18, 22.

⁵ Jer. XXXIII. 17, 18; Isai. XIX. 21; LVI. 7; LX. 7; see Sect. IV.

⁶ Joel I. 9.

⁷ Joel I. 13.

offered burnt-offerings in the holy place to the God of Israel."⁸ Even Malachi, in the time of Nehemiah, who so zealously laboured for the practical introduction of the institutions of the Pentateuch, severely complained of the general neglect of the chief sacrificial laws.⁹ The pious and gifted teachers who occasionally arose in the nation, never ceased to inveigh against the equal and simultaneous corruption of people, priest, and prophet,¹⁰ which would have been impossible, had the priests occupied the position and been charged with the functions assigned to them in the Pentateuch.

Therefore, what is natural and probable in itself, is clearly confirmed by the recorded events. The Levitical system of sacrifices is not the work of one generation, but the result of succeeding ages. Its beginnings may reach back to very early times, possibly to those of Moses; but its progress and development were slow and gradual. It could not, from its nature and end, be built up by one man, however able and energetic. It rooted in the life of the people, and was the sum of the national experience. It gathered in one focus the scattered ideas and customs that had imperceptibly spread. It converted vague aspirations into distinct notions; it proposed a principle and created a unity. This is the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from the discrepancies pointed out between the Pentateuch and the historical Books: but that conclusion derives additional force from the *fluctuations discoverable in the Pentateuch itself*. The laws which it propounds are by no means all finally and irrevocably fixed; they betray a part of that motion and spiritual growth, of which they are the result; they are in some respects indefinite, in others contradictory.

Various arrangements, as the share of the priests in the thank-offerings and in the firstborn animals, and the law of the tithes, are totally different in Deuteronomy and the three preceding Books of the Pentateuch; and they exhibit a steady extension of the privileges of the tribe of Levi, as has been specified elsewhere.¹¹

Deuteronomy prohibits the killing merely of *sacrifices* at any place but the central Sanctuary, but permits the killing of animals for *food* in all abodes; while Leviticus includes the latter also in the same prohibition.¹² But the former demands the celebration of the festivals, and the offering of the tithes, firstfruits, and firstborn animals, in Jerusalem,¹³

⁸ 2 Chr. XXIX. 5, 7.

¹² Comp. Lev. XVII. 3, 4; Deut. XII.

⁹ Mal. I. 7, 8, 14; comp. III. 8—10.

13—15.

¹⁰ See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. II.

¹³ Deut. XIV. 23—26; XV. 20; XVI.

¹¹ See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. IV.

5—7, 11, 15; XXVI. 2, where an impressive ceremony is described.

which it supposes to be the chief seat of priestly jurisdiction:¹ this centralisation, if not abandoned, is not so expressly urged in Leviticus.

In Deuteronomy, it is merely commanded to "pour out upon the earth like water" the blood of the animals slaughtered at home for private use;² while the Book of Leviticus regards blood with a religious awe so strong, that it orders even the blood of animals killed in the chase to be covered with earth.³

For a very long time, the blood of animals alone was prohibited, and not the fat.⁴ But when the latter was, in the course of time, regarded, similarly to the blood, as a seat or principle of animal life, it was likewise deemed too holy for human consumption. However, the interdiction, involving so considerable a loss for an agricultural people, and arising as it did from the laws of public worship, was limited to the sacrificial animals, the ox, the sheep, and the goat;⁵ and as at the time when it was made, all the clean animals were to be killed at the Sanctuary, and thus marked as offerings, its operation was practically restricted to the place of common worship: but finally it was extended, like the interdiction of the blood, to "all habitations" and "all generations."⁶

The thank-offerings were originally *one* class, and their flesh was uniformly allowed to be eaten both on the day of the sacrifice and the following day.⁷ But subsequently, they were divided into praise-offerings and vow- and voluntary offerings, and then the consumption was, for the former or holier class, limited to the day of the sacrifice itself, while, for the latter, the original period was preserved.⁸

In the later legislation, the minimum of fine flour required for a cereal offering is fixed at one tenth part of an ephah, which was demanded even from the very poorest.⁹ But it appears that originally a smaller measure was accepted; for we find that each offering of the High-priest on the day of his initiation was only half that quantity;¹⁰ if at the time when the simple ritual for that solemn occasion was written,¹¹ the law or custom which demanded one tenth of an ephah, had already been established, it would certainly have been applied on an occasion of the highest importance both for the religious and social life of the nation.

It will be expected that the expiatory sacrifices, themselves revealing traces of several successive stages, exhibit fluctuation in a more than ordinary degree. We shall specify a few instances.

¹ Deut. XVII. 8 *sqq.*

² Deut. XII. 16, 29; XV. 23.

³ Lev. XVII. 13; see Sect. IX. 7.

⁴ Comp. Deut. XII. 15, 16, 23—25.

⁵ Lev. VII. 23—25.

⁶ Lev. III. 17; see Sect. IX. 8.

⁷ Lev. XIX. 5—8.

⁸ Lev. VII. 15—18; see Sect. XIV.

⁹ Lev. V. 11; comp. Sect. XI.

¹⁰ Lev. VI. 13.

¹¹ VI. 12—16.

In one passage, simply a *young bullock* is prescribed for expiating a transgression of the whole people;¹² in another, a *kid of the goats*, to be accompanied by a burnt-offering.¹³ How is this double divergence to be accounted for? So decided a difference in one of the most important of all theocratic commands cannot be slightly estimated. The historical principle offers again the only clue for solving the difficulty. It appears that, at first, the goat was the animal peculiarly reserved for expiatory sacrifices. For, at the time of their introduction, the principal species of clean domestic animals had, by long usage, been appropriated for the other and older sacrifices, the burnt- and thank-offerings; and yet it appeared desirable to fix a special victim for sacrifices so distinct as those of expiation. Possibly, at first, a less comely animal may even have appeared particularly appropriate for the stern and serious offerings associated with the sublimest attributes of the deity. Therefore, the earliest sin-offerings consisted of goats or sheep, both male and female,¹⁴ and those killed on the Hebrew festivals, of kids of the goat:¹⁵ when king Hezekiah, after the purification of the Temple, presented a sin-offering, comprising bullocks, rams, lambs, and goats, the latter alone were distinguished by the significant ceremony of imposition of the hand, and were hence chiefly regarded as having effected the expiation.¹⁶ However, the idea of atonement had long been associated with the oldest class of offerings, the holocausts; it is, therefore, intelligible that the latter were at first not discarded as a means of expiation, even after a new kind of offering had been exclusively set apart for that purpose; and hence we cannot be surprised to find burnt-offerings and sin-offerings presented jointly for remission of sins; such was the case in the second passage above referred to,¹⁷ and on the principal festivals.¹⁸ But later, it naturally occurred to the Levitical mind that the noblest animal was due to the noblest sacrifice; and then it was ordained that the sin-offering of the whole congregation and of its representative, the High-priest, should be a young bullock:¹⁹ this arrangement recommended itself the more strongly when the theocratic system had been so far worked out as to establish a clear gradation between the whole people, the High-priest, the rulers, and the common Israelite, and when, therefore, the less valuable animals, as goats and sheep, were required as sin-offerings for the two latter sections of the community. On this principle of gradation alone we can explain the

¹² Lev. IV. 13, 21.

¹³ Num. XV. 22—26.

¹⁴ Lev. V. 6, 15, 18, 25; IX. 3.

¹⁵ Num. XXVIII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX.

¹⁶ 2 Chr. XXIX. 20—24

¹⁷ Num. XV. 22—26.

¹⁸ Comp. Sect. XIII.

¹⁹ Lev. IV. 3—21.

law, that, on the Day of Atonement, a goat was offered for the whole people, but a bullock for the High-priest, who required even a higher degree of purity than the people itself.¹

In one passage, sin-offerings are prescribed for all and every case of Levitical impurity. "If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean reptiles, . . . or if he touch the uncleanness of man, whatever uncleanness it may be wherewith a man defiles himself . . . then he shall bring a female from the flock . . . for a sin-offering."² The command cannot be more comprehensive or more general. Yet, in the later legislation, the cases of impurity to be atoned by sin-offerings are very limited, and singly specified,³ while for all the rest washing or bathing with water was sufficient to restore cleanness.⁴ Evidently, then, when first sin-offerings were introduced, it was thought advisable and possible to order them for every emergency of defilement; but when this was found impracticable, the sacrifice was restricted to the principal cases; while a more convenient emblem of purification was ordained for the rest. This is a rare and remarkable kind of vacillation in the Levitical law — the abandonment of a general principle, which had been adopted in the enthusiasm of a new idea, in favour of expediency and feasibility.

At first, the blood of the expiatory sacrifices, whether sin- or trespass-offerings, was, like the blood of the holocausts, simply sprinkled "round about upon the altar."⁵ Later, however, when the sacredness of those sacrifices, and chiefly of the sin-offerings, was enhanced, because they were considered more specially the sacrifices of the theocratic community or the theocratic citizens, a part of the blood, the proper means of atonement, was put upon the *horns* of the altar, which more prominently symbolised the presence of the deity; and in some solemn cases, not on the horns of the brazen altar in the Court, but of the golden altar in the Holy itself, and on other still more significant parts of the Sanctuary.⁶

In fact, the laws of the Pentateuch with regard to the sin-offerings, involve the strongest proof of their later origin; for they are so pure, so elevated, so free from worldly alloy, that they cannot possibly be placed before the barbarous and lawless times of the Judges, when even human sacrifices were performed and deemed meritorious. They presuppose so long and so earnest a religious education, that they

¹ See notes on XVI. 5 *sqq.*

² Lev. V. 2, 3. ³ See Sect. XV.

⁴ Lev. VI. 20, 21; XI. 24—28, 31—33, 40; XVII. 15, 16; etc.

⁵ Lev. VII. 2, 7; comp. the regulations in I. 5, 11.

⁶ See Sect. X. 7, and Comm. on VI. 17—VII. 6.

form the termination, and not the beginning, of a spiritual career. They exhibit so immeasurable a contrast to the views and practices of the heathens, that they could only be conceived after a complete triumph over pagan theology.

One additional circumstance will complete the basis for our conclusions and inferences. It is surprising that the whole of Deuteronomy, which purports to be a recapitulation of the Law,⁷ and inculcates anew nearly all the precepts of the preceding Books, does not mention any portion of the sacrificial rituals of Leviticus, nor even indirectly refer to it. In fact, it contains nothing beyond general allusions to holocausts, thank-offerings, and free-will gifts, in the manner of Genesis and Exodus;⁸ it has a few fundamental provisions, regarding faultlessness of the victims,⁹ the duty of exclusively sacrificing at the central sanctuary, the dedication and offering of the firstfruits and tithes, and the prohibition of blood.¹⁰ But it is silent about the Tabernacle and its service, about the daily sacrifices and the shew-bread,¹¹ and various offerings of purification.¹² It does not make a single mention either of sin-offerings or trespass-offerings, those specifically Hebrew sacrifices; nor does it name any festival sacrifice, except the Pesach, although it describes the festivals themselves with fulness and with its usual eloquence.¹³

From all these premises we are irresistibly forced to the conclusion that the minute and complicated sacrificial legislation of Leviticus originated at a considerably later time than that of Deuteronomy; and as the Book of Deuteronomy can, from internal evidence, not have been written earlier than the seventh century before the present era, and is probably the "Book of the Law" or the "Book of the Covenant" found in the Temple during the reign of Josiah,¹⁴ the sacrificial laws of Leviticus were not compiled before the Babylonian period, and came into operation in the second Temple only, after the return of the Jews from captivity.

On account of the great historical importance of this result, we shall briefly recapitulate the reasons from which it is derived.

1. The Levitical ordinances were neither known nor carried out before the exile: they were unknown in the time of the Judges, when Jephthah offered his daughter as a burnt-sacrifice with the knowledge of the whole people, and when prominent and pious leaders of the nation publicly performed priestly functions in places not hallowed by

⁷ Deut. XVII. 18.

⁸ Comp. Deut. XVII. 6; XXVII. 6, 7.

⁹ Deut. XV. 21; XVII. 1.

¹⁰ Deut. XII. 5—27; XV. 19—23;

XXVI. 1 *sqq.*

¹¹ Exod. XXV—XXVIII.

¹² Comp. Num. XIX.

¹³ Deut. XVI. 9—17; XII. 26, 27;

comp. Num. XXVIII. 11—31.

¹⁴ See p. 28.

the presence of the Ark; nor in the time of David and Solomon, who, descended from Judah, on many occasions assumed the prerogatives of the Levites; nor in the time of the later kings; for Josiah (B. C. 642—611) was seized with astonishment and despair when he heard "the words of the Book of the Law," the contents of which were entirely new to him;¹ which would have been impossible, had the precept of Deuteronomy regarding the septennial and public recital of the Law existed.²

2. The execution of those ordinances argues a degree of religious education utterly at variance with the multifarious forms of perverse idolatry to which the Hebrews were addicted up to the sixth century.

3. The priests whom history proves to have long been powerless and needy, appear in the Levitical law as men of influence and wealth; indeed even the Book of Deuteronomy represents their position as so little secured that it never ceases to make the most pathetic appeals on their behalf, and recommends their helplessness to the benevolence and charity of the other tribes.³ Their ascendancy was gradual, but steady; it is impossible to believe that they would have renounced any of the privileges once obtained; it is against all evidence to assume that the Deuteronomist lowered the priestly demands "in order to adapt them to real or possible circumstances"; or that he "abandoned some of them because they were never carried out", and because he saw the necessity of greater moderation: those demands were the ideal emanations of a theory, and they inevitably grew with the growth of the Levitical system.

1. The Deuteronomist is more lenient and less authoritative in some of the Levitical injunctions.

5. The Book of Leviticus manifests a decided progress in the depth and purity of religious notions and in the spiritual character of public worship, especially with regard to the expiatory offerings not even mentioned in Deuteronomy: it bespeaks a very matured stage in the internal history of the nation.

6. The minuteness of the sacrificial ritual laid down in Leviticus, accords perfectly with the spirit of post-Babylonian times, and finds a faithful reflex in the thoroughly Levitical Books of Chronicles.

7. The Book of Leviticus, as a whole, cannot be placed before the sixth century, from various intrinsic reasons, among which are the exact description of the Babylonian exile and the allusion to the return of the captives.⁴

1 2 Ki. XXII. 11 *sqq.*

2 Deut. XXXI. 9—13.

3 Deuter. XVIII. 1 *sqq.*; etc.

4 See the Introduction.

It must, therefore, be supposed that the sacrificial laws were gradually framed on the practice customary among the Hebrews from early times and steadily modified and improved, till they assumed, in the seventh century, the form which they bear in Deuteronomy, and were ultimately, on the basis of the latter, developed into the elaborate system laid down in Leviticus. The subject has indeed been similarly viewed by some of the acutest and most consistent critics. The opposite opinion, which claims a higher antiquity for the middle Books, overlooks or disregards the irrefragable arguments derived from the development of the Hebrew hierarchy. Jeremiah wrote, "Thus saith the Lord of hosts... I spoke not to your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices":⁵ he could not possibly have used such language had he known the Books of Leviticus and Numbers, and considered them as Mosaic; but the terms are quite compatible with the existence and diffusion of Deuteronomy; they seem to lead to the inference that, in Jeremiah's time, the complicated Levitical laws of sacrifice began to be compiled and to be forced upon the people as Divine, and that the prophet opposed them as injurious innovations calculated to impair the heart by the burden of an external service.⁶ He indeed mentions "the Law" and its interpreters:⁷ but his allusions refer to Deuteronomy,⁸ and not to other Books of the Pentateuch. Yet some portions of Leviticus are most probably of earlier origin.⁹ For it must be admitted that the author of Deuteronomy had before him, and occasionally referred to, at least the full outlines of the narrative and legislation of the three middle Books,¹⁰ which manifestly formed the groundwork of his own composition. He clearly distinguishes the covenant concluded at mount Horeb from that sanctioned, through Moses, in the land of Moab;¹¹ for he considers the former to have been broken by the disobedience of the Israelites in the desert, and to have therefore required a renewal and fresh confirmation, for re-constituting the Hebrews as the people of God.¹²

Nor is it at all necessary to suppose that because the author of the Levitical laws *attributed* them to Moses, he believed them, at least partially, to be traceable to him. Literary fictions of this kind were frequent throughout antiquity, and occur repeatedly even in the preserved

⁵ Jer. VII. 21, 22.

⁶ Comp. *ibid.* ver. 23.

⁷ Jer. II. 8; VIII. 8; XVIII. 18; comp. XI. 3, 4; XXXI. 32, 33; XXXIV. 13, 18.

⁸ Comp. Jer. XXXIV. 19 and Deut. XV. 12. ⁹ See the Introduction.

¹⁰ Comp. Deut. IV. 5; V. 12, 16; VI. 1, 17; XX. 17; XXIV. 8, 9.

¹¹ Deut. XXVIII. 69; XXIX. 9—11; comp. V. 2—5, 23—31; IV. 14.

¹² Comp. Deut. XXVII. 9; XXVI. 16—19.

fragments of Hebrew literature: almost the whole of Deuteronomy was written in the name of Moses, the Book of Daniel in that of Daniel, long after the age of these men; and the Book of Enoch boldly professes to be the work of Enoch, in the seventh generation after Adam. "The writers had absolutely no taste for genuine history and no notion of criticism; they deemed history important not for the sake of its truthfulness, but for its underlying significance; they did not, therefore, scruple to modify it for the furtherance of their objects, or to enrich it with additions." The Levitical laws can, in no essential point, be Mosaic, because they were, in no essential point, observed centuries after Moses. Yet the composition, on the whole, carefully and skilfully upholds the historical situation. God directs the Israelites through Moses, from the Tabernacle, on Mount Sinai, or in the fields of Moab.¹ The offerings are invariably performed at the "Tent of Meeting."² Moses is to make estimates or valuations which were later given by the High-priest or the priests.³ Some animals or parts of animals are to be burnt "without the camp".⁴ The ashes of the altar of burnt-offering are to be taken "without the camp".⁵ Persons affected with certain kinds of uncleanness are to stay "without the camp."⁶ Several specified perquisites are to be allowed to "Aaron and his sons,"⁷ who form the objects of other ordinances also.⁸ Some laws, evidently recommended as examples for imitation in the practice of the Temple, are expressly adapted to the period of the migrations and encampment in the desert;⁹ while others are enacted for the time of the occupation of Canaan.¹⁰ The law includes detailed commands respecting the transport of the Tabernacle and its utensils,¹¹ commands which, from the time of David, entirely ceased to be applicable: because they are meant to reflect the relative position and religious character of the tribes in the author's time. The local colouring is maintained, with peculiar fidelity, in Deuteronomy. The speeches are represented to have been delivered in the east of the Jordan, and are particularised by the most accurate statements of time and place.¹² The people are on the point of crossing the river.¹³ The possession of Canaan is made

¹ Lev. I. 1; VII. 38; XXV. 1; XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34; Num. I. 1; XII. 5; XXXVI. 13. ² Lev. I. 3; III. 8, 13; IV. 7, 14; VI. 9, 23; etc.

³ Lev. V. 15, 18, 25; XXVII. 2 *sqq.*, 12, 14, 16, 23, 27; etc.

⁴ Lev. IV. 12, 21; XVI. 26, 27.

⁵ IV. 12; VI. 4; etc.

⁶ XIII. 46; XIV. 3, 8; comp. vers. 34 *sqq.*

⁷ II. 3, 10; VI. 9; VII. 39; etc.

⁸ I. 7, 8, 11; II. 3; III. 13; VI. 2, 7, 9, 13, 18; VIII. 9; XIII. 7, 39; etc.

⁹ Lev. XVII. 1—6.

¹⁰ XIV. 34 *sqq.*; XXV. 2 *sqq.*

¹¹ Num. III. IV.

¹² Deut. I. 1—5; comp. III. 20, 24; XI. 30.

¹³ I. 7, 8; IV. 14, 22, 26; VI. 1; IX. 1; etc.

dependent on the faithful observance of the Law.¹⁴ The Israelites are charged, after the conquest of the land, to pronounce the blessing on mount Gerizim, and the curse on mount Ebal,¹⁵ to erect large stones and to write the Law upon them;¹⁶ and in fact, the Book is throughout so composed that minds unprepared by historical research can hardly detect the fiction. But this proves nothing more than that the revisor thoughtfully designed the form and consistently carried out the disposition of the work, as might justly be expected from a man of his superior and manifest ability. Those who insist upon this circumstance as a proof of authenticity might with equal propriety urge the general coherence in the narrative of the Iliad as an indisputable indication of its historical truth; and it is well known that the composition and tendencies of the Homeric books offer more than one analogy to those of the Pentateuch. We refrain, in this place, from entering into the question whether the author's expedient of assigning to Moses his own laws or those of his time, and of thus claiming for them an exceptional sanction, can be justified before the tribunal of a pure morality; it suffices to know that he pursued a lofty aim with unwavering earnestness, and that he hoped to attain it more easily by a literary artifice, which was then not uncommon.

A few remarks will complete the history of the Jewish sacrifices. As their lawful performance was, by the Pentateuch, made dependent on the existence of the Temple, they were interrupted at its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar and during the Babylonian exile. After the return of the Jews and the completion of the second Temple, they were continued with greater regularity and scrupulousness; they were even, at times, encouraged and supported by heathen kings, as Antiochus the Great, who granted to the Jews an annual sum for sacrificial animals, besides a liberal allowance of flour, wheat, and salt. But some Syrian kings exacted a tribute for every sacrifice offered to Jehovah, till Demetrius Nicator repealed the tax. In the time of the Maccabees, during the supremacy of the Syrian invaders, the Temple service was entirely suppressed, but restored after the defeat of Antiochus Epiphanes, to be finally discontinued when the war under Titus had ended with the destruction of the national Sanctuary. A vestige of the old sacrificial worship has been preserved among the small sect of the Samaritans alone, who at Nablous, the ancient Shechem, still offer the annual paschal sacrifice.

¹⁴ IV. 1; VI. 18; VIII. 1; etc.; comp. however, IX. 4—7.

¹⁵ XI. 29.

¹⁶ XXVII. 2—4.

IV. PURER NOTIONS ON SACRIFICES.

In a higher degree, perhaps, than other ceremonial observances, the rites of sacrifice were liable to be severed from motives of true morality, and thus to lose their beneficent influence. The elements of edification were encumbered and almost oppressed by outward acts and even coarse manipulations. Prayer or spontaneous confession, even if it accompanied the imposition of the hand, could obtain neither prominence nor weight. Sacrifices, therefore, easily became ineffectual for religious elevation; they deteriorated into a lifeless form; they were apt to engender that hollow and pharasaical hypocrisy which, under the studied appearance of righteousness, conceals iniquity and corruption. The Israelites were pre-eminently subject to such debasement. Irresistibly attracted by the numerous forms of superstition which surrounded them, and but rarely induced by some powerful mind to adopt the worship of Jehovah, soon again to relapse into their usual and more congenial creeds, they showed little readiness to understand the deeper import of the sacrifices: they failed to employ them either as manifestations of pious submission and gratitude, or as aids for recovering the peace and purity of their hearts. The danger of an unintelligent and mechanical service was naturally greatest in the earlier periods when the authority of public-spirited advisers was the principal and the precarious source of national instruction, because no written Law existed or was diffused to guide and to enlighten. Yet the admonitions and warnings of such noble teachers were equally incessant and impressive; and they contained the germs of a universal religion. "I desire mercy", says Hosea, "and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings."¹ Amos, indignantly denouncing a false service devoid of rectitude, writes, "I hate — says God — I despise your feast-days, and I take no delight in your solemn assemblies: for if you offer Me burnt-offerings, and your bloodless offerings, I will not accept them; nor will I regard the thank-offerings of your fat beasts... but let justice flow like water, and righteousness like a never-failing stream."² More emphatically still Isaiah inveighs against the profitless and sinful worship ungraced by piety. He predicts the most awful calamities "because the people honour God with their lips while their hearts are far from Him, and their fear of the Lord is a precept taught by men."³ He proclaims with rising vehemence, "Of what avail is the multitude of your sacrifices? says the Lord: I am satiated with burnt-offerings

¹ VI. 6; comp. VIII. 13; IX. 3, 4; XIV. 3.

² V. 21—24; comp. IV. 4, 5.

³ Isai. XXIX. 13, 14; comp. Eccl. V.

1; Matth. XV. 7—9.

of rams, and the fat of fattened beasts; and for the blood of bullocks, and of lambs, and of he-goats I have no desire . . . Bring Me no more oblations of falsehood; incense is an abomination to Me, the new-moons, and sabbaths, and convocation of festive meetings; I cannot bear iniquity and solemn assembly . . . And when you spread forth your hands, I hide My eyes from you: even when you multiply prayer, I do not listen: your hands are full of blood. Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean, remove your wicked deeds from My eyes, cease to do evil, learn to do good, seek justice, restrain the insolent, procure justice to the orphan, plead for the widow." ⁴ It is a maxim in Proverbs, "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination; how much more when he offers it with a deceitful mind!" ⁵

But these and similar exhortations, however powerful, remained long unavailing; they required renewed injunction even during the latest periods of the commonwealth. In the prophecies of Jeremiah, God asks with stern reproof, "To what purpose does incense come for Me from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a distant land? your burnt-offerings are not acceptable, and your sacrifices are not pleasing to Me"; and he adds the reason, "Because you have not hearkened to My words, and have rejected My Law." ⁶ And considerably more than a century later, Malachi finds cause for bitter complaint: the sacrifices were not presented in the true spirit; avaricious priests polluted the altars by offering maimed and sick, yea even stolen animals; and God, offended and revolted, proclaims, "Who among you would close the doors, that you might not kindle fire on My altar in vain? I have no pleasure in you, says the Lord of hosts, and I will accept no offering at your hand." ⁷

In the mean time, however, the notions of the deity and the true requirements of religion advanced in depth and refinement. Thoughtful men began to look upon sacrifices, as upon other ceremonials, as less and less essential; while, in the same proportion, they attached greater significance to inward piety and to a life of truth and duty. In a Psalm attributed to Asaph, God declares, "I do not reprove thee on account of thy sacrifices, for thy burnt-offerings are continually before Me; I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds; for every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle on a thousand hills . . . If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is Mine and the fulness thereof. Do I eat the flesh of bulls or

⁴ I. 11—17.

⁶ Jer. VI. 19, 20; comp. XXXI. 31—33.

⁵ Prov. XXI. 27; comp. XV. 8;

⁷ I. 10; comp. similar reproaches in vers. 7, 8, 13, 14.

XXVIII. 9; Eccl. IV. 17.

drink the blood of goats? Offer to God thanksgiving, and pay thy vows to the most High: and call upon Me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me.”¹ Another Psalm expresses more briefly the same sentiment, “I will praise the name of God with song, and will extol Him with thanksgiving: this will please the Lord better than ox or bullock with horns and hoofs;”² and similarly, “To do justice and judgment is more acceptable to the Lord than sacrifice;”³ or “Has the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.”⁴ In the account of the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, the chief stress is evidently laid on the frame of mind of the offerers, not on the nature of their gifts.⁵

Some passages go even beyond this point. “Sacrifice and offering”, says a Psalmist, “Thou dost not desire, this didst Thou reveal to me; burnt-offering and sin-offering Thou dost not require. Then said I, Behold, I come with the scroll of the Book written in my heart; to do Thy will, my God, is my delight, and Thy Law is within my mind.”⁶ And again, “O Lord, open Thou my lips, and let my mouth relate Thy praise. For Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it; Thou delightest not in burnt-offering: the sacrifices of God are a humble spirit; a humble and contrite heart, o God, Thou dost not despise.”⁷ Or, “Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before God the exalted? shall I come before Him with burnt-offerings, with yearling calves? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He has declared to thee, o man, what is good: and what does the Lord require of thee, but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?”⁸ Terms like these seem almost to imply an absolute rejection of the sacrificial service, and to insist upon an internal approach to God’s holiness alone. But such conclusion would be wholly unwarranted. The beautiful penitential Psalm from which we have quoted, concludes with a prayer for the restoration of Jerusalem and the Temple, “then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering and entire holocausts; then will they offer bullocks upon Thy altar.”⁹ Joel, interpreting a terrible locust plague as the Divine retribution for wickedness, indeed beautifully exhorted the people, “Rend your heart, and not your garments”; but he

¹ Ps. L. 5—15; comp. Isai. XL. 16.

² Ps. LXIX. 31, 32.

³ Prov. XXI. 3.

⁴ 1 Sam. XV. 22.

⁵ See Comm. on Genes. pp. 92, 93;

comp. Ps. XV. 1—5; XXIV. 3—6; L.

5—23.

⁶ Ps. XL. 7—9.

⁷ Ps. LI. 17—19.

⁸ Mic. VI. 6—8.

⁹ Ps. LI. 20, 21.

exhorted them also to turn to God "with fasting, and with weeping, and with mourning."¹⁰ Jeremiah, wrath at the intolerable callousness engendered by a false formalism, exclaimed, "Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Put your burnt-offerings to your sacrifices, and eat flesh; for I spake not to your fathers, nor commanded them at the time when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices. But this I commanded them, saying, Obey My voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be My people; and walk you in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well to you."¹¹ But does this prove that Jeremiah entirely repudiated the sacrificial service? Nothing would be more erroneous. He elsewhere declared, "Thus says the Lord, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the priests, the Levites, want a man before Me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle bloodless offerings, and to perform sacrifice continually."¹² Or does that passage at least, as has been contended, testify to the merely *optional* character of the offerings set forth in the Levitical law? This is antecedently impossible from the simple fact that Jeremiah could not have referred to the contents of Leviticus at all, as has above been proved.¹³ But it is also overthrown by the slightest comparison with the Levitical legislation. Optional were indeed the sacrifices and oblations voluntary from their nature, as the private holocausts, and the private thank-offerings; and herewith of course corresponds the wording of the text:¹⁴ but the law of the *public* holocausts to be offered daily and on festivals, is plainly categorical;¹⁵ the expiatory sacrifices are distinctly and positively commanded as indispensable instruments for restoring purity of mind or body.¹⁶ The case is similar with respect to Deutero-Isaiah, the gifted and noble-minded author of the last portion of the Book of Isaiah.¹⁷ In one passage, he seems to rise to the highest and most spiritual form of worship. He first addresses the pious, "Thus says the Lord, the heaven is My throne, and the earth is My foot-stool: where is the house which you could build to Me? and where is the place for My rest? For all these things has My hand made, and all these things were called into existence, speaks the Lord: but upon him will I look who is humble and lowly in mind, and who trembles at My word." Then abruptly turning to the wicked, and describing their sacrifices as abominations, because performed in iniquity, he adds,

¹⁰ Joel II. 12, 13.

¹¹ VII. 21—23; comp. vers. 3—10; III. 16.

¹² Jer. XXXIII. 17, 18; comp. XVII. 26; XXXI. 14; XXXIII. 11. ¹³ See p. 37.

¹⁴ Lev. I. 2, 3, 14; II. 1; III. 1; etc.

¹⁵ Lev. VI. 1—6; XXIII. 12, 13, 18, 19, etc. ¹⁶ Lev. IV. 2, 3, 13, 14, etc.;

V. 1 *sqq.*, 14 *sqq.*, 17 *sqq.*, 20 *sqq.*; etc.

¹⁷ Chapt. XL. to LXVI.

"He who kills an ox, slays a man;¹ he who sacrifices a lamb, strangles a dog; he who offers an oblation, offers swine's blood; he that burns incense, worships an idol."² He declares, therefore, even the lawful sacrifices presented to Jehovah really like deeds of murder and idolatry, unless proceeding from an honest and unstained mind. Yet he is far from disparaging sacrifices in general. Drawing an enthusiastic picture of the happy time when justice, and uprightness, and charity, will reign triumphant, he promises that then God will bring even strangers to His holy mountain; for, says He, "I will make them rejoice in My house of prayer; their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted on My altar; for My house shall be called a house of prayer for all nations."³ The compulsory suspension of sacrifices, whether occasioned by drought and famine, or hostile invasion and oppression, was always lamented as a national disaster.⁴ In fact, sacrifices were never omitted in descriptions of the Messianic age, when distant nations are expected to accumulate offerings to Jehovah,⁵ and when kings will present their choicest treasures and the fatlings of their herds.⁶ In this respect, legislators, priests, and prophets, shared the views of the bulk of the people; offerings satisfied the religious aspirations of all alike.

Yet the Levitical sacrifices have frequently been classed among the institutions permitted merely on account of the people's "hardness of heart." They were so regarded by most of the Fathers of the Church, and by several Jewish writers, and many catholic theologians. This opinion was advocated chiefly on dogmatic grounds; it was deemed inappropriate that the people enlightened by revelation should have forms of public worship in common with heathens; many, therefore, depreciated the value and origin of the sacrifices, which others, looking chiefly to the Pentateuch, were inclined to represent as Divine.

But the view in question is utterly untenable. The sacrifices form undeniably an indispensable part, nay a main pillar of the Mosaic theology. They may indeed, in a certain sense, not incorrectly be described as a means both of religious discipline and of religious education; but the compilers of the Pentateuch thus employed them because they were convinced of their intrinsic value as instruments of grace; they would not have used them for the highest ends, had they

¹ That is, acts as if he slew a man.

² LXVI. 1—3; comp. XLIII. 23, 24.

³ Isai. LVI. 7; comp. LVIII. 2—10.

⁴ Hos. III. 4; Joel I. 9, 13 *sqq.*; etc. comp. also Dan. VIII. 11, 12; IX. 27; XI. 31; XII. 11.

⁵ Isai. XIX. 21.

⁶ Isai. LX. 7; comp. Ezek. XL—XLVIII; espec. XL. 39; XLII. 13; XLIV. 29; XLV. 18—25; XLVI. 20; Zeph. III. 10; Zech. XIV. 20, 21; Mal. I. 11; III. 3, 4.

considered them a despicable heirloom of heathen falsehood, which they would have shrunk from countenancing by injunctions meant to be of unchangeable and eternal application.

We may admit that the ceremonial law of the Pentateuch, and more especially the sacrificial system, is symbolical in its character, and that the writers, evidently men of high cultivation and of considerable power of thought, and conscious of this symbolical form which they occasionally explained, attached importance not so much to the act of offering nor to the value of the oblation, as to the piety of heart thereby revealed: but it would be erroneous to assert that they were themselves fully accustomed to abstract religious notions, which they clothed in symbols merely in accommodation to the untrained understanding of the people. We may also admit that the ceremonial law of the Pentateuch, and the emblems which it employs, are, on the whole, simple and intelligible, worthy of a monotheistic religion, not compromising its primary principles, and free from hair-splitting casuistry, as is more evident if compared with its later Talmudical development: yet it grew out of, and was fitted for, some of the earlier — though not the earliest — phases of intellectual culture; it is adapted, it may be thoughtfully and efficiently, to a modest degree of national education only; and when it claims to be final and unalterable — when it declares, “You shall neither add to it, nor take away from it”⁷ — it becomes injurious and objectionable in the extreme. It was doubtless, for many ages, beneficial in its operation; it constantly fostered the feeling of dependence on God and His will; it helped to separate the Jews from the heathens and their customs;⁸ it usefully occupied the senses of an untutored people; it admitted at least the possibility of disclosing to their minds the deeper ideas of religion. But ceremonials practised after that stage, when the symbol has ceased to be one with its meaning, unable to move the soul and heart, or to occupy the intellect, are not only unjustifiable, but become a dangerous obstacle to religious worship in spirit and in truth.

It appears, therefore, that the Jewish mind possessed no aptitude to free itself from the bonds of ritualism, and to conceive a purely internal faith. Though capable of the loftiest abstractions of monotheistic doctrines, it required and seized the aid of ceremonials. So far from gradually rising above them, the Jews developed them, in the post-Biblical times, into a system unexampled in intricate minuteness, and rendered innocuous almost solely by the power of the fundamental truths of Mosaism. Occasionally, the necessity of sacrifices

⁷ Deut. IV. 2.

⁸ Comp. Ephes. II. 14.

was disclaimed by some independent sect, excelling in simple virtue and righteousness, as the Essenes or Ebionites; or by a class of men, who Jews by descent and education, rose to an ideal conception of the ritual commands. Thus Philo declared,¹ "The mind, when without blemish and properly purified by perfect virtues, is itself the most holy sacrifice, being entirely and in all respects pleasing to God." Jesus Sirach² taught: "He that keeps the Law, brings offerings enough; . . . he that requites a good turn offers fine flour, and he that gives alms sacrifices praise . . . The offering of the righteous makes the altar fat, and the sweet savour thereof is before the Most High . . . Do not think to bribe (God) with gifts, for such He will not receive; and trust not to unrighteous sacrifices; for the Lord is Judge, and with Him is no respect of person." And the apostle Paul³ enjoined, "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable, unto God, which is your reasonable service."⁴ But such examples and doctrines either remained without abiding influence on the progress of thought among the Jews, and like a delicate branch soon withered off from the main stem; and either they helped to form other religious communities, and to impart to them vigour and vitality; or they were blended with fantastical alloy, which virtually rendered them profitless and unavailing. So the Kabballists held, that after the advent of the true Messiah no animal sacrifice would be required, since he would himself effect all that can be hoped for by sacrifices; "the Messiah will deliver up his soul and pour it out unto death, and his blood will atone the people of the Lord."⁵ Even in the New Testament, the ceremonial law, though rendered subordinate to piety and love, is by no means declared superfluous, much less abrogated. Jesus said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for you pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the Law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought you to have done, and not to leave the other undone."⁶ "The curse of the Law"⁷ or its "yoke of bondage"⁸ is not the scrupulous adherence to rituals, but the neglect of moral duties. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother has ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way: first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."⁹ Indeed Christ acknowledged the sacrifices as binding. After having healed the leper, he bid him to present the offering prescribed in the Pentateuch for

¹ De Victim. c. 5.

² XXXV. 1—15; comp. VII. 9.

³ Rom. XII. 1.

⁴ Comp. Hebr. XIII. 16; 1 Petr. II. 5.

⁵ Comp. Isai. LIII. 12.

⁶ Matth. XXIII. 23; Luke XI. 42.

⁷ Galat. III. 13.

⁸ Galat. V. 1; Acts XV. 10.

⁹ Matth. V. 23, 24.

such occasions,¹⁰ and he himself took part in the ceremonies of the paschal sacrifice.¹¹ Animal and vegetable oblations were indeed discarded by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and he declared that "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins."¹² Yet he was far from renouncing the idea of offering itself; he centred his creed in the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice; he merely urged that an internal and moral relation is necessary between the guilty and the victim; that such connection does not exist between man who is responsible and the animal which is no free agent; that, therefore, the sin of the former cannot be atoned by the blood of the latter; that it can only be propitiated by the death of a being at once human and, like God, guiltless. This may be the "spiritualisation of sacrifice;" but even in this conception, the idea of sacrifice reveals its fundamental and irremediable defects: it belongs to an elementary stage of religious life; it flows from illusory and imperfect views of the attributes of the deity; it converts into a transcendental operation what must be a spontaneous emotion of the human heart. Nor ought it to be palliated by vague metaphors: it may be true that the notion of sacrifice is so bound up with our nature that it always manifests itself in some form; and that "no theory, religious or philosophical, dispossesses the heart of it";¹³ but the sacrifice of self-denial and of self-conquest is different from the sacrifice offered to the Deity to secure His favour or His pardon; the former is the offspring of a true and active faith leading to ennoblement and to moral vigour; the latter, theoretically unjustifiable, may practically engender spiritual torpor and contemptible pietism.

Now Talmudical and Rabbinical writings contain indeed maxims highly creditable to their authors and the times in which they lived. "The humble-minded is by God considered to have offered all the sacrifices; for it is said, The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." "Sacrifices, whether great or small, are equally acceptable, provided the heart is turned to God." "Acts of justice are more meritorious than all the sacrifices." Or more strongly, "Unless the mind be purified, the sacrifice is useless; it may be thrown to the dogs." "He who engages in the study of the Law, requires neither holocaust nor bloodless offering." The words, "A day in Thy courts is better than a thousand",¹⁴ were explained to mean, "God said to David, I prefer thy sitting and studying before Me to the thousands of burnt-offerings which thy son

¹⁰ Matth. VIII. 4; Mark. I. 44; Luke V. 14; comp. Acts XXI. 20, 26; XXIV. 17, 18; see Lev. XIV. 10 *sqq.*

¹¹ Matth. XXVI. 17—20; Luke XXII. 7—15; comp. Mark. XIV. 22.

¹² Hebr. X. 4.

¹³ *F. D. Maurice*, *Doctrine of Sacrifice*, pp. 45, 61, *et passim*; *F. P. Cobbe*, *Religious Duty*, pp. 318—323.

¹⁴ Ps. LXXXIV. 11.

Solomon will offer on the altar." When, after the destruction of the Temple, sacrifices became unlawful, the value of *prayer* and of absorbed devotion was more and more acknowledged and appreciated. It was a maxim, "He who prays is considered as pious as if he built an altar and offered sacrifices upon it;" or "prayer is deemed sacrificial service"; or "he who *reads* the laws of sacrifice, will be pardoned as if he had performed the offerings"; or "as the altar wrought atonement during the time of the Temple, so after its destruction the table." However, all these and similar sentiments are merely echoes of the utterances of ancient prophets, and imply no more than these. The discontinuance of the sacrifices was, as in the Biblical times, mournfully deplored as a dire calamity and a punishment for heinous sins. The words of Hosea, "We will offer the sacrifices of our lips",¹ were interpreted to mean, "we will pay the offerings with our lips:"² prayer was regarded as a poor and unworthy substitute for sacrifice, once the most precious privilege, but then alas! no longer permitted. Offerings were declared to guarantee the preservation of heaven and earth. Nor are they in the whole range of Talmudical literature, pronounced to be unnecessary, much less objectionable, at the Messianic time, though they would then be limited to thank-offerings: the restoration of the Temple and the restoration of the sacrificial service were deemed inseparable. And as the Samaritans of Nablus still regularly offer the paschal lamb, so the Jewish prayerbook abounds with fervent supplications for the advent of the time when the blood of sacrifices will again be sprinkled on the sides of the holy altar, and the priests will be reinstated in their functions. Not even the most distinguished of the Jewish scholars and philosophers of the Middle Ages, had the intellectual energy and penetration properly to estimate the value of sacrifices. Ebn Ezra repeated, the Divine glory would indignantly have withdrawn from the earth, had the Israelites neglected the precepts of the burnt-offerings. Maimonides, though professing to consider the sacrificial ordinances of the Pentateuch merely as an expedient accommodation to deeply rooted usages, laid it down as the first and most important rule, that the offerer must firmly believe in the force and efficacy of sacrifices; and he bestowed the minutest care upon collecting, classifying, and expounding the endless host of Talmudical regulations with regard to the various kinds of offerings. Jehudah Halevi, in his elaborate work, the Book of Cusari, attempted to prove the Divine origin, and hence the eternal obligation of the oral law with its numberless expansions of the ceremonial ordinances.

¹ XIV. 3

² Comp. Ps. CXLI. 2.

Baruch Spinoza alone, trained by the philosophy of Descartes, stimulated by the astounding discoveries in astronomy and other natural sciences, and above all guided by the divine impulse of genius, penetrated to the root of religious and metaphysical questions. He boldly rose above tradition; renouncing the Rabbinical teachings of his youth, he worked out, with uncompromising consistency, a system happily combining metaphysical speculation with practical ethics. But this manful independence of thought brought him into hostile collision with his coreligionists; he was, by excommunication, repudiated as a member of their community; he exercised no influence on the development of the Synagogue, whose spirit was utterly foreign to his own. The formula of excommunication, written in Spanish, and recently re-discovered, is instructive. It bears date the 6th day of Ab 5416 (i. e. 1656); after denouncing Spinoza's "wicked views and works", his "evil ways", his "learned heresies" and "abominable deeds", it concludes thus: "By the sentence of the angels, by the decree of the saints, we anathematise, cut off, curse, and execrate Baruch d'Espinoza . . . with the anathema wherewith Joshua anathematized Jericho . . . , and with all the curses set forth in the Law. Cursed be he by day, and cursed by night; cursed when he lies down, and cursed when he rises up; cursed when he goes out and cursed when he comes in; the Lord pardon him never; the wrath and fury of the Lord burn upon this man, and persecute him with all the maledictions of the Law. The Lord blot out his name under heaven, and separate him to his misfortune from all the tribes of Israel. And you who are faithful shall be blessed, if you take heed that no man shall speak to him, no man write to him, no man show him any kindness, no man stay under the same roof with him, no man come nigh him within four yards, no man read a book written by him." The wish of the fanatic Rabbis who composed this document — re-discovered to perpetuate their shame — has to this day been gratified within the pale of orthodox Judaism: Spinoza "is separated from all the tribes of Israel"; if perchance he is mentioned, pious lips involuntarily whisper, "may his name be blotted out"; no one "reads a book written by him"; or if it be read, it is done in no spirit of sympathy, nor even of fairness; not alone is his philosophy distorted, execrated, and reviled with a warped dogmatism for which we are prepared, but impotent attempts are made to defame his moral character — a character of such matchless beauty and purity, that it is in itself a glory to mankind second only to the immortal philosopher's intellectual greatness. Indeed, the Jewish mind so tenaciously preserved its traditionary character and peculiarity, that

even Moses Mendelssohn, though in his philosophical writings as liberal as might be expected from the contemporary of Kant and the friend of Lessing, exhibited in doctrinal matters no perceptible progress, as is manifest from his Hebrew Commentary on parts of the Old Testament; he felt it as his greatest grief and affliction to see his friend suspected of Spinozistic views; and if this suspicion did not, as his biographers say, accelerate his death, it certainly embittered the last days of his life. "Far be it from me to think, writes the learned that the ceremonial laws are not obligatory in our age. All of them that have no connection with the holy land, must be sacred to us at every time and in every place; that which has been commanded by God, cannot be abrogated by men: neither could such attempts be ventured without undermining public morality; for if the Law of God is, in any of its provisions, modified by human arbitrariness, it would no longer be regarded as absolutely and unchangeably binding. Nor can the ceremonial laws, which make man virtuous in more than one respect, at any time lose their salutary influence." Another contemporary Rabbi, Dr. L. Philippson, the mouthpiece of a large and more liberal section of the Jews acknowledging the absolute force of the written, but not of the oral Law, expresses himself in a similar sense. "Man is never and at no stage able to dispense with ceremonies entirely." "No religion can exist without them." "By their neglect the religion of the heart is easily forfeited, or loses immeasurably in efficacy, coherence, and power, and runs the danger of decay." The Hebrew prophets and the Jewish doctors were able to perceive the insufficiency, but not the superfluousness or obnoxious tendency of ceremonial worship. They discovered many fatal errors in heathen religions, and adhered with fervour to their purer convictions; but a lack of independence, the sad inheritance of their eastern origin, prevented the adoption of a rational religion, the result of matured intelligence, and solely reliable as a guide in the intricacies of life. However, the modern Jews, especially those scattered among the Teutonic nations to which they appear to have a peculiar affinity, fairly promise to pass beyond the narrow boundaries of their ancestors, and by blending the eastern and western character, to produce a new type superior to either and not unlikely to realise, though in a different manner, the proud hopes which live in their race. Spinozism counts among them not a few admirers and even adherents. In the prayer-books of some recent reform-sects, as that of Hamburgh and Berlin, the passages relating to sacrifices have been modified or suppressed; and when this subject was discussed in the German conferences of Rabbis, one of the members, distinctly declared, that the prayer

for the return to Jerusalem and the restoration of the sacrifices, is a hollow falsehood; and he thereby expressed not only the sense of the assembly, but of the vast majority of his educated co-religionists.

We have above quoted some advanced opinions on sacrifices from the writings of the Hebrews. But let it not be supposed, that heathen literature is less rich in utterances of a similar import. Indeed a full comparison shows the balance of superiority to be on the side of the latter. It must not be urged that refined notions were not found among the multitude, but in the limited class of the wise and the enlightened. In this respect, the case was not different among the pagans and the Israelites. Moreover, occasional instances or exceptions suffice to show that such improvement lay within the intellectual range of the nations, and might, therefore, be gradually diffused. Nor did the philosophers withhold their instruction and counsel within the limits of the civil laws. They ridiculed the mercenary and selfish spirit in which sacrifices were frequently performed. They described it as iniquity, rather than piety, to present valueless and contemptible offerings. They pronounced it disgraceful to say to the gods, "If you remember the gifts I have bestowed upon you, and love me accordingly, I shall honour you again with increased presents; for I offer them for the sake of expected favours." They derided the frivolity so often exhibited at sacrifices, festivals, and solemn assemblies. "If a sensible person", says Lucian, "witnesses the silliness with which the religious rites are conducted, and considers what notions most people form of the nature of the gods, and what they pray for, he must be very dejected indeed, if he is not disposed to laugh at their folly and childishness". The same writer, in an amusing and humorous description, strongly satirizes the whole of the sacrificial ritual — the wreathing of the victim, its heart-rending cries when killed, which are "the music of the solemn act", the blood-stained figure of the priest, though pure hands only are professedly admitted near the sacred implements, and the other ceremonies and incidents — ; and he concludes his treatise on sacrifices with the words, "It would be impossible for any one to stigmatise all the superstitions of the multitude, whether like Democritus he laughs at their ignorance, or like Heraclitus he weeps at their folly." In another work he logically contends that as the Greek gods are unalterably subject to primeval decrees and infallible directions of Fate and the Parcae, they are themselves powerless to grant or to refuse any favour; it is, therefore, idle to pray or to sacrifice to them; and he then makes Zeus say, "He who offers to us sacrifices, does not wish to secure advantages, but merely to show his sense of obligation, and to repay in some manner the

benefits he has received from us, or sometimes simply to do homage to us as to his superiors." Varro declared all sacrifices as superfluous; "the true gods", he said, "neither desire nor demand them, much less can those made of brass, clay, plaster, or marble care for them; hence no guilt is contracted by not offering sacrifices, and no favour gained by offering them." From a large number of the most unexceptionable sentiments on the true value of sacrifices, we content ourselves with quoting a few. The best sacrifice is a pure mind and a passionless soul: the bad take fruitless trouble in worshipping the gods. It is becoming to a good man alone to sacrifice to the gods and to appeal to them by prayer, offering, and worship: but to receive gifts from a defiled person neither behoves a good man nor a god. Wicked persons fancy that they are able to appease Jupiter with gifts and sacrifice: they lose their labour and their money; for no petition of the perjured is acceptable to him. The citizens must keep their souls free from every baseness, for the gods do not look with favour upon the sacrifices and costly donations of the wicked, but upon the just and excellent works of the virtuous. Let men, in their offerings, approach with piety, but remove luxury; he who acts differently will be punished by god himself. The deity looks on the heart or disposition of the sacrificer rather than on the number of the sacrifices. The simplest gifts, as herbs, fruits, and flour, if presented in a humble spirit, are more acceptable than the most sumptuous hecatombs. Honouring the gods does not consist in victims however choice and resplendent with gold, but in the good and upright intention of the worshipper; the right-minded are religious with barley and porridge, but the wicked do not escape their impiety, though profusely staining the altars with blood. The little frank-incense which accompanies the offerings, is more essential and more prized by the gods than the victims. The plainest and least expensive vessels are the most appropriate for sacrificial ceremonies. Man ought to offer elevation of the soul, and calm reflection free from all disturbing emotions; for this is true worship and safety. Piety renders even the smallest gift welcome. God neither stands in need of presents, nor is it in our power to bestow upon him any. The celestial divinities have no pleasure in slaughtered bulls, but in good faith to be kept honestly and even without controlling witness. Sumptuous offerings accustom men to luxury, and lead to the delusion that the deity can by presents be bribed into remission of deserved punishment; whereas the knowledge that the gods have no desire for idle gifts, but for rectitude of life, would help to make the heedless just and pious. Those

who wish to sacrifice must do so in purity. This purity does not merely reveal itself in a clean body and clean garments, but in "a soul purified from vices", since the soul is the divinest part of man, and most akin to the deity. The temple of Epidaurus bore the inscription, "He who enters the fragrant temple must be pure; but purity is to harbour holy thoughts." Piety is a knowledge of the proper reverence due to the gods: the pious sacrifice to the gods and keep themselves pure; and the wise men are the only priests.

The dialogue "Alcibiades the Second", whether the work of Plato or of some later philosopher, is an elaborate argument on the inutility of addressing to the gods special prayers, since man does not know whether, if granted, they would prove real boons. In the course of the discussion Socrates remarks, "The divine nature, I conceive, is not such as to be seduced by presents like a usurer . . . For it would be a dreadful thing indeed, if the gods looked to gifts and sacrifices, and not to the soul, if it be holy and just." The same subject, and probably with reference to that dialogue, is treated by two of the greatest Roman satirists. The second satire of Persius, a noble rebuke of superstitious, sordid, and double-tongued prayer, contains the following lines:

"He sues for wealth: the labouring ox is slain,
 "And frequent victims woo the god of gain!
 "'O crown my hearth with plenty and with peace,
 "'And give my flocks and herds a large increase!
 "Madman! how can he, when, from day to day,
 "Steer after steer in offering melts away?
 "Still he persists; and still new hopes arise,
 "With harslet and with tripe to storm the skies:"

and it concludes with a passage that has not unjustly been described as "not only the quintessence of sanctity, but of language:"

"No; let me bring the Immortals, what the race
 "Of great Messala now depraved and base,
 "On their huge charger, cannot;— bring a mind
 "Where legal truth and moral sense are joined,
 "And holy depths of thought exempt from stain,
 "A bosom dyed in honour's noblest grain,
 "Deep-dyed: with these let me approach the fane,
 "And Heaven will hear the humble prayers I make,
 "Though all my offering be a barley-cake."

In a composition equally famous for soundness of views and wealth of illustration, Juvenal also (in the tenth satire) sets forth the vanity of human wishes, whether the supplication be for riches, power, and glory, or for talents and accomplishments; he then proposes the following form of prayer, as rational as it is beautiful:

"O Thou, who know'st the wants of human kind,
 "Vouchsafe me health of body, health of mind,
 "A soul prepared to meet the frowns of fate,
 "And look undaunted on a future state;
 "That reckons death a blessing, yet can bear
 "Existence nobly, with its weight of care;
 "That anger and desire alike restrains,
 "And counts Alcides' toils and cruel pains
 "Superior far to banquets, wanton nights,
 "And all the Assyrian monarch's soft delights:"

and he concludes thus :

"Here bound, at length, thy wishes: I but teach
 "What blessings man, by his own powers, may reach.
 "The path to peace is virtue. We should see,
 "If wise, o Fortune, nought divine in thee:
 "But we have deified a name alone,
 "And fixed in heaven thy visionary throne!"

The Persians considered the reading of the Law as an offering presented to the divine word (Honover), and as the daily food of the soul. They consumed the whole of the sacrificial animal, convinced that "the deity requires only the soul of the victim, and nothing else". But more decided than any eastern nation, the Hindoos passed occasionally within the domain of the purest spiritualism. As the principal of the five daily sacrifices obligatory on every master of the house, they regarded the study of the Vedas, the revealed wisdom of Bramah. Next in sacredness and importance stood the exercise of hospitality. The worshipper was commanded to present a bloody sacrifice by slaying all his passions, as anger, covetousness, malice, and envy. He was to address the god thus, "All my works, good or evil, I present to thee, in the fire of thy favour, as a burnt-offering." Unless he loves God, he cannot expect acceptance of his gifts. Voluntary sacrifices of gratitude and submission are alone desired. As God cannot become richer by the offering, he looks upon the intention, not upon the magnitude of the gift. He delights in the pigeon of the poor as much as in the thousand oxen of the rich. But he regards as the choicest sacrifice the conquest of man over his evil impulses and his worldly pleasures; for this he prizes as a self-sacrifice securing the crown of heaven and eternal bliss. Those who so hallow themselves, exchange worthless vanities for glorious and eternal treasures. In short, "the love of God, the child of pious wisdom, is the noblest gift, the purest offering."

V. THE HEBREW APPELLATION OF SACRIFICE AND ITS MEANING.

THE name (*Korban*), by which the notion of sacrifice is designated in the Old Testament, affords no clue as to its nature and significance; it is general in import and vague in its etymological sense; it means

merely *something that is brought forward* or presented; and it may hence be best rendered by the comprehensive term *offering*. Attempts have been made to invest that name with a deeper interpretation. It has been supposed to imply "a means for effecting a close proximity between God and the offerer", or "a means for *bringing* the Israelites near God", and "an instrument of *intercession* with Him"; it has hence been explained as "an agency of *sanctification* through the priests who are near God", or as "a connection and a community of life with the deity." But these and similar views have no foundation in the Hebrew Scriptures; they were suggested by preconceived theories on the nature of sacrifices; and their framers, instead of deducing the thing from the name, expounded the name from the supposed attributes of the thing — a process which the indistinctness of the former renders both easy and tempting. Such premises naturally led to untenable conclusions: the end of the Mosaic sacrifices was declared to be "that the existence or life of the soul (that is, of sin) be given up to God unto death, in order to obtain the true existence or sanctification by the union with God, who alone has true existence, and therefore true holiness", so that the sacrifice is "at once a symbolical (or subjective) and sacramental (or objective) act" — a fanciful definition devoid of probability and Biblical support. It is true that the word *Korban* is exclusively used in reference to objects devoted to the deity for religious worship. It is, in this respect, at once the most generic and the most specific name: for on the one hand, it includes not only all classes of sacrifice, but also sacred gifts not intended as sacrifices in the stricter sense, and not presented on the altar; and on the other hand, it signifies the special portion of an offering devoted to God or His priests. In fact, with a few exceptions easily to be traced and accounted for, it occurs solely in the Third and Fourth Books of the Pentateuch: it seems, therefore, at a comparatively remote period, to have been restricted to the sphere of religion, and to have fallen into disuse with regard to secular donations. But it implies, etymologically, nothing else but *gift* or *present*; it is so taken and expressed by most of the ancient authorities, and the sacrifices are distinctly called *gifts*. The literature of the Old Testament exhibits indeed several instances of a gradual modification in the meaning of words which, in accordance with the progress of religious culture, were imperceptibly understood in a purer, more refined, or more profound sense, as is undoubtedly manifest in many anthropomorphic expressions employed with respect to God even in passages emphatically teaching His incorporeality: but there is no evidence to prove that

the word *Korban* was subjected to a similar change, that it lost its simple and primary meaning, or that it was spiritualised in harmony with later or more definite conceptions regarding sacrifices. Nor was the infusion of a new idea into the old designation necessary; for the names of the various kinds of offering conveyed, with sufficient distinctness, their specific nature or their peculiar object. Yet this etymological meaning of the word does not justify us in tracing the character of the sacrificial laws of the *Pentateuch* to the injunction which commands the Hebrews "not to appear before the Lord empty:" the origin of similar conceptions is separated, by a wide interval of time and spiritual advancement, from the concluding stages of the Levitical system; in fact, the injunction quoted did not at all refer to sacrifices in the stricter sense, but to the dedication of firstlings and tithes on the three great agricultural festivals.

The definition of *Korban* is therefore, clearly, a gift offered to God for any of the various religious purposes arising in the life of individuals or of the nation. It is of collateral, if not subordinate, importance that the gift was presented in a place bearing the character of holiness, and with rites typifying worship and devotion. Yet the offerings more properly so called were those presented on the altar of the common Sanctuary; it is these offerings alone that are here treated of, while other religious gifts, dedicated to the sustenance of the priests, the servants of God, or contributions destined for to the support of the Sanctuary, are entirely excluded. And in as much as every sacrifice was connected with burning to God on the altar either the whole or a part of it, and as this was naturally considered as the gift *par excellence*, the name *ishch* or *oblation made by fire* is frequently used in reference to all classes of offerings,¹ even to the frank-incense placed upon the shew-bread cakes, because it was burnt after their removal.²

History and experience do not countenance the numerous speculations which have been propounded on this subject. Sacrifice has been defined as "a devotion of the perishable and unreal existence to the eternal and absolute being"; as "a negation by which man divests himself of his subjectivity"; as a means "of proving by deed the freedom of religious life through liberation from finite limits"; or as "an agent for effecting the approach of sensual man to God, by releasing him from his material condition and elevating his nature into the sphere of the spiritual and the Divine." Nations capable of such and similar abstractions may well be expected to have passed entirely beyond the childlike stage of sacrifices.

¹ Comp. Lev. I. 9, 13, 17; II. 2, 10, 16; III. 3, 5, 11; IV. 35; V. 12; VI. 10; etc.

² Lev. XXIV. 7.

VI. GENERAL SURVEY AND CLASSIFICATION OF HEBREW SACRIFICES.

THE offerings of the Hebrews, consisting like those of most other nations, either of animals or of vegetable productions (p. 5), were divided into the *bloody* and the *bloodless* kind. Now the sacrifice may either be designed to evince the offerer's absolute submission to the Divine sovereignty, and to acknowledge God's unlimited sway over the destinies of man; or it may be intended as an expression of gratitude for blessings enjoyed; or it may serve to implore forgiveness and expiation for offences committed; or lastly, it may mark the return of a state of purity after a period of uncleanness, as after the recovery from leprosy or "a running issue." In the first case, it was a *Burnt-offering*; in the second, a *Thank-offering* or *Praise-offering*; in the third, a *Sin-offering* or a *Trespass-offering*; and in the last, a *Purification-offering*. The thank-offerings included the *Paschal Sacrifice*, the offering of the *firstborn* of sacrificial animals and of the *firstfruits*, whether these were the new ears of corn, or the loaves baked from the new grain, or any other vegetable production of the land; and to the sin-offerings may be counted the *Offering of Jealousy* presented to test a woman's conjugal fidelity. As a rule, the burnt-, the expiatory, and the purification-offerings were animal sacrifices, though in exceptional cases a cereal sin-offering was permitted or prescribed, while the thank-offerings could either be animals or vegetable oblations.

The animal sacrifices, regarded as pre-eminently acceptable, were generally accompanied by bloodless offerings, and in many cases also by a libation of wine or a *drink-offering*, varied in quantity and graduated according to the nature of the chief sacrifice. Bloodless offerings were, however, also presented alone and independently of animal sacrifices, whether for the whole people and regularly, as the *shew-bread* consisting of twelve unleavened cakes, and the *frank-incense* burnt by the High-priest every morning and every evening on the golden altar in the Holy; or for individuals and on special occasions, as eucharistic oblations, the offerings of the firstlings and firstfruits, the cereal sin-offering, and the offering of jealousy.

The Hebrew sacrifices may, therefore, be surveyed in the following table:

- I. Burnt-offering — exclusively an animal sacrifice.
- II. Joy-offering — either animal or vegetable.
 1. Praise-offering.
 2. Thank-offering.
 3. Paschal sacrifice.
 4. Offering of firstborn animals.
 5. Offering of firstfruits.
 - a. Offering of the first new ears of corn.
 - b. Offering of the first new bread.
 - c. Offering of the firstfruits or other vegetable productions.
- III. Expiatory offering.
 1. Sin-offering — mainly animal.
 2. Trespass-offering — animal.
 3. Offering of Jealousy — vegetable.
- IV. Purification-offering — mainly animal.
 1. After childbirth.
 2. After recovery from leprosy.
 3. After recovery from a running issue.
- V. Drink-offering.
- VI. Shew-bread.
- VII. Incense-offering.

Besides this classification, another in Voluntary and Obligatory Sacrifices might be established: the former comprised the private holocausts, and the thank-offerings presented in consequence of a vow or as a free-will gift; the latter, the public holocausts, the private and public praise-offerings, and the other sacrifices above enumerated.

Again, offerings may be divided into those that were *most holy* which stood in the closest connection with the altar or the sanctuary, and those that were *less holy*. The former could only be touched by holy persons, that is, by priests, to whose share all that was not burnt on the altar or elsewhere exclusively fell, and by whom alone — the male Aaronites — it was to be consumed, in the holy place, that is, in the Court of the Sanctuary, near the brazen altar, and of course in a state of purity: they comprised the incense-offering and the shew-bread, because both were presented in the Holy itself, and the other vegetable oblations of which a part was burnt on the altar “as a memorial” before God, and which were therefore, like the shew-bread, unleavened; the sin- and trespass-offerings, and the holocausts, which were invariably killed on the northern side of the altar, and not like the thank-offerings, in whatever part of the Court. The less holy offerings might be eaten, whether partially or completely, in any locality within the holy town, in a clean

place, by the officiating priests, their families, including their wives and daughters, and every clean member of the household, but not by anyone else or "a stranger", not even the married daughter of a priest living in the house of her husband; whoever partook of them inadvertently had to make increased restitution: they were the thank-offerings, the firstborn of clean sacrificial animals, the firstlings of oil, wine, and corn, and the paschal sacrifice; of the thank-offerings and the firstlings, the fat and the fat parts alone, of the paschal lamb, which was roasted entire, nothing came on the altar; the firstfruits were merely placed before that holy structure.

Some of the offerings were presented by *individuals* exclusively, viz. the Pesach, the trespass-offering, the offering of jealousy, of the firstborn animals, of the firstfruits of vegetable productions, and of purification; others in the name of the *nation* alone, viz. the shew-bread, the incense, the offering of the first new ears of corn and of the first new bread; the rest — burnt-, praise-, thank-, sin-, and drink-offering — were presented both as private and public sacrifices.

The Hebrew offerings had a threefold aim — they were either designed to *express* the harmony of the worshipper with God, or to *restore*, or to *preserve* it: the first end was attained by the joy-offerings, the second by the expiatory and the purification-offerings, the third by the holocausts, the shew-bread, and the incense — a division which clearly discloses the internal nature of the various sacrifices.

VII. ANIMALS AND VEGETABLES OFFERED.

THE animals prescribed for sacrifices, were naturally limited to those characterised in the Pentateuch as "clean".¹

Of QUADRUPEDS, therefore, the cloven-footed and the ruminants were permitted.² But among these again the Law singled out the species which formed the ordinary food of the Israelites, were most valuable to agriculturists, and therefore really involved a *sacrifice*, an act of devoted self-denial; especially as the same animals, being bred, reared, and domesticated by the worshipper, bore a close connection with his pursuits and his ordinary life, and were creatures which he "had toiled for and made grow." Hence the quadrupeds ordained for sacrifices were not beasts like the hart, the roebuck, or the fallow deer, though these were considered clean and lawful for food,³ but mainly *cattle*, whether from the *herd* or from the *flock*; of the former class the *bullock* and *ox*, the

¹ Comp. Gen. VII. 2, 3; VIII. 20; Lev.

² Lev. XI. 3.

XI. 47; XIV. 4; XX. 25; Deut. XIV. 11, 20.

³ Deut. XIV. 5.

cow and *calf*; of the latter class, the *sheep*, male or female, the *ram* and the *lamb*, the *goat*, male or female, and the *kid of the goats*.

Of FOWLS, *turtle-doves* alone and *young pigeons* were to be offered; not only because, as Philo observes, the pigeon is by nature the most gentle of all birds which are domesticated and gregarious, and the turtle-dove the most unoffending of those which love solitude; but because they were abundantly reared and kept in Palestine,¹ and formed the principal animal food of the poor: they were also found wild in mountains and ravines throughout the 'country';² travellers were struck by their vast numbers in the vicinity of Ashkelon, and especially near Jerusalem, where in one tower more than 5000 were observed; they are met with near the Dead Sea and the Lake of Tiberias, and in every part of Syria. As their value was inconsiderable, they were indeed in exceptional cases admitted as holocausts and sin-offerings, but they were unlawful for thank- or praise-offerings, and could never be presented as a public sacrifice. Yet in such large numbers were they constantly required, especially by women who had to offer them in all cases of impurity, issue of blood, and childbirth, that they sometimes rose to a very high price, and even compelled the adoption of sacrificial regulations of less stringency. Geese were, and are still, very rare in Palestine, and are not mentioned in the Old Testament. Cocks and hens are supposed to have been rejected because they seek for food in dunghills, and might therefore be polluted by unclean insects or reptiles, or because they were not valued as food; but more probably because, at the time of the compilation of Leviticus, they were not yet domesticated in Palestine; they are, in fact, never introduced in the Hebrew Scriptures; they do not seem to have been common in western Asia before the Persian period; but they are repeatedly alluded to in the New Testament, and appear extremely frequent in the Talmudical age.

Fishes were not at all accepted as sacrifices, evidently because they multiply freely in the water, without the care and control of man.

The significance of all these restrictions is manifest: the Law demanded for sacrifices not merely the tamest animals and such as were most readily at hand, but those which, at the same time, reminded the worshippers of their daily labour, of their dependence on Him who had allowed it to prosper, and of their deep obligations to His unceasing beneficence. Although the stag and the deer, when kept and bred, were unquestionably the property of individuals, they could, as a

¹ Comp. Isai. LX. 8; 2 Ki. VI. 25.

² Ezek. VII. 16; Jer. XLVIII. 28;

Cant. II. 14; Ps. XI. 1; John II. 14.

species, not be claimed by legal owners; and might well be regarded, even if not presented on the altar, as belonging to God, the Lord of nature: "I will take no bullock, says God, out of thy house, nor he-goats out of thy folds; for every beast of the forest is Mine, and the cattle upon thousands of hills" (Ps. L. 9, 10). Not all the productions of the land, nor all the articles of food, were demanded, but those only which man had made his own by honest exertion and watchful care. The oblations were indeed to represent the property and sustenance, but also the active life and energy of the people. They were a partial restitution of the blessings which God had mercifully vouchsafed to the offerer; they impressed the seal of religion upon his gain and the produce of his work; they hallowed his life, for the maintenance of which that gain was destined.

But though this conception appears obvious, the ordinances in respect to the sacrificial animals have frequently been explained in a manner both so fantastical and so foreign to the spirit of the Pentateuch, that a refutation is scarcely required. It has been supposed that such animals were appointed which heathens held sacred or worshipped, and which the Hebrews were therefore to be accustomed to slaughter: but there is scarcely an animal which was not so revered in the ancient world; and the Levitical law does not systematically carry out the principle of opposition to pagan rites or notions. More objectionable still than this opinion, which has at least an historical tendency, is the *typical* view. It was asserted that the bullock, the sheep, and the goat, valuable in the order mentioned, were designed to recall the memory of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaak, and Jacob, who present the same gradation of excellence and virtue; while the turtle-dove and the pigeon were symbols of Moses and Aaron. By some, these animals were regarded as emblems of the people of Israel itself. Others contended that the bullock was chosen because it appeared most suitable to typify the power of Christ and of his work, the lamb his innocence, the goat his appearance as a sinner, the pigeon his gentleness, the turtle-dove his intimate relationship with God, the oil and wine his blood, and the flour his flesh and sacrifice, or his obedience manifesting itself in good works. But these explanations, trifling and playful, are well calculated to reveal the baseless fallacy of all typical theories.

Now the value of the victim was generally proportionate to the dignity or importance of the occasion. The noblest sacrifice was that of the *bullock*, which was so considered also by the Greeks and Romans, the Phoenicians and Carthaginians, the Egyptians and Persians, who offered it, on solemn opportunities, to their principal deities, to Zeus, to

Isis and Osiris, to Baal and the Sun. It formed the *burnt-offering* of the whole nation on the days of the new-moon and on the high festivals, and for inadvertent transgressions; of the chiefs of the people at the consecration of the Tabernacle; of the Levites at their initiation; and of private individuals on all momentous emergencies. It was the *sin-offering* for the whole theocratic community, or for its representative, the High-priest; for the priests at the inauguration in their solemn functions, and for the High-priest when, on the Day of Atonement, he implored the pardon of God for his sins and those of his house; while Aaron, when actually entering upon his pontifical duties, offered a young calf. It was even chosen for *thank-offerings* in cases of peculiar joyfulness.

Next in value and estimation stood the *ram*, which, like the bullock, was the type of strength and boldness. It was presented as a *holocaust* or a *thank-offering* by the whole people, or its chiefs; by the High-priest or an ordinary priest, and by the God-devoted Nazarite; but never by a common Hebrew; and as it was primitively employed for a medium of exchange and barter, it was the ordinary animal for the *trespass-offering* originally instituted to expiate violation of the rights of property.

Goats were prized less highly and deemed less palatable than even sheep. Yet a *kid of the goats* was the special victim for *sin-offerings*, partly because the chief species of cattle had long been appropriated to the other sacrifices when the expiatory offerings were introduced, and partly because the legislators desired to bring this most important and most spiritual class of sacrifice within the means of poorer people — a consideration which prompted even the admission of a *vegetable sin-offering*, though the sprinkling of blood was ordinarily the very centre of the rituals of atonement. It was ordained for the *sin-offering* of the whole people, on the days of the new-moon and the festivals, after unintentional transgressions, and immediately after the consecration of the priests and the Sanctuary; and of the chiefs and private Israelites on all ordinary occasions; it was admitted for private *burnt-* and *thank-offerings*; but it was never prescribed for public *burnt-offerings*. Of the gradual substitution of bullocks instead of goats for expiatory offerings we have treated above (p. 33).

The *lamb*, the usual animal food of eastern tribes, was regularly employed for the daily *public holocausts*, presented on festivals in increased numbers and accompanied by bullocks and rams; and very commonly for private *burnt-* and *thank-offerings*, for *sin-*, *trespass-*, and *purification-offerings*.

The gradation in the choice of the victims is plainly manifest from the precepts as to sin-offerings: the High-priest or the whole community required a bullock; a chief of the people a male kid of the goats; and a common Israelite a female kid of the goats or a female lamb.

The *pigeon* and the *turtle-dove* were enjoined as burnt- and sin-offerings in cases of lustration after a period of uncleanness, as after the cessation of a "running issue", whether of a man or a woman, or after a Nazarite's unavoidable contact with a corpse; they were allowed as private holocausts, and accepted from poorer people, instead of more valuable animals, as sin-offerings, and as purification-offerings after recovery from leprosy and after childbirth; but they were not admitted as thank-offerings, nor ever formed a part of the great public or festival sacrifices.

All these animals were variously combined, multiplied, or exchanged in accordance with the occasions for which they were required; the reasons for the choice, though not always obvious, may in many instances be pointed out with some degree of probability, and they testify to the thoughtful character of the sacrificial ordinances.

No less manifest is the principle of the Pentateuch in the selection of the *vegetable productions* that were to be taken for the bloodless offerings: it is entirely identical with that set forth in respect to animals. The chief materials were *flour*, or in some cases, *roasted grains* rubbed out of the early ears of corn, and *wine*; for bread and wine are frequently named as the principal means of sustenance, and the choicest blessings of a fertile soil; and next in importance came *oil*, which, belonging to the daily necessaries of Eastern life, was commonly employed for libations and for preparing cereal offerings: these three productions therefore are often coupled to express the staple of Canaan's wealth and of the people's nourishment. Moreover, as accessories were ordained *frank-incense* and *salt*, the latter to be added on nearly all occasions; and *leaven* or *honey* to be used in a few instances. Not the free and common gifts or the spontaneous vegetation of nature, however esteemed and precious, were to be dedicated to the deity, not figs, pomegranates, dates, or almonds, though forming characteristic products of Palestine, but those objects only, which the offerer had made his individual property by exertion and anxious attention and which he had obtained by the sweat of his brow: gratitude, humility, self-abnegation, and the reality of a hard-working life, were to be mirrored in every offering.

The simplicity of these regulations appears more strikingly still if compared with the practice of other nations. As offerings were exten-

sively supposed to be the sustenance of the gods (p. 5), we find, indeed, theoretically the principle adopted almost everywhere that the victims should be animals useful to man as food, such as bullocks, sheep, stags, pigs, and fowl; while those which are serviceable to him by their labour merely, as donkeys and elephants, were not acceptable; and useless and noxious animals, as monkeys and serpents, were entirely rejected. Accordingly, the eatable domestic animals were very commonly killed for offerings. Ancient writers supposed that pigs were the earliest victims. Bullocks and cows, sheep, especially lambs, and goats, were ordinarily offered by the Greeks and Romans, by the Ethiopians, the Syrians, and Phoenicians, though the latter included game also, especially stags, geese, and other birds. But the practice was regulated by a consideration connected with the very root of paganism. In the Laws of the Twelve Tables, it is enjoined, "Such beasts should be used for victims as are becoming and agreeable to each deity". Now every divinity represented, as a rule, a power or manifestation of nature; the victim singled out was, therefore, designed to possess a *cosmic* significance; it bore a certain internal affinity to the deity itself — a point which will be more fully developed in its due place (Sect. XX). But the fluctuations involved in this doctrine are obvious. "What is the reason", exclaimed Arnobius, "that this God should be honoured by bullocks, another by goats or sheep? the one by sucking pigs, the other by unshorn lambs, some by sterile kine, and some by pregnant sows; the one by white, the other by black animals, one by female, and the other by male victims?" Were those animals more pleasing to a god which had been dedicated to him as sacred, or those which stood in no such relation? The customs followed in this respect differed even to direct opposition. The former principle was indeed most extensively adopted. The Greeks and Romans laid it down as a rule that every deity was to be honoured by its own favourite or kindred animals — the Olympians by refulgently white, the terrestrial, the marine, and lower gods by dark-coloured victims; the former also by birds, the latter mainly by quadrupeds. The Greeks sacrificed, therefore, game of any kind and especially stags to Artemis; swine, the emblem of fruitfulness, to Demeter; he-goats to Dionysos, notorious for amorous desires; cows to Latona; black cattle and sometimes horses to Poseidon; donkeys to Priapus; dogs to Hecate, — selections which a reference to the mythological character of the deities will render intelligible. In a similar manner, the Romans appeased Jupiter Capitolinus with white cattle except bulls and rams; Apollo, Neptune, or Mars with bulls; Juno Calendaris with a white cow, on account of her moon-shaped horns; Mars also with wolves; the virgin Minerva with an intact

heifer; Venus with doves and sparrows, "the wanton birds"; while swine in general were immolated to all agrarian deities, and to Mars, Ceres, and Tellus, for confirming imprecations or ratifying treaties. But other nations followed the contrary law, and abstained from offering to a deity the animals sacred to it. Thus the Egyptians never sacrificed cows, because holy to Isis, or rather to Athor, worshipped throughout the land as the primary principle of all things and the creative power of nature. In the Thebais, they offered goats and no sheep, in Mendes sheep and no goats, because the sheep were held sacred in the one district, and the goats in the other. They avoided the sacrifice of turtle-doves from a curious reason. The Syrians and Assyrians regarded the pigeon as so inviolable that even an accidental contact caused uncleanness for the day, because Semiramis was supposed to have finally been changed into that bird. But in order to force or to annoy an *evil* deity, sometimes animals were killed, that were consecrated to it. Thus in times of serious illness, great misfortune, or protracted drought, which they attributed to the malice of Typhon, the Egyptians furtively and silently took some of his holy animals to a dark place, and tried to intimidate them by threats; if the calamity did not abate, they slaughtered them as a punishment of the hated demon. At the interment of Apis, they threw some of Typhon's animals into the open grave, in order to vex him and to diminish his exultation at the death of the sacred bull. In this manner, the strangest aberrations might arise; and not unfrequently the gravity of sacrificial rites was converted into futile play. When the animals deemed necessary for certain occasions could not be procured, various devices were resorted to. Sheep were sacrificed instead of stags, but were then named stags — an expedient similar to that adopted in the temple of Isis at Rome, where the priests used water of the Tiber instead of the Nile, but called it water of the Nile. In fact, the principle was set forth that, in sacrificing, the appearance is taken for the reality; accordingly, if animals were required which it was difficult to obtain, such as the Sibylline books occasionally ordered, images of them were made in bread or wax, and offered as substitutes. This was also frequently done by poor people, who presented figures of animals, whether baked of flour or imitated in wax. — Sometimes they offered even apples instead of sheep because in Greek their *names* are identical (*αἴλα*)!

It would be impossible to specify all the animals sacrificed in the heathen world; wherever they did not bear that cosmic relation to the gods which has above been alluded to, they represented either the

productions of the country or the wealth of the population generally. We must, therefore, restrict ourselves to a few instances.

Among the Hindoos, the most solemn, or "the queen" of offerings, was the horse-sacrifice or *Aswamedha*; to the goddess Kali, the personification of the destructive power of Shiva, and to the avenging demons Bhairawas they presented, besides bullocks and goats, stags, antelopes, and wild boars, also tortoises, ichneumons, and alligators, buffaloes and the rhinoceros, lions and tigers, and nine other species of wild beasts. — The Arabs offered also camels; the Ethiopians gazelles and gryphs; the Laplanders rein-deer. White horses were extensively killed to the Sun, because it was deemed appropriate to dedicate the swiftest animal to the swiftest god; this was the custom of the Persians and the Ethiopians, of the Magi at the river Strymon, the Scythians, and the Massagetæ. Northern tribes frequently slaughtered boars, the emblems of fruitfulness and generative power, especially in honour of those gods to whom the fructification of the soil was attributed, as to Freya in the beginning of February, to Freyr or Frikko, the god of the sun and of procreation, on the eve of the Jul festival in mid-winter, to whom nuptial sacrifices also were commonly offered. The Danes, on their great festival celebrated every 9 years, sacrificed horses, dogs, cocks, and hawks, besides men, 99 of each species: the number 9 so markedly prevailing in these arrangements, evidently points to generation and birth; and the same characteristic is manifest in a corresponding festival of the Swedes, who every 9 years presented, as a great sin-offering, 9 men and 9 animals of every chief species. Birds were also frequently sacrificed — geese by the Egyptians, especially to Isis, by the Phoenicians, the Greeks, and Romans; cocks by the Chinese, and by the Egyptians to Anubis, guinea-fowls, and eagles frequently by the Roman emperors, whose grand sacrifice consisted of hecatombs of eagles, lions, and other rare animals.

As regards the bloodless offerings of the pagans, there was scarcely any vegetable production that was not presented on the altars either in its natural or in a prepared state.

In some religious systems of western Asia, frank-incense was offered in vast profusion. The Babylonians, on the great annual festival of Bel, burnt not less than a thousand talents of the precious perfume, and the term "burning incense" became equivalent with sacrificing and worshipping generally. Several Greek tribes adopted a similar practice; they brought offerings of fragrant wood, as of the cedar, the fig-tree, the vine, and the myrtle; and later, of frank-incense itself, which was generally laid on the altar in conjunction

with other gifts, but was occasionally offered alone, as on the feast of the Diasia, when it was burnt to Zeus Meilichios; indeed, the frank-incense strewn on the victim was extensively supposed to be the most essential part of the animal sacrifice.

The vegetable offerings of the Greeks were pre-eminently varied; they consisted of cakes, in honour of Apollo and other deities; dressed vegetables, as the pots of pulse with which altars and statues of inferior deities were consecrated; an olive or laurel branch enveloped in wool and hung round with various kinds of fruit, carried about by singing boys on certain festivals, and then suspended at the house-door; gall, regarded as a symbol of life, in opposition to honey typifying spiritual death; and many other oblations suggested by Greek ingenuity and enthusiasm.

The Romans presented at first only salted cakes, or other cakes with wine, to Janus or Jupiter; or wine alone, herbs, laurels, or violet-chaplets; then myrrh, the aromatic branches of the zedary (costum), frank-incense, whether alone or mixed with wine, to Janus, Jupiter, and Juno, the firstfruits of the crops, both in their natural state and prepared, and other vegetable productions, whether ready at hand or particularly valued.

But as a general rule, the pagans offered such oblations as were most palatable and savoury to themselves; so the Canaanites presented grape-cakes; the Aramaeans baked cakes; the negroes, besides coral-beads, cowries, and silver-money, also brandy or rum; the American Indians tobacco; and the Samojedes employ greese, with which they besmear the faces of their idols — a natural consequence of the anthropomorphic character of their sacrifices.

The ancient Hindoos devoted to the gods rice, and frequently clarified butter poured on fire. But their most general, as it was their earliest, offering consisted of the expressed and fermented, milky and subacid juice of the *soma* plant. The fluid was mixed with curds, barley flour, and a species of wild corn, and then presented in ladles to the deities invoked; a part of it was sprinkled on the fire, or on the ground, or on the sacred grass, which, after the roots had been cut off, was spread on the altar, or strewn over the floor of the chamber, or arranged as a seat for the deity invited to the sacrifice; the residue was then drunk by those who assisted in the sacred act. The *soma* was extolled, with enthusiastic praise, in many works of Hindoo literature. It was called the grace of sacrifice, the exhilarator of mankind, on account of its narcotic properties, the noblest of the life-giving powers of nature; it was supposed to secure immortality, and to be the delight

of the gods, especially of Indra, who achieves his deeds of glory when inspired by its powers. Gradually it was understood not merely as a drink, but as the god of drink, and was invested with the qualities of a supreme deity. However, it did not maintain its place among the Hindoos; its sale and use were even considerably restricted by the laws of Manu.

An old oblation of the Parsees was the *miczd*, a mixture of meat, bread, and fruit, which was blessed and then eaten. But to the *soma* of the Hindoos corresponds the *hom* or *hasma* of the Parsees, the juice of that wonderful tree through which an evil demon sent by Ahriman seduced and ruined the first human couple. It was both their most important and most common sacrifice. The visions which it produced when tasted were regarded as prophetic. Thus *hom* became itself a genius or god, the sacrament of religion, the medium of divine revelation. He appeared to Zoroaster, whose father is, in the Zendavesta, represented as the most perfect of beings, and the first harbinger of the Law. He was worshipped already by the oldest fathers of the tribes and heroes, who were born by his grace; for *hom* is the protector of houses, cities and countries; he removes death, imparts health and vigour, grants children and long life, secures victory over the hatred of evil spirits, awards a place among the saints, and leads the soul the way to heaven.

But the sacrifices of the heathens, however multifarious and diversified never embraced metal or other lifeless objects; they consisted exclusively of vegetable productions, of beasts, or of men, that is, of gifts connected with the soul of the cosmos or the life of nature, to which the individual existence of the worshipper was given up; they were thus rendered subordinate to the central idea of pagan theology; and herein presented one of the most striking and most interesting differences from the sacrifices of the Hebrews.

VIII. QUALIFICATION OF THE OFFERINGS.

As the main object of sacrifices was to do homage to the Deity, whether by acknowledging His power, or thanking Him for His bounty, or imploring His forgiveness, the offerings were naturally required, from their value and condition, to be worthy of their important purpose. Hence the qualifications, too essential to be left to individual arbitrariness, were strictly regulated by the Levitical law. The principles which, in this respect, guided the legislators, were mainly *excellence* and *significance* of the gift. This is manifest from a consideration of the particular attributes.

A. The ANIMALS were commanded to be

1. *Faultless* or *perfect*. The precepts on this point are distinct and explicit; they are not only given in general terms, as, "Thou shalt not sacrifice to the Lord thy God any bullock or sheep, wherein is blemish or any defect;"¹ or, "If the beast has any blemish, as if it is lame or blind, thou shalt not sacrifice it to the Lord thy God;"² but the disqualifying faults are elaborately specified, "Whosoever will offer a sacrifice to the Lord for a burnt-offering, shall offer it for your acceptance, a male without blemish; . . . but whatsoever has a blemish, that you shall not offer; for it shall not be acceptable for you. And whosoever will offer a thank-offering to the Lord . . . it shall be perfect to be accepted; it shall have no blemish: animals that are blind, or broken, or maimed, or ulcerous, or scurvy, or scabbed, you shall not offer to the Lord . . . You shall not offer to the Lord animals that are bruised, or crushed, or broken, or castrated; you shall not offer the food of your God of any of these; . . . because their corruption is in them, and blemishes are in them; they shall not be accepted for you."³ This law is specially enjoined with regard to burnt-,⁴ thank-,⁵ and expiatory offerings,⁶ and to the paschal lamb.⁷ Its rigour is somewhat relaxed in one single case. A bullock and a lamb with limbs either too short or too long were lawful for thank-offerings presented as free-will gifts, though not as vows: but animals of that description are not properly disfigured by a defect, but are merely abnormal in the proportion of their members; their flesh is not necessarily inferior; they could, therefore, be deemed acceptable for sacrifices offered from spontaneous impulse, without a positive religious obligation. To devote faulty animals was regarded as an abomination to the Lord,⁸ a criminal desecration of the Divine name, and a pollution of the Temple and the altar.⁹ It was certain to cause the rejection of the worshipper and his gift.¹⁰ For man who owes all to God, ought, when he approaches His Sanctuary with new supplications, to dedicate to Him what is best and choicest, and to present to Him who is perfect only perfect oblations; "lest the things consecrated to the most High appear contemptible, and His worship be degraded." But that law of faultlessness is hardly intended as a symbol of the *offerer's* perfection, or of his required freedom from all failings and diseases of the soul whenever he enters the Temple; it refers exclusively to the *sacrifice* which was

¹ Deut. XVII. 1. ² Deut. XV. 21. ⁵ Lev. III. 1, 6; XXII. 21.

³ Lev. XXII. 18—25; see Comm. *in loc.* Jewish tradition counts 50 different defects. ⁶ Lev. IV. 3, 23, 28, 32; V. 15, 18, 25; IX. 2, 3; XIV. 10.

⁷ Exod. XII. 5. ⁸ Deut. XVII. 1.

⁴ Lev. I. 3, 10; IX. 2, 3; XXIII. 18. ⁹ Mal. I. 6, 7. ¹⁰ Mal. I. 8, 9, 13.

to be worthy of God, the holy One ; much less can it be regarded typically to point to the unblemished purity of Christ.

Hence the greatest care was bestowed on the selection of the victim. According to Jewish tradition, it was, before being admitted to the altar, examined from head to foot by experienced officials. Among the Egyptians, a chief section of the priests had the duty to mark the beasts which, on the closest inspection, had been declared fit for sacrifice, by tying a piece of papyrus round the horns, and stamping it with a signet-ring on sealing-clay: whoever offered an animal not sanctioned in this manner suffered death. In fact, the Egyptians sacrificed only "such bulls and calves as were pure" or perfect. Among the Greeks, the same rule was observed with conscientious strictness. They fixed as indispensable a considerable number of qualities; the victims were required to be "perfect, faultless, sound, healthy, unmaimed, complete and strong in limbs, unhurt, not deformed, not without horns, and not crippled". Indeed, they established the comprehensive law, "The victim must be pure in body and life, and uninjured and uncorrupted"; or, "In general, whatever is not perfect and sound, must not be sacrificed to the gods." Nor were the Romans less scrupulous on this point. They were careful to offer "select" animals, which designation was explained to mean *perfect* and *faultless*. On the Phoenician tablet of Marseilles, the attribute "perfect" is almost invariably used in connection with the purification- and thank-offerings. Indeed, all nations acted upon the same view which naturally suggests itself. The Eretrians alone, by a strange fancy, sacrificed to Artemis in their town Amarynthus *maimed* victims.

2. For most occasions, the animal was ordered to be *male*. This was pre-eminently the case with regard to the more important classes of sacrifice — for the burnt-offerings, the paschal lamb, the principal expiatory offerings, and all sacrifices of whatever description presented in the name of the whole people. In other instances, a *female* victim was demanded, as for the sin-offering of the common Israelite. In others again, either a male or a female was permitted, as for private thank-offerings and firstlings. For pigeons and turtle-doves no particular sex was prescribed in the Law. It was very generally supposed that the male is superior to the female. The sin-offering of a chief was a kid of the goats, that of a common Israelite a female of the same species or a female lamb. Human sacrifices, the choicest of all offerings, consisted of males exclusively. It was regarded as base deceitfulness, sure of Divine punishment, if a man possessed a male animal, and yet vowed or sacrificed a female one. We may thus understand the subtlety

with which Philo refined the current notions. "A male", he observed, "is both more lordly than a female and more perfect, and more nearly related to the efficient cause; while the female is imperfect, subordinate, and more fit to be passive than active; so that the rational part of our soul, as intellect and reason, belongs to the male, the irrational part, as the outward senses, to the female sex." Nor can we be surprised to find similar views prevailing among other nations also. In the temple of Venus at Paphos, victims of whatever species were allowed, provided they were males. The sacrificial animals of the Hindoo divinities Kali and the Bhairawas were exclusively males. The Egyptians universally sacrificed male kine and male calves, but never the females, which were sacred to Isis, or rather to Athor; and cows especially were more venerated than any other animal. Though the Mendesians paid reverence to all goats, they honoured the males more than the females; they esteemed the goatherds who tended the former more highly; and when one particular he-goat died, public mourning was observed throughout the district. But another consideration, foreign and even antagonistic to motives of religion, frequently determined the choice. The killing of certain beasts was prohibited, when it would have been detrimental to the increase or quality of the species, or when they were too highly prized to be spared for offerings. The Egyptians and Phoenicians regarded it as a detestable crime to sacrifice or to consume female cattle; "they would sooner have eaten human than cow's flesh"; for the female animals, being more valuable, had become extremely scarce among them, and were to be left untouched for the sake of their breeding. The Arabs released from labour any she-camel that had successively brought forth ten females; she was declared at liberty and hence called *sayiba*, the free one; she could not be used for riding or for carrying burdens; her hair was not allowed to be cut, and her milk was reserved for her young ones and for guests only: if, in this state of privileged exemption, she gave birth to another female, the latter enjoyed the same distinctions. The Egyptian priests pronounced some of the most useful animals as sacred, ostensibly from some mysterious cause, but really in order to guard against a diminution of their breed: so in the Thebaid, mutton, although the most wholesome meat in Egypt, was interdicted at a time when sheep were rare. It was an old custom among the Athenians, for the sake of the produce of the flocks, never to slay a sheep which had not been shorn, or which had not brought forth any young; the priests of Minerva never, up to a late period, sacrificed a lamb. The Libyans and the Derbices in Mount Caucasus prohibited by law the killing of cows. From this point of view, two opposite

practices will easily be accounted for. On the one hand, the tribes of ancient Italy laid down the rule, that for all kinds of sacrifices the females are more valuable than the males; and therefore, when desirous to evince special gratitude to the gods, and to present a particularly acceptable offering, they sacrificed a female animal. On the other hand, the Athenians on one occasion passed a decree that no oxen should be killed on account of their scarcity. The Scythians and Phrygians punished with death any one who killed a ploughing ox. The ancient Romans valued the oxen so much as "their companions in labour", that they long abstained from slaying them for food; and it is related by various writers, that a man was publicly condemned to exile, because he had killed a working ox for that purpose, which act was deemed scarcely less criminal "as if he had assassinated one of his peasants"; for the slaughter of oxen was regarded as an iniquity which began to prevail only after the disappearance of the golden age. Some nations offered male and female animals indiscriminately; thus the Ethiopians killed to Helios a male, to Selene a female victim; the Scythians a female lamb to Hecate; the Greeks and Romans generally observed the characteristic rule, unless modified by other considerations, that the sex of the victim should correspond with the sex of the deity to which it was sacrificed. The same principle partially prevailed among northern tribes, as the Laplanders, who sacrificed male reindeer to the gods Tiermes and Storjunkare, and females to the goddess Baiwe, the three deities just named forming a northern trinity representing the powers of creation, preservation, and destruction, in a manner so perfectly analogous to the Hindoo *trimurtis* that even the colours particular to each divinity, red, white, and black, are those of Brahmah, Vishnu, and Shiva respectively; while the only difference is this that, in the northern mythology, a *god* not inappropriately corresponds with the Hindoo *goddess* of destruction, Shiva.

3. As regards the *age* of victims, it was ordained that none should be offered earlier than the seventh day from their birth;¹ till then, they were not only regarded as unclean, but as too weak and imperfect to represent their species, and to guarantee a well-secured existence. The only restriction enjoined in this respect was, that the young animal and its mother should not be killed on the same day,² a law supposed to have been suggested by reasons of humanity, "for it is the excess of barbarity, to destroy in one day the offspring and her who is the cause of its birth; it is slaughter rather than sacrifice"; and from similar motives, pregnant animals seem to have been excluded from

¹ Lev. XXII. 27; comp. Exod. XXII. 29.

² Lev. XXII. 28.

the altar; "for the animals which are still in the womb, are looked upon as equal to those that have just been born." The firstborn male animals were to be killed within the first year.³ Burnt-,⁴ sin-,⁵ thank-, and praise-offerings⁶ were required to be above one year, and so consequently also the paschal lamb.⁷ It is in harmony with the spirit of the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch to suppose that the victims were not to be too old; for "in an advanced age, the animal is not perfect in its nature", and ought, therefore, if possible, "not to be presented to God, on account of His exalted glory." For turtle-doves and young pigeons no age was prescribed in the Pentateuch.

The practices of other nations were diversified. The Babylonians presented on one of the altars of Bel sucklings only, on another full-grown animals. The early Greeks killed bullocks and pigs five years old, and more frequently bullocks and cows of one year; later, it is recorded that cows and sheep were sacrificed after they had changed their teeth, and pigs, if less than 15 months old; while Pallas was honoured with calves two years and cows three years old. In some instances indeed new-born pigs were offered to the lower gods, or new-born calves to Dionysos; and for purification-offerings sucking pigs were generally chosen: yet as a rule, a certain maturity of age was deemed essential for victims. The Romans did not admit the young pigs before they were five days, lambs and kids seven days, and calves one month, though some authorities fixed the age of young pigs at ten days; but they particularly preferred for sacrifices animals that had the two rows of teeth complete, and were therefore strongest and most perfect. In fact, some considered them absolutely unfit before that time.

4. On some occasions, an animal was demanded that had done no work, and had drawn no yoke. This was the case with regard to the "red cow" killed and burnt for purposes of purification, and the heifer slain at the rite of expiation for a murder not traceable to the perpetrator:⁸ though both were not sacrifices in the proper sense, it was deemed becoming that animals employed for symbolical acts of such solemnity, should not have served any worldly end, but that their full strength and value should be given up to the sacred ceremonials. To enjoin such a qualification for all sacrifices, would have been an impossibility, and would have encumbered the sacrificial legislation with

³ Deut. XV. 19, 20.

⁶ Num. VII. 17, 23, 29 etc.; Lev.

⁴ Exod. XXIX. 35; Lev. IX. 3; XII.

XXIII. 19.

6; XXIII. 12; Num. XXVIII. 3, 9, 11,

⁷ Exod. XII. 5.

19, 27. ⁵ Lev. XIV. 10; Num.

⁸ Num. XIX. 1—10; Deut. XXI. 3, 4.

VI. 12, 14; XV. 27.

a new and insuperable difficulty. It is well-known that other nations frequently adhered to a similar practice. Diomedes promised to offer to Athene a bullock "untamed, never yet led under the yoke." The Romans sacrificed to the gods "untouched" or "yokeless" beasts; and sheep that had not been shorn. But these instances refer mainly to occasions of peculiar importance or interest.

5. It needs scarcely to be observed that the offering was required to be the *lawful* and *exclusive property* of the worshipper — a consideration which prompted the appointment of clean *domestic* animals for sacrifices. To offer the property of others has justly been described as a preposterous contradiction in terms. When David intended to sacrifice on the threshing-floor of Araunah, and the latter offered to him the victim and the wood as a present, he declined in the words, "Nay, I will surely buy it of thee at a price; and I will not offer burnt-offerings to the Lord my God of that which costs me nothing";¹ and the Levitical law declares it to be "an abomination to the Lord", if a man offers for a vow "the gain of unchastity or the price of a dog."² In the distressed periods after the exile, the impoverished people presented indeed on the altar the offerings supplied to them by foreign kings;³ but they had, in that exceptional condition, no alternative but to neglect the public worship or to defray its expenses from presents of strangers; and they provided the necessary means as soon as their circumstances at all improved.⁴

6. So far the customs of the Hebrews with regard to the qualification of victims nearly coincided with those of other nations. But the latter did not stop there; they were, by the nature of their religious systems, almost inevitably led to complicated or artificial and often whimsical rules. Some attached a mystical importance to the *colours*. Black was the emblem of grief and misfortune, white of joy and life. Saturn, conceived as "the great calamity", was worshipped in a *black* hexagonal temple by black-robed priests; Mars, the blood-stained, or "the minor calamity", in a *red* temple, in blood-sprinkled garments. It is still customary in the East for a chief or prince, when he replies in state to important petitions, to appear on a black horse if he refuses, on a grey one if he leaves the matter undecided or delays the decision, and on one of spotless white if he consents.⁵

¹ 2 Sam. XXIV. 24. ² Deut. XXIII. 19.

³ Ezra VI. 9; VII. 17, 22; 1 Macc. X. 39; 2 Macc. III. 3; IX. 16; *Jos. A.* XII. iii. 3. ⁴ *Nchem.* X. 33—35.

⁵ So when, in the beginning of 1864, the venerable and benevolent Sir Moses

Montefiore interceded for his co-religionists with the emperor of Morocco, this prince appeared, in the court-yard of his palace, on a white steed, and immediately issued decrees guaranting the protection and security of the Jews.

Thus the Greeks and Romans considered *black* cattle necessary for the gods of the nether world and for Poseidon, but *white* cattle for the heavenly deities, though they conciliated Poseidon also by reddish or even white animals. They used for offerings of expiation black cattle which was meant to typify guilt; and such they presented at Athens to the Tempests and Hurricanes. Jupiter Capitolinus was, in Rome, to be honoured with a white bullock; but as a beast perfectly of that colour is rarely found, the unfavourable spots were generally whitened with chalk. The Egyptians sacrificed to Osiris reddish oxen, because that colour was attributed to Typhon, his enemy and persecutor; so scrupulous were they on this point that a single black hair disqualified the animal. A remnant of this conception was preserved among the Hebrews in the ordinance of the "red cow."⁶ In China, the victims presented at the four great annual sacrifices differed in colour according to the four seasons, at the beginning of which the festivals were celebrated. The northern and Germanic tribes chose a red, white, or black victim, to correspond with the deity to which it was offered. The bear sacrificed at the beginning of February to Freya, to pray for abundance of corn, was yellow, the colour of the golden ears.

7. We have above alluded to the cosmic nature of the Greek and Roman gods and of their sacrifices; that character appears nowhere more strikingly than in the laws as to the qualification of victims. The deities were viewed in their supposed relations to productiveness and fertility. Therefore, Proserpine, the symbol of decaying and sterile nature, was honoured by *barren*, Ceres, the goddess of harvest, by *pregnant* cows, or by pigs, the types of extraordinary fruitfulness. Such sacrifices were offered especially in spring, when the seed had just been entrusted to the earth; they formed, therefore, a chief feature of the Roman festival of the *Fordicidia*, which was celebrated, in honour of Tellus, in the middle of April. The manes of the departed were also propitiated by a barren cow. But occasionally this principle, intelligible as it is from a certain point of view, could not be carried out with consistency on account of the contradictory attributes of the pagan gods; thus the Eumenidae received, at Sicyon, the offering of pregnant sheep, because they were believed not only to spread blast and destruction among the crops, but also to protect and to bless them, and to grant offspring and domestic concord.

Other regulations were futile or ludicrous. Importance was attached to the condition of the tail. The Greeks considered a pig unfit for sacrifice, unless the tail was complete. The Romans excluded the

⁶ Num. XIX. 1—10.

calf from the altar, unless its tail reached to the pastern joint, since the tail, small at the birth of the calf, grows gradually larger, till the beast arrives at maturity; or unless the tail was rounded off at the end, the tongue not cloven, and the ear not black. They disqualified calves which had been carried to the altar on men's shoulders, or struggled to get away from the altar, on which latter point more will be said in the proper place. Some tribes sacrificed to Mars asses distinguished by stentorian loudness of voice.

B. The materials of BLOODLESS SACRIFICES were prescribed to possess the following qualifications.

1. The *cars of corn*, presented as a first-fruit offering,¹ were to be of the earlier and superior sort, carefully cultivated as if in a garden, and the grains were to be rubbed or beaten out.

2. The *flour* was ordinarily to be of the *finest* or *best* quality, in contradistinction to the coarser sort, and from the choicest species of grain, *wheat*. However, the offering presented for the wife suspected of faithlessness, consisted of the common flour of the less valuable grain of *barley*.

3. The flour, of which never less than an *omer* or a tenth of an ephah was used for an offering, because this quantity was, as a rule, deemed sufficient for one person's daily sustenance, after having been mixed with water and converted into dough, was either leavened, or remained more generally unleavened. It was baked either into *loaves*, into *thin cakes* or *wafers*, or into *thick cakes* pierced with little holes: the thickness is supposed never to have exceeded one finger; and the holes were produced by the small and smooth flints, with which the pot or pitcher used for preparing the cakes was half filled, and over which the dough was spread; such holes are still made in the unleavened cakes of the Arabs and the passover-cakes of the Jews, though in the latter, of course, not in the primitive way just described. Both the thick and the thin cakes are believed to have been round in form.

4. The *oil* employed for the bloodless offerings, was to be the white *olive-oil* obtained from the green, unripe berries squeezed or beaten in a mortar; not that inferior though more abundant kind gained from the ripe olives trodden out with the feet or thrown into oil-presses or oil-mills; much less the very valueless and unsavoury oils extensively used in the East. It was to be pure, that is, not mixed with any other fluid.

Now this oil was used in different ways. It was often simply

¹ Lev. II. 14.

poured over the offering, whether over the plain flour, or over the pieces into which the oblation was divided, or over the roasted ears of corn presented as firstfruits. The thicker cakes, that is, the flour of which they were prepared, were *mingled* with oil; the thinner cakes, after having been baked, were *anointed*, that is, brushed over with it, according to Jewish tradition in the form of the Greek letter X. In a few cases, the offering was *soaked* in oil and almost saturated with it; this was the case with the oblation which both the common and the High-priests presented on the day of their consecration; and with the flour which formed a part of the cereal accompaniment of the praise-offering. It is evident, that the ampler or scantier use of the oil stood in significant relation to the nature of the offering, and harmonised with the symbolical attributes of the oil.

5. The *frank-incense*, largely imported into Palestine from Arabia Felix, especially from Sheba, and obtained from a thorny shrub, *Amyris kataf* or *Juniperus thurifera*, growing on mountainous tracts, with leaves and fruit resembling those of the myrtle, was ordered to be *pure*, which epithet probably refers to the white and superior frank-incense, procured by incisions in the bark of the plant in the beginning of autumn; while the reddish kind gathered in the winter, is of much meaner quality. The quantity required for each offering is not fixed in the Pentateuch, and was probably left to the piety and capability of the worshipper. — While frank-incense was, by the Israelites, presented only as an accompaniment of other oblations, it was by several Greek and many middle Asiatic tribes presented alone and often in copious abundance (p. 66).

6. The *wine* ordained for libations is in no manner described or qualified. Hence, probably, the ordinary or red wine was understood, especially as it easily admitted of a welcome symbolical meaning, and the fine red colour of the wine was admired and extolled.

7. Once another fluid — *shechar* — is mentioned as a libation;² it is probably some strong or intoxicating liquor, resembling wine in its nature and effects, though distinct from it, and hence, like wine, interdicted to priests during their sacred functions, to Nazarites, and other persons of peculiar sanctity. The Arabs designate by the same name wine made from dry grapes or dates.

8. Nor is the *salt*, which was to be used not only with the bloodless, but with all sacrifices generally,³ described in any way. It is well known that the Dead Sea is strongly impregnated with salt which is partly brought thither from the salt-mountain (Usdum) on the

² Num. XXVIII. 7.

³ Lev. II. 13; see p. 63.

southwestern shores, and partly, especially in the northern regions, deposited at the bottom of the lake itself; so that the mineral covers, by exhalation, the surrounding trees with a thick crust, sometimes imparts to the whole neighbourhood the appearance of a snowy plain; and is, after the annual inundations, plentifully found in the marshes and pits abounding in the vicinity. It was hence called *Sodomitic salt*. It was most probably this species which the Hebrews employed for sacred purposes. Large quantities of it were kept in the second Temple, in a room specially set apart for the stores; and Antiochus the Great sent to the Jews, among other gifts, 375 medimni of salt for use at the sacrifices. In default of Sodomitic salt the Hebrews availed themselves of that of Ostracine, a town near Pelusium or Rhinocolura and the lake Sirbonis, where salt was dug out of the earth "like blocks from a quarry."

9. *Leaven and honey*, though generally banished from the altar, were admitted in a few exceptional cases: the former for the first new bread offered on Pentecost, and for every praise-offering, when the bread and the cakes were to be leavened; the latter, if presented as a firstfruit-offering. The reason for these concessions will be pointed out in the following section of this treatise (IX. 9, 10).

Leaven was, in the earliest times, prepared from millet, or fine wheat-bran, kneaded with must; or from the meal of various plants, as the fitch (*erum*) and the chicheling vetch (*ocercula*); or from barley and water baked in cakes upon a hot hearth or in an earthen dish placed upon hot ashes and charcoals, after which the cakes were kept close in vessels till they turned sour. In later periods, it was made chiefly from the bread-flour without salt, kneaded, and then either boiled to the consistency of porridge and left till it became sour, or simply allowed to stand for a few days. Among the Hebrews, this last method seems to have been most common, but they employed for fermentation must or wine-lees also.

10. But we confess our inability to determine the sort of *honey* understood by the Hebrew law — whether it was the bee-honey, so plentiful in Palestine; or, as is less probable, the grape-honey, or *dibs* of the Orientals, which is prepared from must boiled down to one third or one half; or whether it was the date-honey; or fruit-honey generally. Theophrastus, however, who erroneously represents the Hebrews as having used much honey in their libations offered with the holocausts, was, no doubt, like those whom he followed, misled by the usage extensively prevailing among other nations, as the Persians and Eleans, who offered, especially to the gods of the lower world

and at the sacrifices for the dead, either honey alone, or mixed with the holy cakes, or spread on fruits, whence honey was called the "sweet food of the gods", which they eagerly desire.

IX. SYMBOLICAL MEANING OF OBJECTS CONNECTED WITH SACRIFICES.

The sacrificial rites and observances cannot be meaningless and hazardous. They were evidently devised to facilitate the ends which they were intended to serve. They must be understood as instrumental either in restoring or in testifying to the peace of mind and its harmony with God. They are, therefore, visible embodiments of spiritual ideas — they bear a symbolical character. However, the slaughtering of animals and the offering of gifts unavoidably involve certain requirements and acts, without which they cannot be accomplished. Though, therefore, some of the ceremonies have a spiritual meaning, others cannot, without unprofitable playfulness, be interpreted symbolically: a correct appreciation of the nature of the Law will aid the judgment in fixing the distinction. We begin with the sacrificial *objects* which seem to imply a symbolical meaning; after which we shall attempt to explain the *acts* which belong to the same category.

1. SALT.

Salt was indeed, in primitive sacrifices, probably employed merely because it formed an indispensable ingredient in all human food. But when religious education advanced beyond the anthropopathic stage, this seasoning, though still deemed necessary in every sacrifice, was invested with a symbolical meaning. Its significance cannot be mistaken, it was accepted not only by the eastern but the classical nations, and passed, in many languages, into a standing and proverbial metaphor. Enjoined, in the Levitical law, immediately after the prohibition of leaven and honey (II. 13), salt was evidently regarded to be exactly opposed to them in its nature; and as leaven and honey were repudiated because they recall the notions of corruption, decay, and impurity, salt was prescribed, because it implies the ideas of preservation and life, of vigour and permanence, of purity and holiness. It was, therefore, connected with the very essence of sacrifices; it typified that for which all offerings were mainly presented. Starting from the observation that salt shields many objects from decomposition and putrescence, the early and imaginative generations, following their symbolising propensities, employed it in sealing relations which they desired to be binding and enduring. They used it particularly in con-

cluding friendships and treaties. This custom prevailed among the Greeks who hence designated the salt as holy, and it still obtains among the Arabs. Dipping a piece of bread in salt, each of the contracting parties exclaims, "Salam (Peace)! I am the friend of your friends, and the foe of your foes." Solemn affirmations are corroborated by invoking the sacredness of salt, and may then more surely be relied upon than upon an oath. A place where salt is found is deemed inviolable. The Hebrews described an eternal and indissoluble alliance as a *salt-covenant*. Now, as the sacrifices were designed to effect an intimate and perpetual unity between God and man, they were to be offered with salt; and this was hence called "the salt of the covenant of God." Thus salt was undoubtedly prescribed not for bloodless oblations alone, but for every kind of animal sacrifice; and this is confirmed by later allusions and express statements; and according to tradition, it was to be used with the shew-bread also, and even with the oil and frank-incense; in fact, with all substances connected with sacrifices, except the wine, the blood, and the wood. It may hence be explained why salt was cast into springs of unwholesome water for the purpose of improving it. This act may indeed have had a natural and physical foundation, since some substances, among which was probably salt, were believed to possess the power of correcting distasteful qualities of the water: but it recommended itself chiefly on account of the symbolical significance of preservation and healing attributed to salt; and therefore the narratives which relate such changes in the nature of the water bear a miraculous character.

Again, as decay is associated with the ideas of death and impurity, salt, which prevents or counteracts decay, became the type of life and purity, the more so as it was believed "to be itself composed of the purest particles of water and sea"; it could be used for a metaphor like this, "have salt in yourselves", meaning benevolence, righteousness and good-will, and a peaceful communion with your fellow-men; and thus we may understand the pithy expression, "every man shall be salted with fire", that is shall be *purified*, since the same power was attributed to the salt as to the fire, which is pre-eminently the purifying element.

These Biblical notions were gradually extended and amplified, in which process they not always retained their original simplicity. Philo, correctly describing salt to imply a duration for ever concludes, in his accustomed manner of spiritualisation, that it is second in rank only to the soul, "for as the soul is the cause of preserving the bodies from destruction, so likewise is salt, which best keeps them together, and

to some extent makes them immortal." Therefore Philo compares it to the altar, "which preserves the sacrifices in a proper manner, and this too, though the flesh is consumed by fire." Christian mystics understood the salt to symbolise *Christ* preserving from corruption the soul by his doctrine, and the body by the promised resurrection; or they compared it to the *Word of God* which strengthens and purifies. More commonly accepted, however, was the following view. Unity with God is not possible, unless the heart be pure. But the heart can only remain so by steeling itself against temptation. Hence the "salt of the covenant" was regarded to typify wisdom which discerns sinful inclinations, and fortitude which conquers them; it was taken to intimate that untruth and hypocrisy, envy and malice, and all evil passions that corrupt and taint the health of the mind, render the offering unavailing in the eyes of God; and it was invested with the power of converting the sacrifice into a perpetual bond with God under the condition only that it reminded the worshipper himself of his moral obligations and religious aims. Salt thus obtained a twofold significance and holiness. In this sense, Pythagoras commended that salt ought to be set before people as an admonition to justice. But it could thus also be used as a synonym for wisdom and penetration, judgment and intelligence. "Let your speech", wrote Paul to the Colossians, "be always with grace, seasoned with salt that you may know how you ought to answer every man." The apostles were called "the salt of the earth", that is, those who by teaching and guiding the world, guard it from degeneration and moral decay; so that, in that phrase, the term salt implies both the original and the collateral sense. The Greeks employed the word *salt* for wit or sarcasm. The Romans, on the testimony of Pliny, had no better term to express "the pleasures of the mind, the effusions of humour, and in fact all the amenities of life, supreme cheerfulness, and relaxation from toil", or intellectual acuteness, good sense and shrewdness. The Greeks and Romans shared indeed, on the whole, the Hebrew notions with regard to the use of salt at the sacred rites. They maintained the principle that no sacrifice ought to be offered unless accompanied by salted grits. They even ascribed to the salt divine attributes, because they believed it conduces to generation; and as the marine animals are the most fruitful of all, cattle that were to be incited to breeding were fed with salt-beef and other salted food. Among the Romans, the salt-cellar, the symbol of food and sustenance, was held in equal honour with the lares, and placed in the middle of the table at all meals, which thereby received the character of sacrifices; it formed an heirloom

in the family, was preserved with the utmost care, and kept with scrupulous neatness. The sumptuary laws which restricted the use of all articles of luxury, permitted a bowl (*patera*) and salt-cellar of silver; the latter was, especially for the sacrificial service, made in the most elegant and costly manner possible, and was even in the earliest times of severe simplicity, of precious metal, chiefly of silver. The Greeks called the salt "grace", "because it makes the food palatable that is necessary for life"; therefore they often worshipped Poseidon and Demeter in the same temple. They maintained that as all colours need light, so all fluids require salt to have an effect upon our sensation; that all meat is dead; and that the power of salt which joins it like a soul, imparts to it "grace" and a pleasant taste. If in the East, persons eat together bread and salt, they are most solemnly pledged to mutual friendship which it is considered the height of impiety to betray; their persons and their property, their safety and their honour, become objects of each other's sacred solicitude.

The Egyptian priests alone, if they did not entirely abstain from salt, excluded it from their meals during the time of their purification, because they thought it whets the appetite beyond the natural necessities. But they were apparently singular in this view; and even they distinguished between pure and impure salt, the former salpetre or nitre, the latter marine salt, which was forbidden at sacrifices. Yet the Hebrews observed the peculiar custom of scattering salt over places destined for perpetual desolation, such as destroyed cities which were never to be rebuilt. This practice probably originated in the noticed fact that tracts containing salt are remarkable for sterility and unproductiveness, and this opinion was naturally strengthened, in Palestine, by the aspect of the dreary regions round the Dead Sea, where the vegetation is scanty and stunted, and where the salt accumulates in cheerless pits and marshes.

2. OIL.

Men were easily taught by experience to appreciate the valuable properties of oil. They found that it stimulates the vital powers of the healthy, revives the languishing energy of the feeble, and checks even the incipient decomposition of the dead. Oil was, therefore, from primitive ages, employed as a means for refreshing the body; as a restorative remedy in cases of illness, especially for wounds; and as a chief ingredient for embalming corpses. It was used as a symbol and accompaniment of joy, especially at festive repasts; it was resorted to when persons prepared to appear before superiors, or when

they rose from their ordinary life to proceed to some higher and more solemn function; while it was avoided in times of grief and mourning, and even of solemnity, as on the Day of Atonement. It was thus naturally chosen to typify *life*, the more so as life and *light* appeared to be kindred qualities, and were more completely than in any other fluid or substance found united in oil, one of the choicest and richest products of the promised land. Hence oil was extensively regarded as an emblem of *the spirit* of God, of intelligent and godlike reason, of the higher and rational life of man. Anointing became synonymous with imparting the Divine spirit, which is the source of life and light in the ideal world, as oil in the world of matter. Now, the worship of God, and especially its centre, the sacrificial service, aims at the diffusion of the light of the mind and the life of the soul, of truth and righteousness, of wisdom and peace, of the knowledge of the Law and its exercise, of wisdom and happiness; in a word it tends to *holiness*, God's most comprehensive attribute and Israel's ultimate goal; it is intended to rouse the Divine or *holy spirit*. Therefore oil was also termed "the oil of holiness", or "the oil of holy ointment"; anointing was equivalent to bestowing holiness or *sanctifying*, and this again coincided with *consecrating* or *installing* in the priestly office to serve before the Lord: these three notions were coupled in the command, "And thou shalt anoint Aaron and his sons, and hallow them, to serve Me as priests."¹ Therefore, oil accompanied most of the bloodless offerings,² whether the flour and cakes were mixed, poured over, anointed, or soaked with it (p. 77); and it marked them as consecrated to God. It was employed, with peculiar abundance, in the bloodless offering presented by the High-priest on the day of his consecration. It was used to set apart objects for religious purposes, or to appoint persons for sacred service. Thus the Hebrews anointed with oil memorial-stones or *betylia*; the Tabernacle with all its vessels, and particularly the altar, the instrument of atonement; the priests, the mediators between God and the people, and more especially the High-priest, who was "the anointed priest" *par excellence*, and was himself termed "the holy one of the Lord"; the prophets, the interpreters of God's will; and the kings, the earthly representatives of the Divine ruler. But oil was excluded, like frank-incense, from the sin-offering and the offering of jealousy. Its symbolical significance in the ordinances of the *minchah* seems to be indisputably established by these two exceptions, which

¹ Exod. XXX. 30; comp. XXVIII. 41;
Xl. 13.

² Comp. Lev. II. 1, 4, 7, 15; VI. 8;
VII. 12; etc.

prove that the oil did not form, as has been supposed, a chief part of the oblation itself, like the flour, but that it was a characteristic *addition*, like the frank-incense — a circumstance rendered indubitable by the plain text, “And when any one will offer a bloodless offering to the Lord, his offering shall be of fine flour, and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frank-incense thereon.”¹ The same conclusion is confirmed by the ordinance which fixes the relative quantity of flour, oil, and wine to be used for a *minchah* and its accompanying drink-offering. As oil is never consumed alone, like wine or bread, but together with other products or preparations, which it is meant to make more savoury, especially in the East, where it is a frequent substitute for fat and butter, so it is never mentioned as an independent gift, like the wine, but appears mingled or otherwise combined with the flour or the pastry.

The oil used for ordinary consumption and that employed for anointing, were probably identical in early times. But the Levitical law deemed it desirable to distinguish the latter, especially in the consecration of the Sanctuary and its ministers, by the admixture of four sweet-smelling ingredients, myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, and cassia; because four was regarded as the number of perfection and totality; it indicated, on the one hand, that the sacred anointment should comprehend the entire wealth of fragrance which pervades the vegetable kingdom; and on the other hand, that the holiness of those for whom it was intended, should be absolute and perfect; hence the imitation of the compound and its use for profane purposes were threatened with excision, since God’s holiness could manifest itself in His Sanctuary and in His servants only.²

3. WINE.

The application of wine in connection with offerings is too natural to demand any figurative interpretation. The wine “gladdens God and man” — reason enough why it was deemed pre-eminently fit for the altar. But it is not impossible that the symbolising spirit of the ancients endowed it with a peculiar significance. *Red* wine was generally employed to recall the colour and nature of blood. The wine offered with the vegetable oblations represented the blood of animal sacrifices. The High-priest is declared to have poured out, as a libation, “the blood of the grape”; the same metaphor occurs repeatedly in the Hebrew Scriptures;³ and the Romans mixed blood of the victim with red wine to express the kindred meaning of both.

¹ Lev. II. 1; comp. ver. 15.

² Exod. XXX. 23, 24; compare Commentary on Exodus, pp. 427—430.

³ See Gen. XLIX. 11; Deut. XXXII. 14; compare 1 Macc. VI. 34; Sir. XXXIX. 26.

4. FRANK-INCENSE.

The frank-incense was no doubt originally chosen for sacrifices on account of its fragrance, which was supposed to be pleasing to the gods. It was, therefore, employed among most of the ancient nations whenever they were able to procure it; and in some religions of middle and western Asia, it rose lavishly on the altars, and formed the chief offering (p. 66). It was burnt either as an independent oblation or as an accompaniment of other gifts; and it was deemed especially desirable in conjunction with animal sacrifices, to counteract the ill-odour inseparable from the total or partial burning of the victims. In their earliest stages, the Israelites naturally shared these anthropomorphic views, of which a trace is left in the Hebrew phrase "a sweet odour to the Lord." However, as in all other instances, they gradually modified the primitive and pagan notions, in accordance with their purer conceptions of the nature of the Deity. They understood the terms in a spiritual sense. Frank-incense was regarded as a symbol of the devotion of the soul to God, and of its approach to His holiness. It became a metaphor for fervent and contrite *prayer*. It was, therefore, burnt *entire*; no part of it, as was the case with the oil, belonged to the priest, because the prayer was addressed to God exclusively, to none else. It was put alone, with the exclusion of wine and oil, on the shew-bread, which symbolised the daily worship and supplication of the holy community. It became customary for the people to pray in the Court while the fumigation was performed in the Holy; and the fragrance of the incense and the prayers of the pious were believed to ascend simultaneously to the throne of God. It was, therefore, invested with the power of atonement. It thus had, in vegetable offerings, the force attributed to the blood in animal sacrifices. Its fragrance might even represent the Divine spirit and godlike sanctity.

But frank-incense was, like oil, interdicted at the sin-offering and the offering of jealousy; for the latter also was an oblation "that brings iniquity to remembrance." Both were presented in a condition very different from the qualities symbolised by oil and frank-incense. They reflected neither peace nor devotional prayer; the former had, or might have been, forfeited by guilt; and the latter is accepted from a pure mind only.

The thoughtful symbolism of the sacrificial rites will, therefore, be evident from the following survey. Both oil and frank-incense were employed at the independent vegetable oblations; oil alone at the offering of the High-priest on the day of his 'initiation; incense alone with the shew-bread; but neither oil nor incense at the sin-offerings

and the offering of jealousy. Both were naturally also excluded from the two firstfruit-loaves of Pentecost, because these loaves were leavened, and could therefore not be burnt on the altar, either wholly or partially.

But while plain frank-incense accompanied the sacrifices, the daily fumigations in the Sanctuary consisted of four ingredients specified in the Law.¹ For incense was primitively and universally employed with offerings; it was a simple and natural means of external worship; it was, therefore, *retained* in the Pentateuch from early usage. But the preparation from the four ingredients is of later introduction; it is specifically Levitical; it is ordained in harmony with the complicated and more splendid ritual of the Tabernacle and the Temple. Hence incense was prescribed for all private worshippers, but the compound was reserved for the priests; the one was burnt mostly in the Court, the other in the Holy only.

5. 6. WHEAT AND BARLEY.

Wheat was naturally regarded as the choicest, barley as an inferior grain. The former was, therefore, employed for all ordinary oblations, the latter in some exceptional cases, where its use may readily be accounted for. As wheat is compact and nutritious, and as it is heavy in weight and has little bran, the term "fat of wheat" occurs as a usual metaphor, and later writers declared it even as "the only food worthy of man, the creature endowed with speech and Divine reason."

But barley was considered poor and common; it bore the epithet *vile*; it was deemed fit especially for beasts; it had in Palestine about half the value of wheat; and it was extensively and perhaps ordinarily employed for bread by the poorer, though occasionally also by the wealthier classes. Barley-meal was, therefore, used for the offering of jealousy: from a reason similar to that which suggested the exclusion of oil and frankincense, the costlier wheaten flour was eschewed in an oblation stern and sad in its character, and presented when the dearest relations of domestic life and affection were disturbed or imperilled.

But the presentation of a *barley*-sheaf on Passover was prompted by considerations entirely external; for barley ripens earlier; it was, therefore, more appropriate for a firstfruit-offering, which marked the beginning of the corn-harvest, and which gratitude demanded not to delay beyond necessity. All symbolical explanations of the command are, therefore, inevitably artificial.

¹ Exod. XXX. 34—38; see Commentary on Exodus pp. 430, 431.

7. BLOOD.

The blood of victims is, in the Pentateuch, invested with a meaning which cannot be mistaken. Probably starting from the simple observations that a considerable loss of blood causes death, and that the healthful action of the nerves and muscles depends on its free and normal circulation, the Hebrews held that the blood is "the soul" of the animal, that is, the principle of its existence. It was a fundamental axiom, "The life of the flesh is in the blood", or "The blood is the soul"; soul and blood were correlative notions; hence dying was expressed by "pouring out the soul"; to "shed blood" meant "to destroy life"; the blood and the soul of the murdered were said alike to cry to heaven for vengeance; "pure blood" became synonymous with "a pure soul"; and even the combination "the soul of pure blood" was formed to denote a guiltless person. "The blood is the libation of life", was a well-understood maxim; for "the law-giver esteemed it to contain the soul and the spirit"; or "the breath is the essence of the soul, which has no place independently of the blood, but resembles it and is blended with it." Blood was, therefore, considered most sacred; it seemed connected, by a mysterious bond, with the continuance of that breath, which God infuses in producing a *living creature*. The Bible is so consistent in this conception that it indeed identifies blood with the principle of life or "the soul", but never with the power of reason, or with mind, intellect, and "spirit"; the former is represented as animating the outward senses, the latter as a part of the Divine spirit itself. Hence, as animals also were looked upon as endowed with "a soul", they were, in the period of man's innocence, not designed to be killed for human food; and though, after the flood, their flesh was allowed, their blood was interdicted by a command meant to be binding for all times and in every clime, and enforced under the most fearful penalties, "Whatever man there is of the house of Israel, or of the strangers that sojourn among you, that eats any manner of blood; I will set My face against that soul that eats blood, and will cut him off from among his people";¹ which almost vehement severity, directed alike against the native and the foreigner, seems to have been suggested by the opposite and deep-rooted practice of the Hebrews and the surrounding nations.² The same prohibition was, with singular unanimity, upheld by Jewish tradition; it was by an apostolic decree enjoined upon the early Christians

¹ Lev. XVII. 10; comp. ver. 14; Gen. IX. 4; Lev. III. 17; VII. 26, 27; XIX. 26; Deut. XII. 16, 23—25; XV. 23.

² Comp. 1 Sam. XIV. 32, 33; Ezek. XXXIII. 25.

as a most solemn moral obligation;¹ and it was enforced in the Koran among the fundamental laws of Mohammed's creed. The custom of abstaining from blood seems to go back to very primitive times, and was probably suggested by some simple or cosmic reasons. It has been conjectured, that the Israelites shunned blood as being dangerous to gentleness of temper, and fostering animal propensities and the sanguinary nature of beasts; or as injuring health, and if copiously taken, even causing death, as is especially the case with ox-blood; or because it was, in Asia, commonly drunk at the sacrifices of heathens, and particularly for the confirmation of oaths or compacts, from which customs the Hebrews were to be weaned. It may be a matter of dispute whether such considerations influenced them in the earliest periods, as they perhaps guided other nations; but they certainly find no echo in the Bible; this regards the blood as the seat of life, and forbids it for that reason exclusively.

And from this point of view alone can the significance of the blood in the Hebrew sacrifices be correctly estimated. As the victim gives up its life for him who offers it, and thereby restores his harmony of mind or secures his atonement, the blood which represents that life is of paramount moment in the economy of the sacrificial ritual; it forms, in a certain respect, its very centre; and not unjustly has it been described as "the kernel of the offering." So intimately was, in the course of time, the prohibition of blood connected with the system of sacrifice, that it was indeed extended to all quadrupeds and birds, but not applied to fishes, because the latter were never offered on the altar. The old Jewish canon "There is no atonement except by blood", accords with the spirit of the Law; the few exceptions judiciously admitted in the Pentateuch, so far from disproving the supreme importance of the blood in sacrifices, help to confirm the general rule. Hence that blood only was efficacious for propitiation, which was shed in *killing* the animal, not that which flowed from a wound or any unhealthy organ. The blood was not a mere symbol; it was not regarded, "in the hand of God and by His will, as the means of atonement", a view that has been prompted by aversion to the doctrine of vicariousness: it was supposed actually to conciliate the deity as no other agency could have done, because it responds to the demand of "life for life." Nor was it employed in the public ceremonies because it was deemed the seat of desire, passion, and sin, and was, therefore, to be removed; if so, how could it be put on the most sacred parts of the Tabernacle

¹ Acts XV. 20, 29; XXI. 25, see Commentary on Genesis p. 147; and so the fathers of the Church.

and Temple, on the altars of the Court and of the Holy, the vail of the Holy of Holies, and the Mercy-seat with the Cherubim? Will it be seriously urged that "the misdeed itself which is engendered by the blood, is purified and ennobled in the presence of God"? Indeed the blood was by no means esteemed impure; it was not considered to have become so because the guilt of the sinner was transferred to the victim; for the latter did not take upon itself the guilt, but the punishment of the offender. On the contrary, the blood had the power of purifying and sanctifying the dedicated implements on which it was sprinkled, as the brazen and the golden altar, or the persons and garments of the High-priest and the common priests at their consecration, the leper after his recovery, and the contracting parties at the conclusion of treaties; in certain cases, it hallowed even those objects which it touched by chance; and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews could declare in general terms, "almost all things are by the Law purged with blood." Had it been impure and not holy, it would not have been put by the Hebrews on the door-posts and lintels of their houses, on the night of the exodus, as a distinctive badge of safety and rescue. It was, like the fat, "the food of God"; and the Law propounded the principle that a sin-offering of which any of the blood was brought into the Holy for atonement, was not to be eaten but entirely burnt; whereas the flesh of the other expiatory sacrifices was consumed by the priests.

However, it would be erroneous to declare the blood as the principle and foundation to which every sacrificial law or rite is traceable; such inference can at least not be derived from a passage prominent and notable indeed, but surely not so comprehensive in import, namely "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar, to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul" (Lev. XVII. 11). These words explain merely the signification of the sacrificial blood; they do not disclose the nature and meaning of the sacrifices themselves. If so, they would exclude all bloodless offerings. The sprinkling of blood formed indeed a part in all animal sacrifices, but it was not the principal act in all alike; it had this paramount significance in expiatory offerings, but it was, in holocausts and in thank-offerings, subordinated to other and more characteristic rites. All classes of animal sacrifice considered together, not the blood itself was most essential, but the shedding of the blood, or the killing of the victim, or its death.

The eating of blood was properly interdicted because it was considered to be or to enclose the soul; but on this prohibition also the

Levitical legislators desired to impress their stamp; they regarded such a reason as too mundane and too physical, and therefore strengthened it by urging that the blood ought lawfully to be appropriated, on the altar alone, to the ends of atonement. But they were in this case, as in most others, unable to efface the lines of history. A clear trace of the primitive notion has been preserved in two laws: even the blood of cattle that was killed at home and for food was to be "poured out on the ground like water", and to be covered with earth; and not only the blood of the sacrificial animals, of ox, sheep, and goat, was to be avoided, but also that of all other clean beasts, as stags, roes, and gazelles, and of all birds — evidence enough that the considerations of altar and sacrifice did not originally prompt the comprehensive prohibition; and this becomes more evident still by a comparison of the corresponding ordinance regarding the abstinence from fat.

The notions of the Israelites with regard to the blood were not isolated; they were shared, though with some significant modifications, by nearly every people and tribe which offered animal sacrifices. The Egyptians hieroglyphically expressed the soul by a hawk, because, they said, "the one like the other feeds on blood"; and they plainly taught that the soul and reason of animate creatures dwell in the blood. The Chaldeans held that man was formed of earth and of the blood of the god Belus, the one constituting his body, the other his soul. Early philosophers of Greece simply maintained, "the soul is blood"; some, perhaps adopting Egyptian doctrines, limited this power to the blood of the heart; the stoics defined the soul as "an exhalation from blood"; and others contended that the soul is nourished by the blood. The Romans used *offering with a soul* as synonymous with *offering with blood*, and both were the priestly terms commonly employed for sacrificing under favourable auspices. In the old Teuton tongue, blood is equivalent with soul or life, and the blood of Odin, falling on the ground, was believed, in the ensuing spring, to produce herbs and flowers. Again, the bloody offerings were everywhere the more important class; they were considered to realise more completely the idea of sacrifice, not merely because for warlike tribes, requiring strong sensations, fire-offerings were more congenial than the simpler bloodless oblations; but because blood was, at all times and under every zone, supposed to be pre-eminently fitted to work expiation and to appease the gods. The Persians offered to the deity nothing of the flesh, but only the blood "or the soul." Whenever the old Arabians implored a god for benefits, they besmeared his image with blood. The Chinese put blood on things connected with the object of the sacri-

fice, as for instance on the ship, in which a voyage was intended, thereby trusting to secure the good-will of the gods. The Scythians poured the blood of captive enemies over an iron shield which represented the figure of the god of war. In India, at the sacrifices of Shiva, the blood of the victim is solemnly carried before the image of the god; his wife Kali is entreated to drink of it; and the people, sprinkling with it their faces, prostrate themselves to the ground. In fact, blood is in many instances synonymous with sacrifice itself. In Greek, to sacrifice was expressed by *sprinkling the altar with blood*. The ancient Germanic tribes, though presenting bloodless oblations also, called every offering blood (blot); to sacrifice or to worship was to bleed (blotan), and sacrificial service blood-service (blotinassus); the priest was called a blood-man (blotmadur, blotgodar, or blutekirl); and among the ancient Prussians the high-priest *Crive* derived his name from *Krawia* which means blood.

Nor was the *sacredness* of blood less highly estimated by heathen nations than by the Hebrews. Blood was extensively employed for sealing compacts and treaties, and for ratifying solemn oaths and vows, as has been more fully specified in another place.¹ It was on such occasions sometimes mixed with wine, and then drunk both by the contracting parties and those present who served as witnesses. The instance of Catiline will at once occur to every reader. The boar-sacrifice offered by the northern nations to Freya, the goddess of fertility and peace, like Ceres, helped to renew the relations of loyalty between the king and his subjects and to confirm the oath of allegiance. Poured into pits or caverns the blood was believed to call up the gods and the spirits of the lower world and to elicit revelations. The drinking of blood was believed to bestow higher powers or spiritual faculties, and especially the gift of prophecy, in a word, to effect a closer communion with the deity and the invisible world. The intact woman who gave oracles in the temple of Apollo Deiradiotes in Argos, killed by night every month a lamb, and drank of its blood whenever she wished to be prophetically inspired. Though the Zabii ordinarily held blood in utter abhorrence and regarded it as the food of fiendish demons, they drank a part of the sacrificial blood, and devoted the rest to the gods; they thus hoped to conclude with them a holy friendship and to learn from them the future. With a similar view, the priestesses of the Cimbri, who accompanied the armies, observed the blood of slain captives as it flowed into a brazen vessel. The old Germans believed that the blood of victims imparted life and

¹ See Comm. on Gen. p. 234, and on Exod. p. 363; comp. also Ps. XVI. 4; Zech. IX. 7; Ezek. XXXIII. 25.

consciousness to inanimate objects; they therefore sprinkled it on the images of their gods in the hope of endowing them with speech and sensation. They supposed that it secured prolongation of life; they attributed to it the power of magic and witchcraft, which no earthly effort could resist; and in their language to bleed (blotan) signified to deify or to impart supernatural faculties.

We have faithfully recorded and unfolded the notions of Hebrews and pagans on blood: but it would be impossible to analyse them from an absolute or philosophical point of view. They belong inseparably to the whole circle of primitive conceptions; and in connection with these alone they can be understood and fairly estimated. They originated in those childlike times, when the entire living creation was joined together by a bond of relationship, when the animals, though inferior to men, were conceived, like them, as cosmic beings, and when, therefore, the blood of either was regarded with the same holy awe and unaccountable terror, because in either case revered as an emanation from the soul of the universe, and hence inherently possessing the power of purification and atonement. But so irresistible is the mystic hold of these conceits upon the human mind, that they linger and vibrate even in those religious systems which have risen above a worship of nature and her powers; they have, in such creeds, indeed been subordinated to the doctrine of a Divine Ruler who created man in His own image, and the beasts as clay animated by the breath of life; but they have been retained as spiritual emblems which, like all symbols, could not be preserved in purity and without an admixture of irrational and superstitious alloy.

S. FAT.

With the prohibition of the blood the interdiction of fat is more than once coupled in the Pentateuch, "You shall eat neither fat nor blood";¹ it is, like the law on blood, to be valid "as a perpetual statute for all generations";² and it is enjoined with almost equal severity, and under the same rigorous penalty, "You shall eat no manner of fat, of ox, or of sheep, or of goat... for whosoever eats the fat of the beasts, of which men offer an offering made by fire to the Lord, that soul that eats it shall be cut off from his people."³ Moreover, fat is, like the blood, repeatedly called "the food of the Lord."⁴ It cannot, therefore, be doubtful, that analogous reasons prompted the law in both cases. Nor is it difficult to discover the common principle. Like the blood, the fat is an index of the life and strength of the animal; and as man

¹ Lev. III. 17.

² Ibid.

⁴ Lev. III. 11, 16; Ezek. XLIV. 7, 15;

³ Lev. VII. 23, 25; comp. vers. 26, 27. comp. XXXIX. 19.

was to abstain from blood, because it was deemed the soul, so was he to avoid the fat, because it was supposed to express the health, vigour, and vitality of the animal. The Hebrew Scriptures allow us to trace the steps by which the fat gradually was endowed with such dignity. It was, from early times, naturally considered as "the richest part and that which guards the entrails; for it envelops them, and makes them flourish, and benefits them by the softness of its touch." It became, therefore, a synonym of wealth and abundance; it was the emblem of joy and cheerfulness; it was employed for what is most valuable and most distinguished; "the fat of the land" denoted its wealth and its choicest fruits; the "fat of wheat", the "fat of oil", and "the fat of wine", designated the richest kinds of these productions; "the fat of heroes" described the bravest of the brave; "the fat of the people", the wealthiest, noblest, and most powerful citizens, also called "cows of Bashan", because these were renowned for remarkable fatness. Therefore, whenever the sacrifices were not entirely burnt on the altar, it was deemed right and appropriate to dedicate to the sacred flames those parts of the victim which have aptly been termed "the flower of the flesh", and which, because the best, might well represent all, or the entire animal. As, therefore, most nations, and among them the Phoenicians, burnt the fat to the deity, the rising smoke of which was deemed its most pleasing and most acceptable offering; so the Hebrews, resembling the Phoenicians in many points, adopted the general rule, "All fat belongs to the Lord";⁵ and they clearly understood that it was burnt "as a sweet odour to Him":⁶ it was so burnt, from remote periods,⁷ in thank-offerings to point to the prosperity and happiness of the worshipper; and in the expiatory offerings, to symbolise the supremacy and power of God. Now, when it was in this manner set apart for the purposes of the altar, then, and then only, it was forbidden for human consumption, and men were not to share what belonged to God. For it is impossible to suppose that a cattle-breeding people, like the Hebrews, surrendered one of the most valuable parts of their slaughtered animals willingly and primitively; the very severity with which it is prohibited in the Pentateuch proves how generally it was eaten. Nor is it easy to see how, among a simple-minded people, the use of fat could be made a religious crime; the idea that *fat* is life, is not so natural and manifest as the doctrine that *blood* is life; and it pre-supposes a longer course of observation and reflexion. The prohibition is, therefore, evidently a special development of the Levitical theories; it originated when these were worked out with unconditional consistency regardless of the exor-

⁵ Lev. III. 16.⁶ Lev. III. 5, 11, 16; XVII. 6.⁷ Comp. 1 Sam. II. 15, 16.

bitant burdens they imposed upon the people. It was brought into the closest connection with the laws of sacrifice; it was at first not enjoined, like the blood, with the addition "in all your habitations";¹ it was, therefore, understood to apply to the time and place of the common offerings only; and it was restricted to the fat of ox, sheep, and goat, that is, of those beasts alone "of which men present an offering made by fire to the Lord";² it was therefore indeed meant to include *all* animals of these species, since even those intended for food were, according to the same exacting legislators, to be killed as sacrifices at the common Sanctuary;³ but not even the hierarchical party could venture to extend it to all clean animals of whatever species; while the blood, not so valuable in itself and looked upon with awe from primitive times, could be generally prohibited, both that of all quadrupeds and that of all birds. Only with respect to time and place, the laws of both could gradually be equalised, and a subsequent ordinance declared, "It shall be an eternal statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, You shall eat neither fat nor blood."⁴ These conclusions are corroborated from another side also. That the holiness of fat was a later idea is manifest from the circumstance that it is not even enjoined in the Book of Deuteronomy.⁵ In the last "song of Moses",⁶ the author names, among other choice blessings granted by the bounty of God to the Israelites, also "the fat of lambs and rams;" in the poet's time, therefore, that is, at a very late period of the Hebrew commonwealth,⁷ the fat of sacrificial animals was still unscrupulously eaten and regarded as a special delicacy worthy of being coupled with honey and oil, wheat and wine.

It is in harmony with the tenor of the Biblical commands to limit their operation to that fat which, in solid masses, covers the bowels, the kidneys, and the flanks, and not to extend it to that involved in the flesh, which requires to be cut in order to expose it to the view. But, naturally, the fat of *all* animals which died of themselves, or were torn by beasts, was forbidden as food, because such animals were "unclean."⁸

9. LEAVEN.

The reason why leaven was rigorously kept aloof from the altar⁹ is indisputable. It cannot be derived from the nature and properties of the prepared substance; for leaven was deemed to enhance the pala-

¹ Lev. VII. 26. ² Lev. VII. 23, 25.

³ Lev. XVII. 3—5, see p. 31.

⁴ Lev. III. 17.

⁵ Comp. Deut. XII. 15, 16, 23—25;

see p. 31.

⁶ Deut. XXXII. 14.

⁷ See Comm. on Gen. pp. 496—498.

⁸ Lev. VII. 24; comp. XVII. 15; XXII. 5; see notes on VII. 22—27.

⁹ Lev. II. 11; XXIII. 18; comp. Am.

IV. 5.

tableness and nutritiousness of bread; and as it possesses the power of raising and uplifting, it was occasionally compared even to the "kingdom of heaven."¹⁰ But the cause must be traced to the mode in which leaven was usually obtained — namely, by allowing dough mixed with water to stand for some time till it passed into a state of fermentation or *corruption*. It is on these grounds that leaven was regarded incompatible with the innermost character of the altar and of the offerings there presented, which typify life and health, regeneration and purity. It was used to symbolise sin and defilement. While, in the later Jewish literature, unleavened bread was an emblem of the virtuous instincts of the heart, and the New Testament speaks of "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth";¹¹ leaven, or "the leaven in the dough", became a very frequent metaphor for the evil propensities of man; the New Testament familiarly alludes to "the leaven of malice and wickedness",¹² the "leaven of the Pharisees" which is "hypocrisy",¹³ and the "leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" which is their perverse "doctrine";¹⁴ and it was a current maxim, that as "a little leaven leavens the whole lump",¹⁵ one sinful thought that is harboured in the mind renders the sacrifice unavailing and unaccepted. Hence the ordinance scrupulously to remove from the houses and the whole land, under penalty of excision, all leaven on Passover, and to eat unleavened bread exclusively during the seven days, though partly intended as a historical reminiscence, and partly as a symbol of the "bread of affliction" which the Israelites ate in Egypt, was also understood to prefigure that sanctity and purity which behove the people chosen to enter into a solemn covenant with God for the revelation and diffusion of His truth. But the notion of absolutely removing from the altar which secures spiritual life all that recalls the condition of decay, this notion, complex and allegorising, belongs obviously not to an early, but to a very advanced stage of religious thought, and it accords fully with the whole edifice of the Levitical laws of sacrifice.

The views entertained by the Hebrews regarding leaven, were shared by the ancient nations. They are, in fact, plainly stated in the following remark of Plutarch: "Leaven itself comes from corruption, and corrupts the dough with which it is mixed, . . . and in general, fermentation seems to be a kind of putrefaction"; therefore the priest of Jupiter (flamen Dialis) was forbidden to touch leaven; and so rigidly was he to be shielded from contact with everything that even remotely

¹⁰ Matth. XIII. 33; Luke XIII. 21.

¹¹ Matth. XVI. 6, 11, 12.

¹¹ 1 Cor. V. 8.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹⁵ 1 Cor. V. 6; Gal. V. 9.

¹³ Luke XII. 1; comp. Mark VIII. 15.

implied the idea of deterioration, that the same prohibition was extended to flour, which was regarded as corn "deadened as it were and destroyed by grinding", because it lost the strength of a seed-grain without immediately obtaining the usefulness of food.

It is not difficult to account for the two exceptional cases in which leavened bread was admitted in the sacrificial service of the Hebrews. Pentecost was the "Feast of Conclusion", because it marked the completion of the corn-harvest commenced on Passover. On that festival, therefore, which was made the occasion of thanks-giving for the sustenance and plenty graciously provided by God for His people, it was deemed appropriate to offer to Him, as a firstfruit-oblation, the daily and ordinary bread, or leavened wheaten loaves, while, on Passover, new barley was presented with equal fitness.

A kindred reason, seems to have suggested, in praise-offerings, the permission of leavened bread as an accessory to unleavened cakes. The joy-offerings bore a homely and familiar character; the worshipper who, in convivial repast, partook of his own gift, felt that God stood to him in the relation of a *friend*; the sacred act was devoted to the Dispenser of every blessing rather than to the King or Judge; on such occasions, the ordinary leavened bread, when eaten by the offerer at the sacrificial meal, was well suited to remind him not less of the benign than the awful attributes of the Deity.

10. HONEY.

The connection in which the prohibition of honey is introduced, is alone sufficient to guide us in determining the reason of the ordinance: "No bloodless offering which you shall bring to the Lord shall be made fermented; for you shall burn no leaven, nor any honey, in any offering of the Lord made by fire."¹ From this combination of leaven and honey it is evident, that both alike were disallowed because they create fermentation, and thus involve those notions of corruption and decay so utterly antagonistic to the nature of the life-giving altar. It is needless to state, that honey was everywhere highly prized not only as a delicacy, and that therefore everything pleasant was commonly compared with the "sweetness of honey," but that, if eaten together with other food, it was considered extremely nutritious, conducive to a healthy complexion and longevity; that hence it was, and is, in the East extensively mixed with bread and pastry, and that honey-cakes were frequently offered to the gods. But it is equally well known that honey easily turns sour; therefore, vinegar was prepared by washing honey-pots and -combs with water which was then boiled.

¹ Lev. II. 11.

This being the simple and obvious meaning of the prohibition, it is surprising to notice the numerous reasons, often curious and fanciful, that have been assigned for it.

Some, laying stress on the words, "they (the leaven and the honey) shall not come upon the altar as a sweet odour",² hold that honey was forbidden because, in being burnt, it emits an offensive smell; but this opinion evidently attributes to the words "for a sweet odour" a material and external sense, which they do not possess in the Pentateuch.

Philo believes the honey to have been objectionable because the bee is not a "clean" animal; since "it derives its birth from the putrefaction and corruption of dead oxen, just as drones and wasps spring from the bodies of horses." This fiction, entertained by classical writers also, is overthrown by the familiar fact that the bee has a natural aversion to lifeless bodies, to meat, blood, and fat, and eagerly shuns repulsive places. "The bee", says Aristotle, "is the only insect that never touches anything putrid"; and the swarm carefully removes the dead bodies of its own species. Its nature is clean. It was hence extensively honoured with the epithets *pure* and *wise*. It was so regarded by the Pythagoreans, because it does not settle on beans looked upon them with dislike. The Pythian priestess was described as "the bee of Delphi." It was called the *best* animal, and therefore sacred to Zeus *Aristaeus*. Holy bees were said to watch the grotto where Jupiter was born. *Melissa* was his nurse, and *Melitaeus* one of his sons; the former was the earliest discoverer and preparer of pure and innocent human food, and especially introduced and taught the cultivation of fruit trees. Luna also, presiding over births, was called *Melissa*, and so every priestess of Ceres, as guardian of the mysteries of the earthly goddess. The bee was the emblem of the Muses; it was the symbol of the struggle between virtue and vice; of the mind which governs matter; of the soul which returns to its divine origin; and among the Egyptians, of royal dignity. The Hindoos frequently represented the god Krishna with a bee hovering over his head. Its wonderful habits and instincts were the types of domestic and social order, of the foundation of states and colonies, of blessings and plenty secured by judicious industry, and even of the manifest working of the divine spirit. The very belief of the birth of the bee from the decaying body of the bull, was converted into a fine allegory of the soul emerging and rising from the depths of terrestrial matter, and soaring to its celestial home, where it rejoins the deity of which it is a part;

² Lev. II. 12.

for the bee is a "home-loving animal." Bacchus, the dispenser of sustenance and joy, was termed "the father of the bees" or Brisaeus. From all these facts it will naturally appear that honey itself was not considered unclean; it was presented as a firstfruit-offering; it could be mixed with those oblations which were permitted to be "leavened"; and it was freely allowed by Jewish tradition. Leaven, though prepared from the very mass of which the bloodless offering consisted, was forbidden to be burnt on the altar: it is therefore evident, that it was not the *origin* of leaven and honey which caused their exclusion. In fact, some ancient philosophers and theologians ascribed to the honey itself purifying and preserving power capable of healing old wounds, removing dimness of sight, and preventing putrefaction, whence it was used for embalming and instilled into the noses of the dead to shield the bodies from decomposition. Accordingly, honey was understood as a symbol of rectitude and integrity of life. It was supposed to have been the sole sustenance of the earliest men in their golden age of innocence and perfect virtue. Bread and honey were the ordinary food of the kings and priests of Persia, of Pythagoras and his followers, of the rigid Jewish sect of the Essenes, and hence also of John the Baptist. At the initiation in certain rites, the hands were washed with honey, not with water, to indicate that they ought to be clean from all wickedness and pollution. Honey was eaten to purify the tongue from sin. The libations of honey were described as *sober*, in contradistinction to those of wine. The Persians offered honey to Mithras, because it symbolised this god most clearly as the guardian and preserver of fruits. It was holy to the Naiades, because their element, the water, is purifying, not liable to putrefaction, and, as was considered, conducive to generation. Therefore, bees were believed to deposit their honey in bowls and jars, because these vessels typify fountains.

As if aware of the insufficiency of his first reason, Philo adds another one, hardly more convincing; the laws, he observes, interdicted honey in order to indicate that "all superfluous pleasure is unholy, making indeed the things that are eaten sweet to the taste, but later inflicting bitter and incurable pains, by which the soul must, of necessity, be agitated and thrown into confusion"; and this opinion, variously modified, recurs repeatedly. The Talmud commenting on those verses of the Proverbs which advise a moderate use of honey, applies them figuratively to all kinds of intemperance, even to excesses in spiritual matters and in speculation. Theodoret deemed it unfit for the altar as a symbol of sensual enjoyment, since, in primitive times,

and before the cultivation of the vine, it was a luxury of the dissipated, was believed to lead to wild indulgences and carnal desires, to indolence and thoughtlessness, and being effervescent, symbolised haughtiness and contumacy; it was, in fact, used as an emblem of death, or of secret corruption by sin, "because the life of the soul perishes by pleasure"; it was designed to teach that whoever is intent upon good works, must shun sensuality and exercise rigid severity towards himself. Hence Jerome believes that nothing that is merely sweet, without having in it an element of pungent truth, was to be offered in the Sanctuary; and Nachmanides declared that everything sweet must be tempered with bitterness, just as God, in creating the world, coupled mercy and judgment. These opinions disregard the unmistakable hints of the Hebrew text, which forbids honey, not because it is sweet, but because it is "fermenting", and which fixes for the exclusion no other reason than for the prohibition of leaven.

Maimonides asserts that honey was forbidden to the Israelites, because it was commonly used at the sacrifices of the heathens. It is true that it was dedicated to nearly all gods, among others to Janus, when he was implored to grant "a sweet" or happy year, and especially to the evil deities and those of the lower world, to Pluto and Proserpine, Hecate and the Furies. But the Pentateuch, though opposing pagan notions, left untouched innocuous pagan customs, which it readily employed if capable of embodying useful religious ideas. If it had meant consistently to carry out the principle of opposition, it would have rejected the domestic animals for victims, flour, incense, oil, and salt, nay the sacrifices themselves, which yet Maimonides regards as an accommodation to deep-rooted pagan usages.

Again, it has been supposed that honey was looked upon with disfavour, because it was largely employed at the libations for the dead, which the Hebrews were to hold in abhorrence; but such libations frequently consisted of oil and wine, which were not excluded from the offerings of the Hebrews.

Some imagined that the bloodless oblations were to be pure and unmixed flour; others, that being pleasant to the taste, honey might mislead to the belief that offerings are agreeable to God in proportion to their palatableness; and others again, that, being a later and artificial innovation, perhaps combined with idolatrous mysteries, it was banished by a legislator desirous to restore the old and patriarchal simplicity in the sacrificial service: but the bloodless offerings contained, besides flour, also salt, oil, and wine; and the Levitical rites, in point of simplicity, differed vastly from primeval practices.

11. TYPICAL EXPLANATION.

From the preceding remarks on salt, oil, and frank-incense, on blood and fat, on leaven and honey, it will be manifest that the *symbolical* interpretation of the Hebrew sacrifices and their rituals is in accordance with the spirit of the Scriptures. It derives support from other commands of the Pentateuch, the tendency of which is evidently symbolical. Phylacteries are plainly ordained as a "sign" and a "memorial" for the Law and its observance.¹ The golden plate with the words "Holiness to the Lord", worn by the High-priest on his mitre, was clearly designed to lead the Hebrews to a consciousness of their sins, and thus to render their gifts and offerings acceptable.² The flesh of certain classes of sin-offerings was to be consumed by the priests, to indicate that they "removed the iniquity of the congregation and made atonement for them before the Lord."³ The Hebrews were enjoined to sit in Tabernacles during seven days every year, that they might perpetually be reminded of the time, when their ancestors, rescued from Egyptian bondage, pitched their tents in the desert under Divine protection.⁴ Moreover, the Hebrew prophets insisted with holy earnestness upon the moral and spiritual ends of all ceremonials; and they taught impressively by symbolical acts,⁵ which indeed, natural in themselves, are peculiarly suitable and attractive to a childlike intelligence requiring to perceive the ideas in some outward embodiment.

But very different from the symbolical is the *typical* explanation: this regards the ceremonies and events of the Old Testament as the prefigurements of some corresponding doctrine or occurrence recorded in the New; it, more especially, supposes the Hebrew sacrifices and their rituals to foreshadow the person and nature, the life and death of Christ. As it has exercised a momentous influence upon the formation of religious dogmas, the enquiry is not uninteresting what value ought to be attached to it. But it cannot be justly estimated, as will presently be evident, without a direct reference to the Talmudical and Rabbinical mode of exegesis; we therefore premise a short delineation of the latter, after which we shall compare it with that adopted in the New Testament.

As in nature, so in history, the same things are often repeated at different times and in different degrees of perfection; the development

¹ Exod. XIII. 9, comp. Deut. VI. 8, 9; Comm. on Exod. XIII. 9.

² Exod. XXVIII. 36, 38; see Comm. on Exod. p. 416.

³ Lev. X. 17; comp. Sect. X. 14; XV.

⁴ Lev. XXIII. 43.

⁵ Comp. Isai. XX. 2—4; Jer. XIII. 1—11; XVIII. 1—6; XIX. 1—12; XXIV. 1—8; XXVII. 2—12; XXVIII. 10—14; XXXII. 7—14; Ezek. IV. 1—13; V. 1—4; Hos. II. 1—9; III. 1—5; etc.

of nations and of mankind advances in rhythmic cycles, each complete in itself, and each analogous, but superior, to the preceding. The Hebrew mind had, in the period of the Old Canon, created for itself a certain system of religious thought and public devotion, compact and consistent, and for the time entirely satisfactory. But the Jews advanced; they unfolded the germs of the earlier literature, and they assimilated to their own views ideas borrowed from the creeds of other nations. Yet they had long learnt to look upon the Old Testament as the all-embracing code of wisdom and knowledge, which must contain — it may be in obscure allusions or hidden allegories — all truths that can ever be discovered by the human intellect to the end of time: they acted upon the conviction, “turn it and turn it, for everything is in it.” Therefore, they strove to corroborate any new conception or opinion by connecting it with some really or apparently kindred passage of the Scriptures, and they introduced that connection by the word “as it is written.” For instance, Ben Zoma said, “Who is wise? He who learns from everybody; for it is written, ‘I acquired knowledge from all who taught me’”;⁶ though the words employed have in the Psalms where they occur a very different meaning, viz. “I have more knowledge than all my teachers.”

Such midrashic elements began to appear from very early times, in fact, not long after the completion of the second Temple; they are discernible in all, even the oldest translations of the Hebrew Bible, in those of the Septuagint, Symmachus and Theodotion, in Onkelos, Jonathan, and the other Targumim, in the Peshito, and even in the version of the Samaritans generally so reluctant to adopt anything from the rival sects; they were recognised by the Essenes, of whom Philo clearly observes, “Engaged in the sacred Scriptures, they speculate on their national philosophy by allegorising; for they look upon the literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature, intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions;” and Philo himself habitually indulging in kindred modes of elucidation, supposed every Biblical expression to imply a double sense, a physical and spiritual, that is, a literal and allegorical one.

At first, the Jewish doctors were cautious in this method: preserving the consciousness that the combinations were the work of their own judgment, they desired the Scriptural passage to be regarded as no more than a mere “support” of their own view, or as implying, at best, only “a hint” in reference to it, and the Mishnah, still sparing in that process, speaks of many new laws that “fly in the air and have no

⁶ *Mishn. Aboth.* IV. 1; comp. Ps. CXIX. 99.

Biblical foundation", and of others that are "like mountains suspended by a hair, as they are little alluded to in the Bible, yet developed into numerous ordinances." But gradually, though not without opposition from some more sober sects, as the Sadducees and Baeothusians, they pursued the same path with greater boldness and assurance; they considered no opinion safe against later fluctuations, unless guarded by Scriptural authority; they deemed it, therefore, necessary to trace *all* the innumerable expansions of the Law to the Bible, which they diligently searched and unscrupulously employed for that object; and they seriously and confidently pointed to their discoveries, no matter how strange soever, as "proofs" of the doctrines they were anxious to diffuse. In this manner, that which at first was understood merely as a happy and welcome *parallel*, was imperceptibly converted into an irrefutable *argument*.

It is obvious that the text of the Bible could not without being strained yield the desired results. How could the unlimited number of later laws, ideas, and ethical precepts be pressed into the small compass of the Old Testament without the most hazardous³ and the most violent manipulations? Indeed, the expedients employed by the Talmudists to gain their object, form a most curious chapter in the history of human ingenuity and intellectual perversion; they are barely redeemed from reckless frivolity by the religious earnestness which prompted them, and the high aim which they were designed to serve — that of hallowing every thought and elevating every relation of life. It was supposed that the diction of the Bible, that is, the holy language of God, is superhumanly profound and significant, capable of involving all future progress and mental life, pregnant of marvellous and mysterious power; that it teaches many things at once; hints by one word at many truths; conceals a lesson in every sign; is designedly obscure, and frequently renounces current expressions; that it may long baffle the efforts of human reflection and penetration, dimmed as these are by sorrow and suffering, but reveals itself at last to pious research; while the enigmas that remain unsolved, will one day be disclosed by the light of the Redeemer — views which were encouraged by the peculiar and indefinite character of Hebrew phraseology, and by the indistinctness of many legal and ritual ordinances. Occasionally, a gleam of a better hermeneutical method broke through the chaotic confusion; it was declared, "In the whole Law, the text does not pass beyond the literal sense", or "the Law speaks in the ordinary language of men", or specific instances were judiciously generalised and referred to similar cases: but the actual application of these abstract principles was a

rare and unavoidable exception; as a rule, they were absolutely ignored, and sometimes expressly disclaimed. Ordinarily, letters of the Biblical text were transposed or read with different vowels and interpreted accordingly, combined with the preceding or following word, or permuted with letters of a similar form or of an analogous position in the alphabet. Words were interchanged with others of an approximate sound, or read in a different order, computed according to the numerical value of their letters, and then replaced by others making up the same sum; or they were pronounced superfluous, unusual, or anomalous, on purpose to render them available as supports of some fancied idea. Some particles were supposed invariably to include something else, others, always to exclude a notion. Verses were torn from their context, and invested with a meaning utterly foreign to it, or they were divided, cut asunder, and distorted with such a degree of arbitrary freedom, that sometimes even Talmudists expressed their disapproval, and began seriously to doubt whether the literal exposition ought not to be admitted at least by the side of the allegorical. Important analogies of religious law were founded upon a slight and accidental verbal resemblance; and inferences were drawn entirely unwarranted by the manifest tenour of the verse. The words of the Scriptures were compared to jewels set in silver plates, or to a string of pearls, beautiful as an entire ornament, but precious also individually; thus they were regarded as full of import both in their continuity and their isolation. The recurrence of the same word in different passages was deemed sufficient ground for explaining the passages themselves as identical or kindred; and it was believed that every verse could be interpreted from multifarious points of view. Such rules were necessarily fraught with the most singular and most deplorable results. No conceit was too fanciful or grotesque, no construction too incongruous and artificial, too illogical and capricious, if insinuating by adroitness or wit, or evolving a novel idea from familiar terms. Every trace of sound comment vanished, and the Bible was overgrown with the weeds of eccentric paradox. All the conclusions so obtained were endowed with the same authority and holiness as the clear utterances of the Bible. They were regarded not only as justified, but as so exclusively genuine and infallible, that Talmudists could propound the surprising rule, "he who renders a verse according to its plain form (that is, literally) is a falsifier"; although they had the boldness to add, "he who makes any addition is a blasphemer."

The history of the Christian or typical interpretation of the Bible was in many respects analogous to that of the Jewish schools just

sketched, and the stages of advance were nearly identical. The earlier phases are visible in the Books of the New Testament. The apostolic writers, Jews by birth and education, followed in the exposition of the Bible the taste and usage of their time and people; nay, they would probably, for practical ends, have accommodated themselves to the current manner, had it even, as is not apparent, been uncongenial to them. In fact, the New Testament offers numerous instances both of "the support" and "the proof": the former is, as in the Mishnah and Talmud, introduced by "as it is written" or "spoken";¹ the latter usually by "that it might be fulfilled, what was spoken or written."² One instance of each will suffice. When Christ intended to enter Jerusalem, it is related, "when he had found a young ass, he sat thereon; as it is written, Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, the king comes, sitting on an ass's colt."³ Joseph returning with the child Jesus from Egypt, went into Galilee, and "he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled, what was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene."⁴ Let us briefly examine the two passages. The second Zechariah prophesied of a time when peace would unite the nations of the world, when God would "cut off every chariot and every horse, and cut off every battle-bow, and He would speak peace to the nations"; when, therefore, the ideal king, "just, and victorious, and lowly", would not ride on a horse, used in war and loving the tumult of battle, but on an ass, the peaceful, harmless, and patient animal, which would alone be employed in those days of perfect harmony. How then can the riding of Christ on an ass at a time, when the horses were not "cut off" and warfare had not ceased, in any sense be called a parallel to Zechariah's description! how much less can it be considered a fulfilment! The picture which the prophet draws of the future monarch is not that of humiliation, but of humility, and every one knows that the ass is, in the East, by no means looked upon with contempt. More characteristic still is the second passage. Isaiah speaks of the Messianic king in the following words, "And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch (*netser* in Hebrew) shall grow out of its roots",⁵ that is, the Messiah shall be a *netser* of the house of

¹ John XII. 11; Acts II. 16; comp. Matth. XXI. 13, 12, 44; XXVI. 31 (Zech. XIII. 7); 1 Cor. I. 19, 31; II. 9; IX. 9; 2 Cor. VI. 2; VIII. 15; Rom. II. 21; III. 1, 10, 18; V. 17; VIII. 36; IX. 13, 33; XV. 3, 21; Hebr. V. 6 Rom. IV. 3; X. 8; XI. 2, 1; Gal. IV. 30.

² Matth. I. 22; II. 15, 23; VIII. 17;

XIII. 35; John XIII. 18; XV. 25; XVII. 12; XVIII. 9; XIX. 36; comp. Matth. II. 17; XXVI. 54, 56; Luke (IV. 17) XXII. 22, 37; XXIV. (15) 27, 44; Mark IX. 13; John V. 40, 46; 1 Cor. XV. 54, 55.

³ John XII. 14, 15; comp. Zech. IX. 9.

⁴ Matth. II. 23.

⁵ Isai. XI. 1.

Jesse: therefore, concludes the Evangelist, Christ settled in *Nazareth*, that he might, in fulfilment of such prophetic expressions, be called a *Nazarene*; the Hebrew word *netser* for the appellative noun *branch* was thus taken as the type of the *town* Nazareth in Galilee — a combination preposterous in the extreme, and exactly in the spirit of the Jewish Midrash.

But it seems expedient to insert a few specimens of the general interpretation of the New Testament, which will help to form a well-balanced judgment.

Christ endeavoured to prove the resurrection of the dead by the words which God spoke to Moses at the burning bush, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob", that is, manifestly, I am the God that was acknowledged by, or revealed to the patriarchs; but Christ interprets, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living";⁶ therefore the patriarchs cannot cease to exist, they must be immortal: can this most casuistic deduction really be deemed a support of the doctrine of immortality? and has it the least reference to that of resurrection? — The apostle Paul thus annotates or explains some verses in Deuteronomy declaring that all enjoy ready access to the Law, and need make no perilous effort for its discovery, "Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? — that is, bring Christ down from above; or who shall descend into the deep? — that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead":⁷ in the latter part, the Hebrew text is even inaccurately quoted or rendered, evidently for the sake of the application; for the correct words in Deuteronomy are, "Who shall go *over the sea* for us, and bring it to us?" — God said to Abraham, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed",⁸ that is, evidently, in thy descendents, since immediately before God had promised, "I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven";⁹ yet St. Paul, urging the *singular* of the collective noun seed, argues, "To Abraham and his seed were the promises made: he says not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."¹⁰ — In one passage, the same apostle introduces an elaborate comparison of husband and wife with Christ and the Church, which he describes as "a great mystery";¹¹ and in another, he declares the verse of Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treads out the corn", a command undeniably suggested by motives of humanity, not at all to be meant literally — for "does God take care for oxen?" —

⁶ Matth. XXII. 32; comp. Exod. III. 6.

⁷ Rom. X. 6, 7.

⁸ Gen. XXII. 18.

⁹ Ver. 17; comp. Gen. XIII. 15; XVII. 8.

¹⁰ Gal. III. 16.

¹¹ Eph. V. 22—33.

but to teach that the minister ought to be maintained by the congregation and to gain his sustenance by the preaching of the gospel.¹ — Of Abraham's two sons Ishmael and Isaac, the former was born of the bondmaid Hagar "after the flesh", the latter of the free woman Sarah "by promise" or "after the spirit": this is by the apostle taken as an "allegory"² and interpreted to point to the old and the new covenant; for, says he, "Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answers to the actual Jerusalem which is in bondage with her children"; while Sarah is "the Jerusalem above which is free and which is the mother of us all", since to her apply the words of the prophet, "rejoice thou barren that bearest not etc.";³ now as Ishmael persecuted his younger brother, so must the followers of Christ, who, like Isaac, are the children of promise, be persecuted by their older kinsmen, to be, however, ultimately victorious and to inherit alone the kingdom of heaven. Irrespective of the taste in which this exposition is conceived, it is wholly inappropriate with regard to the types and antitypes; for the *first* covenant or that of Mount Sinai was also concluded with the descendants of *Isaac*, while Ishmael stands in no relation whatsoever to that "testament" or the Mosaic Law: therefore even Luther was forced to the confession that the allegory of Sarah and Hagar is untenable because it disregards the historical truth.

The author of the hundred and tenth Psalm, in language no less obscure and abrupt than fervid and devoted, congratulates a contemporary king of Judah upon achieved or expected victories, "Jehovah speaks to my lord, Sit down at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool . . . rule thou in the midst of thy enemies;" and in rising veneration and enthusiasm the poet exclaims, "Jehovah has sworn and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," that is, he declares him worthy to unite, like Melchizedek in Abraham's time, the crown of royalty with the crown of priesthood, and wishes or predicts the "eternal" preservation of the double dignity in his house. This Psalm received from an early date a Messianic interpretation, which was favoured both by its soaring elevation and pregnant brevity; it was evidently so understood by the Jews in the time of Christ; and Christ and the apostles applied it in this manner with the assent of their hearers.⁴ It is, therefore, but natural that

¹ 1 Cor. IX. 9, 10; comp. Deut. XXV. 4.

² Galat. IV. 22—31,

³ Isai. LIV. 1, quoted from the Sept.

⁴ Comp. Ps. CX. 1 and Matth. XXII. 42—46 (Mark XII. 35—37; Luke XX. 11—14); Acts II. 30—36; 1 Cor. XV.

25—28; Hebr. I. 3, 13; X. 12, 13; esp. the sitting of Christ "on the right hand of God" (meaning "be thou My stadholder or co-regent"); comp. also Matth. XXVI. 63, 64; Mark XIV. 61, 62; Luke XXII. 69; Acts VII. 55, 56; Rom. VIII.

Melchizedek "king of Salem, a priest of the most high God," expressly named in the ode, should have been taken as the type of Christ — "a priest or High-priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek."⁵ But the expedients which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews⁶ adopted to carry out the parallel, are indeed highly curious. He explained the *name* of the Canaanite monarch, which is simply "righteous king", as "the king of righteousness", the fountain of wisdom, sanctification, and redemption;⁷ and he interpreted the *town* Salem or Jerusalem as peace, so that Melchizedek was the "king of peace";⁸ but more strangely still, he described him as "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God; abideth a priest continually."⁹ What are the supports that justify the assumption of that marvellous nature of Melchizedek, to whom the Old Testament makes absolutely no other allusion except in the history of Abraham — "king of Salem, a priest of the most high God" — and in the Psalm above analysed, where he is but incidentally named both king and priest? But it is the silence of the Hebrew Scriptures which seems to have been eagerly seized by the author of the Epistle: they do not mention his father and his mother — therefore he had none; they do not mention his descent — therefore he was unconnected with human generations; they do not mention his birth nor his death — therefore he was neither born nor did he die; and all this was evidently assumed that he might be "like unto the Son of God", with whom, as was supposed, that Psalm compared him.¹⁰ But is this surprising *argumentum ex silentio*, unparalleled as it is, efficacious after all? does it not prove even too much? Was indeed the Christ of the New Testament "without mother"? was he indeed "without descent"? he whose indispensable attribute it was to descend from the house of David?¹¹ Can the proof that he was neither, be attempted without the most wanton distortions? But it must be observed that the idea of the possibility of a birth either without father or without mother seems to have been familiarly entertained about the time of Christ: thus Philo calls Sarah "without mother", because "she had no share in the female race" and its weakness, and "was not formed of the materials accessible to outward perception, which are always in a state of

34; Eph. I. 20—22; Col. III. 1; 1 Pet. III. 22; Hebr. VIII. 1; Rev. III. 21; V. 1, 7.

⁵ Hebr. V. 6, 10; VI. 20; VII. 17, 21.

⁶ Hebr. VII. 1—3.

⁷ 1 Cor. I. 30; comp. Jer. XXIII. 6.

⁸ Rom. V. 1; Eph. II. 14, 15, 17; comp. Isai. IX. 5, 6; Zech. IX. 9, 10.

⁹ Vers. 3, 6; VI. 20; comp. X. 12, 14.

¹⁰ Comp. Matth. I. 18, 20; Luke I. 35.

¹¹ Comp. John VII. 42, "Hath not the Scripture said, that Christ cometh of the seed of David"? see also Matth. IX. 27; XV. 22; XXI. 15; etc.

formation and dissolution", but "had emerged out of the whole corporeal world." It is certainly possible that the writer did not wish to press the analogies too closely, conscious that they would either lead to an unscriptural identification of Melchizedek and Christ, or to a supernatural paradox, or to a grave Biblical perplexity, since, if Melchizedek "abideth a priest continually," there would be neither room nor occasion for the priesthood of Levi and of Christ: but if so, the whole of that typical explanation collapses and falls to the ground. Indeed, how can Melchizedek, who was not even permitted to use the sacred name of Jehovah, because, not belonging to the race of Abraham, he had not fathomed His attributes,¹ and was merely a priest "of the most high God," how can he be the type of the "Son of God," the embodiment of Divine wisdom and holiness? how can he at all point to the future unfolding of God's kingdom? The comparison between the two lies in the blending of the regal and pontifical power, and in nothing else; and as the former was to remain "for ever" in David's house, so also the latter. We are, therefore, happily released from following the writer of the Epistle into his remaining and over-subtle inferences, all designed to glorify Christ by means of Melchizedek — that the latter received the tithes from Abraham himself, and through him, as it were, from the Levites also, while these could exact them from their fellow-Hebrews only; that he blessed the patriarch and must therefore have surpassed him in exalted dignity; that he is immortal, while the Levites were perishable beings; that he, therefore, installed with the confirmation of an oath, absorbs and annuls the Levitical priesthood;² and we pass over the numerous and incredible reveries that have been ventured on the nature, the life, and the office of the priest-king so briefly and so imperfectly alluded to in the Old Testament.

If, therefore, the speculative expositions of Talmudists and Rabbins must, in principle, be denounced as playful and futile, the same epithets apply with equal force to the typical expositions of the New Testament; both belong to the same class and the same mental bias, and fall at the slightest touch of criticism.

Perceiving the questionable value of interpretations which might well tend to discredit the whole canon, great Christian divines alleged, that the allusions made in the New Testament to the Old, have no argumentative weight, but are merely introduced as suitable and memorable similes, "to illustrate the subject treated of." But the express and unequivocal declarations of the New Testament do not permit such evasion. It is true that in a few passages, words are inserted from the Old

¹ Gen. XIV. 19. 20. See Comm. on Gen. p. 229.

² Hebr. VII. 4—21.

Testament as no more than familiar or convenient expressions,³ even without being marked as quotations;⁴ and it may be that in some others, the "type" is represented as consisting simply in an accidental and illustrative analogy, and not in a designed and intended pre-figuration. Thus the disobedience of the Hebrews in the desert and their consequent punishment are described as "our examples to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted",⁵ which only implies the warning to expect similar disasters from similar offences.⁶ As the brazen, and therefore poisonless, serpent was lifted in the desert, and gave health to those who looked up to it, so Christ, sinless and nailed to the cross, saves those who turn to him in faith.⁷ Jonah remaining three days and three nights in the whale's belly, was a "sign" that Christ would be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.⁸ But other passages entirely exclude such conception; they were unmistakably meant to involve the idea of real types. Thus Adam is called the "figure of him who was to come",⁹ or "the first man of earth, earthy", while Christ is "the second man, the Lord from heaven."¹⁰ The Deluge in which Noah was saved is a "figure" of baptism and its power of salvation.¹¹ The history of Hagar and Sarah is an "allegory", the former of the old Jerusalem, the latter of the new, or of the covenant through Christ.¹² The earthly Sanctuary made by human hands on celestial patterns and guarded by human priests, is the "figure of the true one" in heaven presided over by Christ.¹³ And with a more comprehensive scope, "the holy ghost" signified the incomplete service in the Temple as a "figure" of the time when through Christ worship will be perfect.¹⁴ The Jewish priests are affirmed "to serve unto the *example* and *shadow* of heavenly things",¹⁵ while the Law has merely "the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things", and could therefore not render those perfect who sacrificed under that dispensation,¹⁶ since the ceremonial precepts, as those on food, the sabbath, and the holidays, were "a shadow of things to come", or "the weak and beggarly elements", whereas "the body is Christ."¹⁷

³ 1 Cor. II. 9; III. 19, 20; XIV. 21; 2 Cor. IV. 13; VI. 16—18; VIII. 15; IX. 9; Matth. XXI. 13; Rom. III. 4; IV. 10—18; VIII. 36; IX. 25, 26, 33; XV. 3, 21; Hebr. III. 15; X. 5, 38; XI. 13; 1 Pet. II. 4—8.

⁴ Rom. X. 6, 7, 13, 18; Hebr. II. 12, 13; 1 Cor. XV. 25, 27; Eph. IV. 26.

⁵ 1 Cor. X. 6.

⁶ Comp. 1 Cor. IX. 9, 10.

⁷ Num. XXI. 8, 9; John III. 14.

⁸ Matth. XII. 39, 40; but this is not accurate. Comp. Matth. IV. 4—6, 7, 10.

⁹ Rom. V. 14. ¹⁰ 1 Cor. XV. 47.

¹¹ 1 Pet. III. 21.

¹² Gal. IV. 22—31; see p. 106.

¹³ Hebr. IX. 23, 24; comp. IX. 11; VIII. 5 and Exod. XXV. 9, 40.

¹⁴ Hebr. IX. 9. ¹⁵ Hebr. VIII. 5.

¹⁶ Rom. X. 1. ¹⁷ Col. II. 17.

In narrating the life of Jesus, the Evangelists introduce a series of events which, though they had happened in previous times, occurred again in the history of Christ, but in a manner so much more real that they were considered as the "fulfilment" of the former. Jesus was born by the Virgin Mary, that a corresponding promise given to Isaiah more than 700 years before and at that time literally realised, might be "fulfilled."¹ He was taken to Egypt as a child and brought back to Palestine, that he might "fulfill" in a deeper sense the words of the prophet Hosea, originally applied to the Hebrews, "Out of Egypt have I called my son."² The child-murder at Bethlehem which he occasioned, was the "fulfilment" of the carnage perpetrated by the Babylonians in Jerusalem at the time of its destruction about six centuries before;³ although the former was utterly insignificant compared with the fearful bloodshed of the latter. He cast out the devils and healed the sick, that the utterances of Isaiah with regard to the servant of God who "took our infirmities upon himself and bore our sicknesses", might be realised in a profounder meaning.⁴ He always spoke to the people in parables, that the intention of Asaph, who declared at the beginning of one of his Psalms, "I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter dark sayings of old", should be carried out in a manner as it could never be done by Asaph himself.⁵ He declared that Judas must betray him, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, "He that eats bread with me, has lifted up his heel against me", words used many ages before by a poet groaning under misery, persecution and disease.⁶ The money received by the traitor and then returned by him in the Temple, was employed for buying "the potter's field" as a burial place, in order that a corresponding purchase actually made by Jeremiah in the Babylonian period might be "fulfilled";⁷ although the same transaction is, in another place, very differently related, so that evidently various traditions and legends existed on the subject.⁸ Who does not see that these and similar "fulfilments",⁹ founded neither upon human

¹ Matth. I. 23; comp. Isai. VII. 14.

² Matth. II. 15; Hos. XI. 1.

³ Matth. II. 17, 18; comp. Jerem. XXXI. 15, 16.

⁴ Matth. VIII. 16, 17, Isai. LIII. 4.

⁵ Matth. XIII. 35; see Ps. LXXVIII. 2.

⁶ John XIII. 18; comp. Ps. XLJ. 10.

⁷ Matth. XXVII. 9; comp. Jerem. XXXII. 8 *sqq.*; comp. Zechar. XI. 13.

⁸ Acts I. 18—20; comp. Ps. LXIX. 29; CIX. 8, 10.

⁹ Comp. Matth. IV. 15, 16 and Isai.

VIII. 23; IX. 1; Matth. XII. 18—21 and Isai. XLII. 1—4; Matth. XIII. 14, 15 and Isai. VI. 9, 10; Matth. XXVII. 35 (John XIX. 24) and Ps. XXII. 19; John XV. 25 and Ps. LXIX. 5; John XII. 37—41 and Isai. VI. 10; LIII. 1; Acts XIII. 35—37 and Ps. XVI. 10; see also Matth. XXVI. 24, 54; XVII. 12 and XVIII. 9; XIX. 28, 37; XX. 9; Luke XXIV. 25, 27, 44, 46; Mark IX. 13. Sometimes the quotations from the O. T. are incorrect, whether unconsciously or in-

design and co-operation, nor upon internal necessity, nor the remotest causal connection, are nothing but self-discovered adaptations not always happy and invariably deceptive, in the Rabbinical taste above characterised?

But the New Testament proceeded even farther in this direction. The principle of fulfilment was applied not only to events, but to laws. The command to roast the paschal lamb entire, so that no bone of it is broken — to symbolise the unity of the families and the nation — found its true fulfilment, when the legs of Christ were not broken after the crucifixion.¹⁰ But this latter accommodation was only a part of a larger conception. Starting from the notion of the Old Testament that leaven is corruption and decay, and that, therefore, Passover or “the feast of unleavened bread”, is the emblem of purity and sinlessness,¹¹ and moreover considering that Jesus died on the day before that festival, evangelists and apostles took the paschal lamb for the type of Christ, and set forth the doctrine, “Christ, our passover, is sacrificed for us”¹² — manifestly as a sin-offering, in harmony with the character of the *first* or Egyptian paschal celebration.¹³ Applying these notions to the sacrificial code in general, they maintained that Christ is the great sin-and purification-offering, by whose blood the transgressions of the world are for ever forgiven and eternal redemption is wrought;¹⁴ and advancing a step farther, they arrived at the idea that he was the universal and true sacrifice, which had been foreshadowed by all the defective offerings of the Old Testament, and thenceforth rendered them for ever superfluous;¹⁵ so that the Hebrew sacrifices, once acts of daily and perpetual necessity,¹⁶ “were manifestly evangelical sermons on the suffering, death, and justification of Christ.” For he gave himself up as a sacrifice, not like all other victims, but self-consciously and spontaneously; and, possessing an inner affinity both with the human and the Divine nature,¹⁷ he alone was able to effect a true intercourse between

tionally, in order to effect the desired fulfilment or to make it more striking; comp. Matth. II. 6 and Mic. V. 1; 1 Cor. II. 9 and Isai. LXIV. 3; while sometimes various passages are mixed or blended; comp. Rom. XI. 26, 27 and Is. LIX. 20, 21; XXVII. 9.

¹⁰ John XIX. 36; comp. Exod. XII. 9, 46; and *supra* p. 16.

¹¹ See p. 95. ¹² 1 Cor. V. 7.

¹³ See Sect. XVII.

¹⁴ Matth. XX. 28; XXVI. 28; Mark XIV. 24; Luke XXII. 20; John I. 29;

III. 16; VI. 51; X. 15; Rom. III. 24, 25; IV. 25; V. 2, 6—9, 11, 15, 19; VIII. 31—39; 1 Cor. VI. 20; XV. 3; 2 Cor. V. 18, 19, 21; Gal. I. 4; Eph. I. 7; V. 25, 26; Col. I. 14, 20—22; II. 14; 1 John I. 7; II. 1, 2; III. 16; IV. 10; Hebr. II. 9; VII. 25; IX. 14, 15, 18—22, 26; X. 12; 1 Petr. I. 18, 19; II. 24; Tit. II. 14; Revel. I. 7; comp. also Eph. V. 2 and 1 Cor. V. 7.

¹⁵ Hebr. IX. 25—28; X. 10, 12, 14.

¹⁶ Hebr. X. 1—3, 11, 12.

¹⁷ See p. 47; comp. 2 Cor. V. 18, 19;

God and men, and to create a communion between mankind and God. And as every sacrifice was designed as a *covenant* with the Deity, from which reason each was to be accompanied by the "salt of the covenant of God",¹ so were the death and the blood of Christ the means of a new covenant between God and the human race, involving the everlasting remission of sins.² These ideas were, with eager zest, worked out into minute parallels: the lamb was in the Old Testament ordained as the most usual victim, because it is, like Christ, the emblem of innocence and of patience under sufferings; the sacrificial animals were to be faultless, because Christ was without defect and free from all disease of guilt;³ the sin-offering was burnt without the camp, as Christ suffered without the gates of Jerusalem;⁴ the flesh of the victims was consumed, because the flesh of Christ was to be eaten by the believers, and his blood drunk to acquire eternal life.⁵ But Christ was regarded not only as the *victim*, but also as the *priest*,⁶ that is, as the *mediator* between God and men,⁷ in fact, as the true High-priest,⁸ appointed by an oath of God,⁹ eternally occupying the dignity, without follower,¹⁰ and alone completely realising the idea of an intercessor, because in order to atone for others, he does not require first to atone for himself.¹¹

Unbiased readers might suppose that these views of the New Testament approach the very boundary even of fantastical adaptation. They might consider that most of them obviously include their own refutation. The faultlessness of the victim was a requirement even in heathen sacrifices.¹² The holiest kind of sin-offerings was neither consumed by the priests nor the offerers, but burnt entirely; the less holy class was indeed partially eaten, but by the priests alone; while the worshippers were permitted to partake of the thank-offerings only, which involve the idea of atonement in the least degree;¹³ and when Christ declared, "I say to you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you",¹⁴ he amazed his

1 Tim. II. 6; Eph. V. 2; see Matth. XX. 28; John X. 18; Rom. V. 19; 1 Pet. II. 22, 23; Hebr. IX. 14; X. 5, 6.

¹ See p. 80; comp. Ps. L. 5.

² Matth. XXVI. 28; Mark XIV. 24; Luke XXII. 20; Hebr. IX. 14—22; XIII. 20; 1 Cor. XI. 25.

³ Hebr. IX. 14; 1 Pet. I. 19; II. 22; 2 Cor. V. 21; John VIII. 46.

⁴ Hebr. XIII. 1—13.

⁵ John VI. 53—58.

⁶ Hebr. VII. 15; VIII. 4; etc.

⁷ Gal. III. 20; 1 Tim. II. 5; Hebr. VIII.

6; IX. 15; XII. 24; comp. VII. 25; IX. 24; or *surety*, Hebr. VII. 22; comp. 2 Macc. X. 28.

⁸ Hebr. III. 1; IV. 14; V. 5, 10; VI. 20; VIII. 1; IX. 11; X. 21; XIII. 11.

⁹ Hebr. VII. 21; comp. Ps. CX. 4.

¹⁰ Hebr. VII. 23, 24; comp. Ps. I. c. see pp. 107, 108.

¹¹ Hebr. V. 3; VII. 26, 27, 28; IX. 7.

¹² See pp. 69, 70.

¹³ Comp. Hebr. XIII. 10, 11.

¹⁴ John VI. 53; comp. vers. 32, 33, 54—58.

own disciples, many of whom left him thenceforth for ever.¹⁵ The Hebrew prophets never expected or wished the sacrifices to be abrogated in the time of the Messiah.¹⁶ There lived indeed in the better minds of the nation the hope that God would, in due time, conclude with Israel "a new covenant"; but this covenant was not meant to consist in a new Law, but that the old one should become a truth and a reality in the lives of men, after a complete remission of their sins. "This shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: in those days, says the Lord, I will put My Law into their minds, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be My people; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."¹⁷ "A new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh";¹⁸ and in that time, it was anticipated, sacrifices would be performed not alone at the place of the Ark of the Covenant, but everywhere in Jerusalem, in which town, as at the throne of God, all nations would, in purity of heart, assemble with their offerings.¹⁹

But neither difficulties nor improbabilities deterred prepossessed minds from the dangerous path. With increasing exaggeration and arbitrariness, the typical method was pursued in subsequent ages. Degrees of deterioration are distinguishable in the New Testament itself. While the allegorical applications attributed to Christ are comparatively simple and intelligible, those of St. Paul are considerably bolder, though always ingenious and original, fresh and spontaneous, and often surprising by admirable and important deductions; but the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, basing his conclusions not upon the original Hebrew text, but upon the Greek translation, even where it is manifestly erroneous, is subtle, studied, and laborious, yet versatile, able, and dexterous.²⁰ However, even he was immeasurably surpassed by those who followed his track, by Barnabas, Justinus Martyr, and Origen, by Ambrosius and Hilarius, whose typical elucidations are often flimsy, poor, and trivial. In vain the voice of warning was raised by thoughtful and discerning men; in vain did St. Augustin advise the utmost caution and moderation; he observed that details of the Old and New Testament are often very cleverly compared with each other, but

¹⁵ Vers. 60, 61, 66.

¹⁶ See p. 48.

¹⁷ Jer. XXXI. 33, 34 (Hebr. VIII. 7—13; X. 15—18); comp. XXIV. 7.

¹⁸ Ezek. XXXVI. 26—28.

¹⁹ Jer. III. 16, 17; see pp. 43, 44.

²⁰ Comp. Hebr. I. 6 and Ps. XCVII. 7 Sept.; Hebr. II. 10—12 and Ps. XXII. 23; Hebr. III. 7—IV. 9 and Ps. XCV. 8—11; Hebr. VII. 17, 21 and Ps. CX. 4; Hebr. II. 7; X. 5; XII. 26, 27 and Hagg. II. 6.

that this is not done by Divine suggestion, but by conjectures of the human mind, which indeed sometimes discovers the truth, but is as frequently in error. But so strong was the propensity of the time, and so powerful the temptation to yield to it, that St. Augustin himself propounded the theory of a fourfold interpretation of the Scriptures — according to history, causality, analogy, and allegory — a theory which, in the Middle Ages, produced no less mischievous effects among Christian theologians, than the corresponding Talmudical canon of the four modes of exposition — according to the literary meaning, the occult or underlying sense, the allegory, and mystery — called forth among Jewish scholars; the former gave rise to the mystic and theosophic, the latter to the cabalistic and chasidic schools, the luxuriant extravagance of which totally overspread and buried the plain sense of the Bible. The typical method knew no bounds; and it went astray into the most arid wastes of fanciful speculation.

The broad doctrine was set forth, that even the actual events recorded in the Old Testament happened but figuratively, and were images to be realised and truly accomplished in Christ. It would be unprofitable to recount all the typical inferences that have been ventured on such premises; let it suffice to mention some of the more moderate views and explanations. Rachel, long praying for issue, and at last giving birth to Benjamin under pain and death, was understood as the Jewish Synagogue, for ages expecting the Messiah and then killing him. The blooming rod of Aaron was the Divine appointment of Christ and his work through the resurrection.¹ The manna that fell from heaven in the night, is Christ, the heavenly, who was born in the night, the food of the soul; it was white in colour, because he was innocent and spotless; it was at first unfamiliar to the Hebrews, because he is not understood by ungraced men of nature; a part of it was preserved in a vessel as a memorial, to point to the Lord's supper that would in due time be instituted. Nearly all the prominent persons of the Old Testament — as Isaac and Jacob, Joseph and Moses, David and Solomon² — were taken for types of Jesus, his life, and his sufferings; and Elisha with his twelve yokes of oxen for the emblems of Christ and his twelve apostles,³ who, however, were also prefigured by the twelve wells of water at Elisha, the twelve gems in the High-priest's breast-plate, the twelve stones selected from the Jordan by the command of God through Joshua,⁴ and by the twelve cakes of shew-bread, pure and unleavened,

¹ Num. XVII. 23; comp. Hebr. IX. 4.

³ Comp. 1 Ki. XIX. 19.

² Comp. Hebr. I. 5 and Ps. II. 7;
² Sam. VII. 4.

⁴ Ex. XV. 27; XXVIII. 17—21; Josh. IV. 2—8; Matth. XIX. 28.

since Christ is the bread of life.⁵ The priest laid the incense of the people on the altar, because Christ alone can bring human supplications before God; and the incense was burnt with the fire taken from the brazen altar, because any prayer unconnected with the sacrifice of Christ is illegitimate and cannot approach the throne of God. All sacrifices were to be offered in Jerusalem, because Christ was there crucified;⁶ yet the ashes were to be removed without the camp to a clean place, because Christ was buried at a spot that had not been rendered levitically impure by bones of the dead. The paschal lamb was to be selected five days before the festival, because Christ came to Jerusalem to suffer death a similar time before Passover;⁷ and the former was to be killed "between the two evenings", because the latter was nailed to the cross at the same time of the day.⁸ The victim was to be neither too old nor too young, because Christ took upon himself the punishment of human sin in the bloom of his life, when he was most able to feel the agony and to ponder over it. The offerer killed the victim himself, because Christ was slain by the people whom he redeemed. The fat and the fat parts, that is, the choicest portions of the animal, were to be burnt on the altar, because God gave for the salvation of the world His most precious treasure, His own son. Yet the burning of the animal symbolised both the tortures of hell that await the sinner, and the death of Christ which saves him. One goat was slain on the Day of Atonement, and another sent out free into the wilderness, because Christ was killed for mankind, which by his death became free from sin and its direful retribution. Certain pieces of the sacrifices were "heaved" and "waved", because Christ, when nailed to the cross, was lifted up, and as it were waved to the four winds.

A number of objections against these and all typical views must at once crowd upon the reader's attention. He will first of all be struck by the uncertainty and indistinctness of the interpretations. Can Christ be at the same time the victim and the mediating priest? If the victim, how can he intercede? if the High-priest, how can his blood be shed for atonement? Yet he is represented both as the one and the other; in either case the parallels are worked out into microscopic details; and the inevitable result is a most perplexing confusion both in the sacrificial rites and in the attributes of Christ. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems indeed to have felt this difficulty; for he represents Christ as the victim on earth, but as the High-priest after

⁵ Comp. John VI. 35, 53, 54, 57, 58;

see *supra*.

⁶ Comp. Matth.

XX. 18; Mark X. 33; Luke XVIII. 31.

⁷ Comp. John XII. 1.

⁸ Comp. Exod. XII. 6 and notes *in loc.*:
see p. 123.

his crucifixion, in heaven, which is the Holy of Holies where he performs his ministrations;¹ but if so, where is the analogy between the ordinary sacrifices and that of Christ? That one and chief inaccuracy led naturally to unlimited and almost universal identifications; Christ was contended to be, in his own and sole person, "victim, sacrifice, priest, altar, God, man, king, High-priest, sheep, lamb, in fact, all in all, that he may be our life in every respect"; till in this maze of entanglement every landmark disappeared, and all connection with the Old Testament was utterly lost. Occasional similarities may be discoverable, because, as we have above remarked, historical events repeat themselves within certain conditions; but even a cursory examination will generally prove the decided preponderance of the divergences. If Christ is the "Passover", how can his life, even by the remotest allegories, be harmonised with the requirements of the paschal lamb, which was to be *roasted*, consumed *entirely*, without the least portion being left, eaten with *bitter herbs*, and killed *annually*? Typical explanations cannot be consistently followed out without leading to absurdities, of which a treatise entitled "How Christ — the altar — was square"? is but one specimen in a large class. If their adherents gave due weight to this consideration, they would attempt to test their religious tenets by their own intrinsic merits, rather than by unnaturally grafting them upon the Old Testament. As many theologians, therefore, had not the courage, typically to interpret all details, they selected some as adapted for that method, while they understood the rest literally; but a principle which is not generally applicable is no principle at all, and reveals its fatal weakness. Some distinguished between *inherent* and *transferred* types, the former being marked as such in the Scriptures, the latter formed by analogy; others explained every point in a twofold manner, once as a mystery of Christ, and once as a mystery of the Church, or as "a memorial" of a past, and as "a type" of a future event, so that the Old Testament was supposed frequently to interrupt itself in the historical context, in order to speak typically of the coming events of the New; or an idea of the Hebrew Scriptures might be fulfilled at different times and in different degrees of distinctness and comprehensiveness, so that, for instance, the prophet Elijah, promised to precede the Messiah, is not only John the Baptist, but "the impersonation of the preacher of repentance";² and the pouring out of the spirit of God upon all flesh announced by Joel, was by no means entirely realised by the inspiration

¹ Hebr. V. 9, 10; VI. 19, 20; VII. 26; VIII. 1.

² Mal. III. 1, 23; comp. Mark I. 2; Matth. XI. 10, 11.

of the apostles,³ but continues to be fulfilled till it has indeed literally pervaded all mankind. Some maintained that the Levitical institutions refer to Christ and to him alone; others averred, that they prefigure many necessary truths besides. Some were of opinion that the Bible contains the whole sum of typical expositions, and others held that it includes but a fragmentary portion of them, while the rest, having lived for a time in oral tradition, were later forgotten and lost. Thus the basis was found for the most contradictory views; one sect proved as a dogma what another rejected as heresy; and interpretations were continually propounded to be soon renounced as impossible by their own framers. So understood, the Hebrew text would be more ambiguous and indefinite than any Egyptian hieroglyphic; it would be bereft of every practical value; ideas and institutions would be exposed to typical abuses just in proportion to their profundity and significance; and in the same measure would they cease to be intelligible or available.

Again, according to theories like those described, the sacrifices would, from the time of Moses to that of Christ, that is, during the whole period of their performance under the Law, have been devoid of all sense, of all meaning, of all tangible purpose whatever for the Hebrews. *Were* they understood by them as types? *could* they possibly be recognised as such? If the former alternative be supposed, all individual Israelites were prophetically inspired; if the latter, the typical relation must so clearly, so organically and inherently lie in the sacrificial laws, that it occurs spontaneously to every mind. But the one assumption is a paradox, though it has been asserted by some extreme champions of the method; the other a palpable fallacy overthrown by experience, for even after the diffusion of Christianity and of the writings of the New Testament, the typical applications were neither discovered nor acknowledged by large numbers of Jews and Christians. Needs it to be seriously proved, that an ancient Israelite, in offering a sacrifice, hoped for expiation through the blood of the animal he was then killing, and through no other blood? Where does the Old Testament give the slightest hint or allusion to the contrary? Indeed, the early Hebrews were total strangers to the doctrine of a suffering and dying Messiah, as will be demonstrated in another place;⁴ they could not possibly, therefore, in presenting a sacrifice, have had in their minds a redeemer at once God and man, at once victim and High-priest. The Old Testament describes the sacrificial enactments as eternal, the best and most advanced among the Hebrews deemed

³ Acts II. 16—21; comp. Joel III. 1—5.

⁴ See Sect. XIX.

them so, and Jesus himself acted accordingly;¹ but after the death of Christ all oblations would have been superfluous for those who believed in him, since he is to them the great antitype, by whose brilliancy all the pale types of by-gone ages are eclipsed: thus the New Testament, instead of being a fulfilment of the Old, would be in embarrassing contradiction with its main principle.

It has been argued that God cannot delight in sacrifices, which in themselves are inexpressive; if He yet commanded them, they must have possessed some hidden object; and what better and deeper meaning could they involve than an internal affinity to Christ and his work? But for the ancient Hebrews the sacrifices were *not* inexpressive or meaningless; they were to them a momentous reality; they were deemed well-pleasing in the eyes of God if presented in the right spirit. The Cherubim, the shew-bread, the Tabernacle and its utensils, the offerings and their rituals, had certainly a symbolical significance; they were to impress and to familiarise certain ideas and truths held essential for devotion and moral improvement; this end was sufficiently important — and it was the only one that was aimed at.

It has often been asserted that the words of the prophets were, in the time of the latter, indeed to be understood far more in reference to current events; but “the Divine intention looking far into the future, formed the speech so that it suits more properly the time of the Messiah”; and on such grounds, the Psalms in which the poet speaks in the first person, and which are quoted in the New Testament,² were supposed to be written in the name of Christ. This irrational opinion is so entirely bound up with an antiquated and exploded or “mechanical” form of the doctrine of inspiration, that it vanishes before the light of historical criticism and philosophical analysis.³

And finally, the typical view is only compatible with false and inadmissible notions regarding the composition of the Biblical canon. It starts from the theory that “the same necessary connection subsists between the words of God as between His works in nature.” “The Bible”, it is supposed, “is based upon an organic coherence, according to which the Old Covenant bears the same relation to the New, as the embryonic germ to the perfect development”; and on these or similar

¹ See pp. 15—17.

² Ps. V. (comp. Rom. III. 13); XVI. (comp. Acts II. 25; XIII. 35); XVIII. (comp. Rom. XV. 9); XXII. (comp. Matth. XXVII. 13, 46; John XIX. 24; Hebr. II. 12); XXXIV. (comp. 1 Pet. III. 10—12); XL. (comp. Hebr. X. 5—7); XLV. (comp.

Hebr. I. 8, 9); LI. (comp. Rom. III. 4); LXIX. (comp. John II. 17; XV. 25; Rom. XV. 3); LXXVIII. (comp. Matth. XIII. 35; John VI. 31); CII. (comp. Hebr. I. 10); CIX. (comp. Acts I. 20); CXVI. (comp. 2 Chron. IV. 13); CXL. (comp. Rom. III. 13). ³ See Sect. XXVI.

principles, the typical explanation is still defended by some writers. That opinion contains indeed a certain general truth; but the truth is blended with deluding error which cannot be redeemed by its insinuating speciousness. It lay in the natural progress of development that ceremonials should gradually be superseded by a more spiritual worship, as they were partially renounced by sects anterior to the Christian era, like the Essenes and the Sadducees; it was equally natural that the ceremonial service, as ordained in the Hebrew Scriptures, should be made the foundation of the reformed faith: thus in a certain sense, the earlier phase points to the later, and the later is derived from the earlier; and the apostle Peter might not unjustly say, that "the spirit of Christ" was in the old prophets.⁴ But though the writers of the New Testament, following the bent of their age as has been shown, could represent their creed and dispensation as a "fulfilment" or more real manifestation of past doctrines and events; it must be absolutely denied that the authors of the Old Testament, and especially of the Pentateuch, regarded their laws and institutions as the transitory germ of some higher form to be unfolded in the lapse of ages, or as parts of a preparatory economy to be ultimately merged in some more perfect system; on the contrary, they looked upon them as final and immutable for all times, because embodying the sum of all truth and Divine wisdom. This is a cardinal point decisive on the question: the Old Testament repudiates all change as ungodly innovation; therefore, it can never be employed for sanctioning the important and often radical modifications adopted in the New; the one cannot be regarded as the "shadow" or "figure" of the other; in spite of many points of contact, both are two distinct designs separated from each other by numerous and heterogeneous influences.

Indeed the typical theories, after having been upheld for a time in the Reformed Church with tenacious and even vehement zeal, by Coccejus and his school, by Bengel and his followers, began to lose ground towards the end of the last century, and are at present virtually abandoned by Protestant critics and scholars. "We have no hesitation", wrote G. L. Bauer as early as 1805, "in acceding to the opinion at present all but generally entertained that typical exposition is not founded in the holy Scriptures, and that the types are pious plays of imagination and of wit."

Now returning to the symbols, we shall describe and explain the sacrificial *acts*.

⁴ 1 Pet. I. 11; comp. also Gal. III. 24; III. 18—26; and comp. Deut. XVIII. 18
2 Cor. III. 6; Rom. II. 29; VII. 6; Acts with John VI. 14.

X. SACRIFICIAL CEREMONIES AND THEIR MEANING.

1. PREPARATION.

THE presentation of an offering was naturally, and therefore probably, preceded by suitable preparations in consonance with the nature of the sacred ceremony. Outward and inward purity — the former the ritual prototype of the latter — was the primary condition of man's approach to God; it was enjoined before great festivals, and when some special Divine manifestation was expected or hoped for; it was, no doubt, after the diffusion of the Levitical spirit and law, rigorously enforced; it was under the specific name of "sanctification" made an indispensable preliminary to public assemblies and fasts, national works and enterprises;¹ and it was expressed by the removal and renunciation of every emblem of heathen superstition, by bathing, and washing or change of garments, and frequently by conjugal abstinence, extended on remarkable occasions to three and more days.² When Samuel arrived at Bethlehem, he addressed the elders, "Sanctify yourselves and come with me to the sacrifice: and he sanctified Jesse and his sons, and called him to the sacrifice."³ The laws of purification were enlarged and intensified with respect to officiating priests.⁴ The Mishnah propounded the principle that no one, even if he were pure, was permitted to enter the Court and to take part in the service unless he had bathed beforehand. In the period of the second Temple, when, corresponding to the 24 orders of priests, the nation was divided into 24 sections for the sake of representing the people, by weekly rotation, at the daily public sacrifices, those who thus acted as national delegates had to fast during their week, except on Sabbath and the day that preceded and followed it; the residents of Jerusalem and the neighbouring towns were obliged to attend at the Temple, while the inhabitants of more distant places had to perform particular prayers and devotions in the Synagogues of their districts.

Similar views pervaded all ancient creeds. The Hindoos were commanded to begin the sacrifice by a "bath of purification." The Egyptians inaugurated the great festival of Isis and its solemn sacrifice by a fast and matrimonial abstinence during nine days. For some time, varying from 7 to 12 days, previous to important religious observances, they were scrupulous in chastity and lustrations, avoided

¹ Comp. Joel I. 14; II. 15, 16; IV. 9; Mic. III. 5; Neh. III. 1; comp. Ps. XX.

² Comp. Genes. XXXV. 2—4; Exod. XIX. 10, 14, 15; XXXIII. 5, 6; Josh. III. 5; VII. 13; see Comm. on Gen. p. 396;

on Exod. p. 248; comp. also Zeph. I. 7; Jer. XII. 3.

³ 1 Sam. XVI. 5; comp. also Job I. 5.

⁴ Exod. XXX. 17—21; XL. 30—32; comp. Treatise on Priesthood, ch. I.

animal food and certain kinds of vegetables. Prior to killing any victim, the Persians addressed prayers to the fire, the pure element. Those who came from whatever distance to worship in the temple of Hierapolis, were prescribed to abstain from any drink but water and from sleeping in a bed, till they had returned to their homes. The Chinese emperor prepares himself for the grand procession and sacrifice, which take place at the commencement of spring, by severe religious exercises during three preceding days. The Greeks, considering purity of body an indispensable requisite, appeared, with their offerings, not only in clean, generally white garments, but also, except in times of mourning, festively decked with wreaths or garlands, which were made of appropriate leaves and flowers, and which, by placing the wearer under the protection of the deity, rendered him inviolable: and before the sacrificial acts were begun, a direct exhortation warded off all "profane" or unclean persons, and admonished those present to reverential silence. An ancient writer comprehensively stated the requirements in the following words: "The worshipper must approach the gods cleansed, purified, bright, sprinkled with water, washed, stainless, chaste, unspotted, hallowed, sanctified, with a pure mind, with fresh and washed garments." The women who took part in the processions of the festival of the Thesmophoria in honour of Ceres, shunned conjugal embrace for nine days before. Washing of hands, facilitated by basins with holy water kept at the entrance of temples, commenced the sacrifice; "to be excluded from the holy water", was equivalent to being debarred from sacred rites, especially sacrifices, on account of guilt of blood; while "to allow the holy water", expressed admission to religious privileges. Hector, requested by his mother Hecuba during a battle to offer a libation, deprecated it with the words, "I dread to pour out the sparkling wine to Zeus with unwashed hands." "Never venture", writes Hesiod, "to offer a libation of dark wine to Jupiter or the other immortals with unwashed hands; for they do not listen, and spurn thy prayers." The Platonists, when intending to offer supplications to the gods, were recommended to fast, or at least to abstain from meat. In certain cases, offering in a state of moral impurity was, by Plato's advice, to be punished with death. The Romans combined nearly all the introductory ceremonies — they bathed in spring water, arrayed themselves in fresh, white garments, washed their hands, adorned their heads with wreaths, warded off unclean persons,¹ and in some instances refrained from sexual intercommunion in the preceding night or nights. "Worshippers shall approach to the gods with purity", observes Cicero, "that

is to say with purity of mind, which is everything; not that the law dispenses with purity of body; but this must be understood in as much as the mind is superior to the body"; terms almost identical with those employed by Philo on the same subject, "It is necessary for intending sacrificers to be cleansed as to their bodies, and as to their souls before their bodies; for the soul is the mistress and the queen, and superior in everything, being endowed with a more Divine nature"; and both utterances are perhaps an echo of the beautiful admonitions attributed to the Pythian priestess:

"Enter the pure god's temple sanctified

"In soul, with virgin water purified:

"One drop will cleanse the good; the ocean wave

"Suffices not the guilty soul to lave."

The broad rule was established, "Whoever wishes properly to perform a sacred act in honour of the gods, must first thoroughly purify himself"; and Virgil was praised for strictly conforming his narrative to that law. Inviting the peasants to the lustration-offering of the rural festival of the Ambarvalia, Tibullus demands, "You also I order to stand aloof — approach not the altar — you who the preceding night enjoyed the pleasures of Venus: chastity delights the gods; come in clean garments, and cleanse your hands with water from the spring." And opponents of animal sacrifices pointed to the strange anomaly that, while the burning of flesh and fat, of skins and feathers, produced an intolerable stench, the worshippers were earnestly exhorted, "whenever they prepared to visit the temples, to preserve themselves pure from every stain, clean, and above all chaste."

Numa ordained that previous to religious processions, heralds were to pass through the streets and order general cessation from labour. For, observes Plutarch, "as the Pythagoreans were known not to suffer casual devotion or worship, but demanded that people should undertake it well prepared in mind from the beginning, thus Numa believed that his citizens ought neither to hear nor to see anything appertaining to divine service at random or carelessly, but putting aside everything else to direct their whole minds to the pious act as to their most important business; wherefore he wished, during the sacred ceremonies, the streets to be kept clear of all din and noise and turmoil inseparable from everyday work." Hence it remained a Roman custom up to the latest time, that before the beginning of public sacrifices a herald proclaimed with loud voice the words "hoc age", thereby inviting all present to absorbed attention and silent devotion.

2. THE TIME.

The Law contains no enactments with respect to the time of the day when the offerings were to be presented; except that it orders the daily holocausts to be killed "in the morning", and "between the two evenings",¹ that is, between the later part of the afternoon or about 3 o'clock and sunset,² which hours are also fixed for the killing of the paschal lamb,³ and were later selected for the afternoon prayer.⁴ As regards all other offerings, they were probably deemed suitable at any time during the day between the morning- and the evening-holocaust; for the former marked the commencement, and the latter the conclusion of the diurnal public worship; therefore, sacrifices were hardly offered either before the one or after the other; though those that had been slain in the day could be burnt in the subsequent night.⁵ Many nations selected the earlier part of the day for their offerings, in order to make the repast that followed the sacrifice coincide with their principal meal; but the Hebrews could not possibly sanction the distinction adopted by the Greeks and Romans, who sacrificed to the upper gods who give the light or enjoy its exhilarating rays, by day, and to those of the lower world who pass a cheerless existence in sombre darkness, by night.

3. THE PLACE.

Prepared in the manner described, the offerer, whether man or woman, brought⁶ the gift to the place where alone it could be lawfully presented, namely "before the Lord",⁷ or as it is more accurately qualified, "to the door of the Tent of Meeting", that is, into the Court, where the altar of burnt-offering stood;⁸ for rites designed to effect or to preserve the communion between men and God could fitly be performed nowhere except at the spot specially dedicated to Divine presence and revelation. With such severity was this rule enforced that an Israelite or stranger who slaughtered a victim at any other place, was not considered as one who had presented a sacrifice, but as one who had committed a murder, "Blood shall be imputed to that man; he has shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people."⁹ The injunction was therefore expressly repeated with regard to every

¹ Exod. XVI. 12; XXIX. 39, 41; XXX. 5; Num. XXVIII. 4.

² See Comm. on Exod. pp. 146, 147; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 36; Ezra IX. 4.

³ Ex. XII. 6.

⁴ Dan. IX. 21; Ezr. IX. 5; Acts III. 1; comp. 2 Chron. XXIX. 27—30.

⁵ Comp. Lev. VI. 2.

⁶ Comp. Lev. IV. 4, 14; XII. 6; XIV. 23; XV. 29; XVII. 4, 5, 9; also Rom. XII. 1.

⁷ Lev. I. 3, 11; III. 1, 7, 12; IV. 4; IX. 2, 4, 5; comp. Exod. XXIX. 42; Lev. IV. 4; XV. 14; XVI. 7.

⁸ Exod. XL. 6.

⁹ Lev. XVII. 3—5, 8, 9.

individual class of sacrifice, to holocausts,¹ eucharistic² and expiatory offerings,³ and offerings of purification.⁴ It was evidently designed as a means of securing among the Hebrews the unity of public worship, of banishing by a rigorous control all idolatrous rites, and of permanently strengthening the faith in the undivided authority of God. But it was no more than a consistent consequence of Levitical principles; we have above pointed out the difficulties which operated against even its approximate observance, and have tried to prove its all but total disregard during long epochs of Hebrew history.⁵

In some other polities, analogous practices were observed or advocated. An enactment of the Roman Twelve Tables enjoined, "No one shall have gods privately." Plato strongly recommended the following law, "Let no one perform sacred rites in private dwellings; but if any one desires to sacrifice, let him go to the public buildings, and there sacrifice; and let him place his offerings in the hands of the priests and priestesses to whom the holy ritual is entrusted"; if a person is convicted of special orgies in private temples, he is to be warned, and punished by a fine or a heavier penalty. His reasons are, in some respects, kindred to those which guided the Hebrew legislators; he saw the danger of extravagant aberration if sacrifices and the erection of private temples or statues were permitted to the caprice, ignorance, or superstition of every individual; but he was, in other respects, influenced by fanciful considerations; he feared that impious men, putting up altars in their private dwellings, might think they rendered the gods propitious by sacrifices and prayers in secret, and thus encouraged in their iniquitous path, they might call down the anger of the gods upon the whole community — as if the wicked could not offer blasphemous gifts and prayers at public as well as private altars.

The Law ordains to kill the victim "on the side of the altar of burnt-offering northward."⁶ Indeed, the northern side of the altar was manifestly the most convenient locality; for to the west of it was the brazen laver and the access to the Holy; in the east, it would have obstructed the entrance of the Court, especially as the place for depositing the ashes was also on the same side;⁷ and in the south, there was, at least in the later Temple, the gently sloping dam of earth, which led up to the top of the altar.⁸

The Greeks and Romans offered to the upper gods on high, to the terrestrial deities on low altars, and to the infernal powers on grates

¹ Lev. I. 3.

² Hl. 2, 8, 12.

⁶ Lev. I. 11; IV. 24; comp. 29, 33;

³ IV. 4, 11; VI. 18; XIX. 21.

VI. 18; VII. 2; XIV. 13.

⁴ XII. 6; XV. 29.

⁷ Lev. I. 12

⁵ See pp. 16—19.

⁸ See Comm. on Exod. p. 372.

or in pits, a custom which naturally grew from their mythological systems, and which corresponded with the practice of touching the ground with the hands while praying to Demeter or Terra, of stretching them forward while imploring the deities of the sea, and of lifting them to the skies while invoking Jupiter.

4. IMPOSITION OF THE HAND (הִמָּיְקָה).

When the offering had been brought within the precincts of the Sanctuary, and an appointed priest, after a searching examination, had declared it to possess all legal requirements and to be duly qualified for the altar, then only the proper rites of sacrifice commenced. If it consisted of a quadruped, whether an ox, a sheep, or a goat, the offerer, first of all, laid his hand upon the head of the victim. This act was identical in manner, whether the sacrifice was a holocaust, a eucharistic or an expiatory offering.⁹ It matters little whether the hand was laid slightly upon the head, or as Jewish tradition contends with the full force of the body, though the latter view is supported by the etymology of the term. As a rule, one hand was imposed, probably the right one, since the right hand was considered stronger, more privileged, and more auspicious; on the scape-goat alone, which was properly no sacrifice, but was under peculiar ceremonies sent alive into the wilderness on the Day of Atonement, the High-priest laid both his hands,¹⁰ evidently because the head of the animal was to be marked, in the most signal manner, as laden with the sins of the people. The act was performed, within the precincts of the Sanctuary, by the offerer himself; it could not be transferred or entrusted to any one else, not even a priest, except when the sacrifice was presented in the name or on behalf of the sacerdotal order. It was hence confided to the elders of the people, if the sacrifice was presented for the whole community. But on the Day of Atonement, it was, like all the other functions connected with the exceptional service of the day, performed by the High-priest who acted as mediator between God and the nation. From these facts it appears easy to determine its meaning and significance. It was manifestly designed to indicate the *personal and intimate relation* between the worshipper and the victim. Thus, when Moses consecrated Aaron and his sons as priests, he caused them to lay their hands on the head of the sin- and burnt-offerings,¹¹ to signify that the victims were killed on their behalf. Those who heard a man blaspheme the name of God, imposed their hands on his head to testify that both as Israelites and witnesses they were closely concerned in

⁹ Lev. I. 4; III. 2, 8, 13; IV. 5, 15. ¹⁰ Lev. XVI. 21. ¹¹ Lev. VIII. 14, 18.

his fate. When Moses was to appoint Joshua as his successor, and to confer upon him a part of his own spiritual glory, he was commanded to place his hand upon Joshua's head before the eyes of the congregation;¹ and similarly, in the New Testament, imposition of the hand is employed as an emblem of imparting the spirit of holiness.² The Israelites imposed their hands on the Levites, when the latter were initiated to serve in the Sanctuary in their stead,³ in order to express the closeness and directness of their mutual relation. This was evidently the general character of the ceremony; but its nicer and more exact purport was qualified by the special nature of the sacrifice at which it was performed. In holocausts and thank-offerings it implied the confession of reverential submission and gratitude; while in expiatory offerings it conveyed, besides, the ideas of penitence and atonement. But in all cases it pointed to the vicarious nature of the animal, and its power of mediation between God and the suppliant.⁴ More than this it was hardly intended to symbolise. It cannot have been designed to invest the animal with a higher sanctity or power, in which case it would have been performed by the priest, the representative of God, and not by the offerer who himself required or solicited purification.

The rite was omitted if the animal sacrifice consisted of a fowl — a pigeon or a turtle-dove.

Rabbinical writers maintain, that it was accompanied by verbal utterances, in harmony with the nature of the sacrifice; namely by a confession of sins at expiatory offerings, by a declaration of offences committed against positive injunctions of the Law at holocausts, and by a recital of the praises of God at thank-offerings. Some oral expression of the feelings and cravings of the offerer is indeed not improbable. Even the patriarchs, after building altars, are generally reported to have "invoked the name of the Lord"; and this is certainly in accordance with the spirit of the ceremony under consideration. Expiatory offerings are repeatedly stated to require confession of sins;⁵ and the Deuteronomist sets down an elaborate address to be spoken at the oblation of firstfruits and tithes.⁶ In fact, sacrifices are, in a remarkable passage, used as an equivalent for mentioning the name of God: "An altar of earth shalt thou make to Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings...; in all places where I shall let My name be mentioned I will come to thee and bless thee."⁷ The Psalmist entreats, "Let my prayer be set forth before

¹ Num. XXVII. 18—20; comp. Deut. XXXIV. 9.

² Comp. Acts VI. 6; VIII. 17; XIX. 6; 1 Tim. IV. 11; etc.

³ Num. VIII. 10.

⁴ See Sect. XVIII.

⁵ Lev. V. 5; Num. V. 7; comp. Lev. XVI. 21. ⁶ Deut. XXVI. 3—10; 13—15.

⁷ Exod. XX. 21; see 1 Sam. XIII. 12; Prov. XV. 8.

Thee as incense!"⁸ Jonah promises, "I will sacrifice to Thee with the voice of thanks-giving."⁹ The Temple is indifferently called "house of sacrifice"¹⁰ and "house of prayer."¹¹ The later Isaiah declares, that the sacrifices of both Hebrews and strangers will, in a happier age, be offered in the Temple, because this will then be called "a house of prayer for all nations."¹² In the long address of Solomon, at the consecration of the newly-built Temple, he often and emphatically mentions the prayers,¹³ but only once and obscurely hints at the sacrifices of the worshippers,¹⁴ a proof that the former must have constituted a common and ordinary mode of devotion. Strangers even came to pour out their supplications, and entered the sacred precincts, certain of being graciously accepted by God.¹⁵ On some occasions, the sacrifices are distinctly recorded to have been attended with prayers or invocations,¹⁶ on others with songs, music, and psalms of praise.¹⁷ Among the ordinary functions of the Levites is enumerated "standing every morning to praise and to extol the Lord, and so also in the evening."¹⁸ After the exile, the Israelites were in the habit of offering up prayers while the fumigations with the sacred incense took place in the Holy;¹⁹ and they performed their daily devotions in the Synagogues at the times fixed for the regular sacrifices in the Temple. Josephus sets it down as a common duty incumbent upon all sacrificers to pray not only for their own, but for the general welfare. However, it is more than probable that prayers were, for many ages, left to the option and impulse of the worshipper. It was certainly very long before they were fixed in formulas such as have been handed down by tradition. One of them, asserted to have been uttered by the offerer of an expiatory sacrifice during the act of imposition, runs thus: "O Lord, I have sinned, I have offended, I have transgressed, I have done this and that; but now I return to Thee in repentance, and may this victim be my expiation." Another and similar prayer is attributed to the High-priest on the Day of Atonement, before he sent away the scape-goat, and one before he slaughtered the bullock for the expiation of himself and his house. While

⁸ Ps. CXLI. 2; comp. XXVI. 6, 7.

⁹ Jon. II. 9.

¹⁰ 2 Chron. VII. 12.

¹¹ Isai. LVI. 7.

¹² Isai. I. c.

¹³ Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 28—30, 33, 35, 38, 42, 44, 45, 47—50, 52; see also 2 Chr. VI. 12—42.

¹⁴ Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 31.

¹⁵ 1 Ki. VIII. 41—43; 2 Chr. VI. 32, 33.

¹⁶ 1 Sam. VII. 9; Job XLII. 8; Ezra VI. 10; 1 Chr. XXI. 26; XXIX. 10—21;

2 Chr. XXX. 22; Ps. LXVI. 13—20; CXVI. 13, 17; CXVIII. 1—29 (see ver. 27); Bar. I. 10, 11.

¹⁷ 2 Chr. XXIX. 26—30; comp. Judg. XXI. 24; 1 Sam. I. 15; Am. V. 22, 23; Ps. XXVI. 6, 7; XXVII. 6; L. 14, 15; LXIX. 31; C. 4; Sir. I. 17—19.

¹⁸ 1 Chr. XXIII. 30; comp. XVI. 4—6, 8—36.

¹⁹ Luke I. 10; comp. Revel. VIII. 3, 4; V. 8; see p. 55.

the Israelites killed their paschal lambs in the Temple, the priests are said to have chanted the great praise consisting of Psalms CXIII to CXVIII. But independently of other arguments, the language of those formulas alone suffices to prove their post-Biblical origin. Indeed, supplication formed, up to the time of the exile, no indispensable part of public worship,¹ though, of course, prayers were addressed to God by individuals both for themselves and others, as necessity or impulse prompted,² till they became a regular, if not mechanical practice with fixed hours, generally three times a day, and appointed forms of supplication, pronounced with the face turned towards Jerusalem, and accompanied by prostration, bending of knees, stretching out and uplifting of hands, and were, together with fasting, sometimes extended to the domestic animals, the chief exercise of piety.³ It seems to have been usual for the officiating priest to pronounce a blessing upon the offerer;⁴ but that blessing was no necessary or essential part of the sacrificial ritual. Similar accompaniments of sacrifices were usual among most ancient nations. The Scythians offered up a prayer while felling the victim to the ground, the Egyptians either before killing or after flaying it; the latter, at the burning of the body beat themselves, as a mark of humiliation, while the Carian settlers in Egypt went so far as to express their submission by cutting their faces with knives. In Persia, the sacrificer, before the act of immolation, invoked the name of the deity, and prayed both for his welfare and that of the king and the nation; while after the animal

¹ Comp. *Vitringa*. De Syn. Vet. pp. 50—52; the opposite assertion of Ewald (l. c. p. 48) cannot be substantiated.

² Comp. Gen. XX. 7, 17; XXIV. 12, 27; XXVIII. 22; XXXII. 10—13 (comprising in a brief compass nearly all the elements of prayer — thanksgiving, contrition, and entreaty); Exod. VIII. 1, 5, 24, 25; IX. 28, 33; X. 17, 18; XV. 1—18; XXXII. 11—13; Lev. XVI. 21; Num. X. 35, 36; XVI. 22; Deut. IX. 26—29; X. 10; XXI. 7, 8; Josh. VII. 6—9; Judg. VI. 36—40; XVI. 28; 1 Sam. I. 10, 12, 15; VIII. 6; XII. 19, 23; 2 Sam. VII. 18—29; 1 Ki. VIII. 22—54. esp. vers. 30, 35, 38; XVII. 20; XVIII. 36, 37; 2 Ki. IV. 33; VI. 17, 18, 20; XIII. 4; XIX. 4, 15—19; XX. 2, 3; Isai. I. 15; Jer. XXIX. 7; XXXII. 16—25; Hos. XIV. 3; Jon. II. 2—10; Hab. III. 1—19; many Psalms (as III—X. XII, XIII, XVI—XVIII, etc.

etc.), esp. XXII. 1—26; XXXV. 13; LV. 18; LXIII. 2—12; C. 1—5; CII. 1, 2; CXIX. 58, 164; CXLII. 1—8; CXLIII. 1—12; Job XLII. 8; 1 Chr. XXIII. 30; 2 Chr. XX. 6—13; and so among the Greeks and other nations.

³ See Ezra VIII. 21; IX. 5—15; Neh. I. 4—11; IX. 1—37; XI. 17; Dan. VI. 11 (comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 48; Ps. LV. 18); IX. 3—21; Esth. IV. 1, 2, 15, 16; 2 Chr. XX. 3, 4; Tob. III. 11—15; XII. 8; Judith IV. 9—13; VIII. 6; XIII. 7; 1 Macc. IV. 30—33; V. 33; VII. 40—42; XI. 71; 2 Macc. VIII. 29; XV. 26; Acts III. 1; X. 9, 30; XXVII. 35; Matth. VI. 5—13; X. 14; Luke II. 37; XVIII. 12; 1 Tim. II. 1—5.

⁴ Comp. 1 Sam. II. 20; 2 Sam. VI. 18; 1 Ki. VIII. 14, 55—61; see also Lev. IX. 22, 23; Num. VI. 23—27; 1 Sam. II. 20; 1 Chr. XVI. 1, 2; 2 Chron. XXX. 27; Sir. L. 17—19.

had been slain and duly laid upon myrtle and laurel bunches, the Magi, holding in their hands a bundle of slender tamarisk rods with which they touched the flesh, chanted long hymns supposed to recount the origin of the gods: indeed the Persians seem to have considered prayer the chief part of the sacrifice, and in itself the most acceptable oblation. The Greeks accompanied their offerings frequently with hymns of praise and with religious and solemn dances round the altar and the sacrificial fire; the invocation was generally pronounced at the killing of the victim; a sacrificial prayer from a work of Menander has been preserved to us: "Now let us pray to the Olympian gods, and now to all the Olympian goddesses, to give us safety, health, and all good things in future and full enjoyment of all present happiness." Pliny observes, with regard to the Romans, "It is a general belief that, without a certain form of prayer, it would be unavailing to immolate a victim, and that without it the gods would be consulted to no purpose"; nay the omission or improper performance of the prayer was supposed to be most ominous and often portentous. Therefore, in order to prevent hesitation or faultiness in the recital, a priest read from a book the prayer, which the sacrificer repeated after him word by word. And both among the Greeks and Romans, the sacrificial act was occasionally accomplished with the shrill sounds of the Phrygian pipe, partly to add solemnity or cheerfulness to the ceremony, and partly to prevent any irrelevant or inauspicious words being heard during the sacred rites; just as men veiled their heads during prayers, lest they beheld anything unlucky.

5. KILLING THE ANIMAL.

The offerer, after having signified by imposition of the hand his intimate relation to the victim and his readiness to surrender it to God in his stead, forthwith proved and sealed this readiness by at once killing the animal at the sacred altar. The worshipper was designedly permitted to perform the act of immolation, that the offering might clearly be marked as his own; and it was therefore entrusted to one of the elders of the people, if the sacrifice was presented in the name of the community.⁵ This privilege alone was left to the Israelites to remind them that they were designed to be "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." It would scarcely have been prudent on the part of the compilers of the Pentateuch wholly to exclude the people from all participation in the sacrificial ceremonies which they had so long performed

⁵ Lev. IV. 15. At the consecration of Aaron and his sons, *Moses* killed the victims (Lev. VIII. 15, 19, 23), because he acted throughout that ceremony as the direct instrument of God (see Comm. in loc.).

as of natural right; such immoderate ambition would probably have provoked a dangerous reaction, which not even the growing power of the tribe of Levi would have been able to resist. The Law is therefore in harmony with the Talmudical canon that the duties of the priests commenced with the act of receiving the victim's blood; and that, therefore, the killing might be lawfully performed by any one.¹ With this rule corresponded, in bloodless offerings, the law that the sacerdotal functions began with the act of taking off a handful to be burnt on the altar as a memorial, while the Israelite poured over and mixed the oil himself. However, priests were *permitted* to slaughter the animals for the offering Israelites;² they did so regularly with respect to the purification-offering of the leper,³ or when the victims were presented in the name of the whole people, whether on Sabbaths and festivals or on other occasions;⁴ and they invariably killed the pigeons and turtle-doves by wringing or wringing off their head;⁵ several reasons seem to have suggested this last exception; first because in such cases the ritual was so simple that it could scarcely be divided between the worshipper and the priest;⁶ especially as the blood of those birds is so scanty that it could not well be sprinkled or pressed out on the altar, unless so disposed of at once by the person who killed them, without being previously received in a vessel; and then because it was deemed desirable to enhance the value of the small sacrifice of fowls, often presented by poor people as a substitute for more expensive animals, by confiding its performance exclusively to the holy ministers of God.

How far the act of slaying the victim represented the life and death of the offerer will be pointed out in another place;⁷ it here concerns us to observe that even the mode of killing had, in many instances, undoubtedly a symbolical significance. So if the Greeks or Romans offered a victim to an Olympian god, the head was turned upward and cut with the sacrificial knife from above downward; while the head of animals dedicated to the lower gods, to heroes, or to the dead, was turned downward to the ground, and cut from below upward; in the latter case, the blood was poured into a pit dug for the purpose. The Greeks generally stunned and felled the victim to the ground by striking its temples with an oak club; but this was distinct from the proper slaughtering, which was usually performed by cutting the sinews of the neck with a sharp axe, and which formed the essential

¹ Lev. I. 5; III. 2; IV. 24, 29, 33; see also VIII. 15.

² Comp. 2 Chron. XXX. 15—17; XXXV. 10, 11.

³ Lev. XIV. 13, 25.

⁴ Comp. also 2 Chron. XXIX. 22—24; Ezra VI. 20.

⁵ Lev. I. 15; V. 8; see Sect. XIII. 3; XV.

⁶ See Lev. I. 14—17, and notes in loc.

⁷ See Sect. XVIII.

part of the ceremony, for by that slaughtering only which made the blood gush forth, the soul or the life of the victim was surrendered. And similarly among the Romans, an inferior official or assistant first struck the victim with a hammer, after which the priest slaughtered it with a knife. Some tribes seem to have abstained from the use of iron instruments in killing sacrificial animals, apparently for the same reasons which induced others to avoid them in the construction of altars. Plato in his mythical description of primeval customs mentions that the animals intended for victims on solemn occasions were caught "without iron, with staves and cords", though they were apparently slaughtered in the usual way. The Magi in Cappadocia called *pyraethi* or fire-kindlers, "did not perform the sacrifice with a knife, but beat the victim to death with a log of wood as with a mallet." The Scythians and Indians strangled or suffocated the animal, "that nothing mutilated, but only that which is entire, might be offered to the deity." The Syrians in Hierapolis threw the wreathed victim over the terrace in the court of the temple, and killed it by the fall; while on some occasions, as on the "Festival of Torches", it was suspended on trees within the precincts of the temple and burnt alive. Similarly at Patrae in Achaia, on the festival of Artemis Laphria, pigs, stags and roes, wolves and bears, young and old, and every kind of eatable birds were cast alive into the flames. The Trojans sacrificed horses to Poseidon by throwing them alive into the waves; and the old Rhodians did the like in honour of Helios.

It is uncertain whether the Hebrews adopted any peculiar rite or observed fixed rules in slaughtering the victim; but the regulations laid down in the Talmud are unquestionably of later growth; they all aim at causing the death of the animal in the most natural and least painful or violent manner, so that it might not even remotely fall under the category of a "torn animal"; and they strictly kept this object in view that all the blood should completely stream out of the body, and that none of it should be lost; for it was forbidden as food, but indispensable for atonement. Guided by similar views, the old Teutons struck the heart of the victims, whether these were men or animals, because the heart is the fountain of the blood, and the blood of the heart was pre-eminently regarded as the blood of sacrifice.

6. RECEIVING OF THE BLOOD.

When the blood streamed out of the dying victim, the utmost care was taken by the officiating priest, clad in his holy vestments, to receive it, at the same side of the altar where the slaughtering had been

performed, in a vessel of rather large dimensions, which he held in his right hand and was specially appropriated to the purpose. It was deemed so all-important that no part of the blood which is the life and soul of the animal, should be lost or wasted, that the Law deviated from a fundamental principle at the offering of birds, by directing the killing to be performed by the priest instead of the offerer. But the act of receiving the blood was on no account permitted to the Israelite; it was by tradition, and no doubt in accordance with the spirit of the Law, strictly regulated; it was illegal, if performed by a non-Levite or an uncircumcised person, or by the priest or High-priest without a full array of priestly garments, or in a state of total or partial uncleanness, or by a common priest who, on that day, had been thrown into mourning; for it was the direct preliminary to that ritual, in which the whole sacrificial ceremonial centred, namely

7. THE SPRINKLING OF THE BLOOD.

This was the exclusive privilege of "the priests, the sons of Aaron."¹ It was invalid if attempted by any one not belonging to that elected family. Only when Moses initiated his brother with his sons into their sacred functions, he himself, the Levite, sprinkled the blood, because on that exceptional occasion he officiated as chief priest.² Indeed if an intercessor between God and the Israelite was at all deemed desirable, he was properly employed for that special act. For it not only formed the weightiest of the rituals without which the sacrifice was not considered accomplished, but it involved the chief means of atonement, and was, therefore, justly termed "the kernel of the offering." It was rigorously and carefully performed in all animal sacrifices of whatever class. Its eminent significance is manifest: in burnt- and expiatory offerings it typified contrition and atonement; in thank-offerings, humility and submission. For the blood represented the life and existence of the animal which man offered to God either as a substitute for his own life forfeited by sin, or as an oblation of gratitude and praise for benefits received.³ Hence it was sprinkled either on the brazen, or the golden altar, or the mercy-seat, that is, on the most important and most characteristic implements of the three chief divisions of the Sanctuary, the Court, the Holy, and the Holy of Holies; it was, in fact, put upon those parts which symbolized, though in different degrees, the revelation and holiness of God, and which,

¹ Lev. I. 5, 11; III. 2, 8, 13; IV. 16—18, 25, 30, 34; VII. 14; V. 9; IX. 9, 12, 18; XVII. 6; comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 13; etc.

² Lev. VIII. 15, 19, 23.

³ See Sect. IX. 7, pp. 87—92, and the references there quoted.

therefore, if covered with the emblem of the offerer's soul, were best calculated to point to his purification and his restored union with the Deity. And while the preceding ceremonies were uniform in all classes of offerings, this chief rite varied in mode and manner according to the nature of the different sacrifices. The blood of thank-offerings and holocausts consisting of quadrupeds, was sprinkled *round about upon* the brazen altar; while the blood of holocausts consisting of fowls was pressed out on its *side*,⁴ evidently because it would not have sufficed for so complete an aspersion of the altar as to be everywhere visible. If the High-priest presented a sin-offering for himself, or if the elders of the people presented one for the whole community, the High-priest dipped his finger into the blood, and sprinkled of it "seven times before the Lord against the veil of the Sanctuary."⁵ By the peculiar force of the number seven which indicated the sacred covenant between God and Israel, and by the approach to the veil through which lay the passage from the Holy to the Holy of Holies, the ceremony was invested with the character of aspiration for purity and for harmony with God. To impress these ideas still more markedly, the High-priest put a part of the blood on the horns of the altar of incense within the Holy; for the horns, the most prominent as well as the most important part of the structure, pointed strikingly to the presence of God; while the rest of the blood was poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering.⁶ If the sin-offering was presented by a chief or a common Israelite, the inferior degree of authority and distinction was denoted in a twofold manner: the blood was sprinkled by a *common* priest, and a part of it was put, not on the horns of the golden, but of the *brazen* altar in the Court.⁷ For both the High-priest and the community were identified with the Hebrew theocracy, the former as its chief representative, the latter as its actual embodiment; both stood, therefore, towards God in a relation of supreme holiness; but any individual Israelite, were he even a chief, was allied to the Deity only in proportion to his personal merit.

But it is necessary to observe, in this respect, the following chronological distinction. In holocausts, or the oldest kind of sacrifice, and in thank-offerings, the class next to them in antiquity, the blood was sprinkled "round about upon the altar."⁸ There are traces to prove that the same method was for a long time also followed with regard to the latest class, or the expiatory offerings; for in reference to

⁴ Lev. I. 15.⁵ Lev. IV. 6.⁷ Lev. IV. 25, 30, 34.⁶ Lev. IV. 7, 18, 25, 30, 34; comp.⁸ Lev. I. 5, 11; III. 2, 8, 13.

trespass-offerings it is expressly commanded, that the blood should be sprinkled "round about upon the altar";¹ and the same section adds, "as the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering; there is one law for them."² Later, however, when the sin-offerings, developed by Levitical legislators with ardent partiality, were appointed as the most effectual and most sacred means of theocratic worship, it was found appropriate to distinguish them by a peculiar proceeding with respect to the blood; and it was then determined that, on ordinary occasions, a part of it should be put on the *horns* of the brazen altar, but in cases of special moment, not only on the horns of the *golden* altar, but also on still holier parts of the sacred edifice.³ Some such distinction was already introduced or contemplated at the time when birds also were admitted for animal offerings;⁴ for while the blood of pigeons or turtle-doves offered as holocausts was simply pressed out on the side of the brazen altar,⁵ it was, if these birds were presented as sin-offerings, partly *sprinkled* on the side of the altar, and partly pressed out at its base;⁶ though the change had not advanced so far as to direct some of the blood to be put upon the horns of the altar.

The most solemn sacrifices in the whole course of the religious year were doubtless those performed by the High-priest on the Day of Atonement for the expiation of himself and the people; and they were, among other characteristics, distinguished by a remarkable mode in the disposal of the blood. The High-priest sprinkled some of it "upon the mercy-seat eastward, and before the mercy-seat seven times";⁷ that is, in the Holy of Holies, on that part of the Ark of the Covenant which bore the mysterious figures of the cherubim, the emblems of the Divine presence.⁸ Moreover, he put a part of the blood round the horns of the altar of incense and sprinkled upon its sides seven times, and he thereby "cleansed it and hallowed it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel."⁹ No symbols could possibly be devised more strongly expressive of the craving for union and reconciliation with God.

So essential was the act in sin-offerings, that it took place even in connection with the *red cow*, which was no proper sacrifice, and was slain and burnt without the camp: the blood was sprinkled seven times in the direction of the Tabernacle,¹⁰ to indicate that though that animal had not been killed at the altar, it bore an intimate relation to the Sanctuary and the religious blessings which it secures.

¹ Lev. VII. 2.

² Ver. 7.

⁷ Lev. XVI. 14, 15.

³ Lev. IV. 6, 7, 17, 18, 25, 30, 34.

⁸ Comp. ver. 2.

⁴ See notes on l. 11—17.

⁹ Vers. 18, 19; and similarly VIII. 15.

⁵ Lev. I. 15.

⁶ Lev. V. 9.

¹⁰ Num. XIX. 4.

Bringing the blood of the victim upon the altar was so completely in harmony with the notions generally entertained of the importance of blood in sacrifices, that it is naturally found among many ancient nations, especially among the Greeks and Romans; in fact, *to sprinkle the altar with blood* was synonymous with *sacrificing*. The Chinese, after cutting the throat of the victim, generally a pig or cock, allow the blood, while still warm, to flow over the hands and feet of the idol, or they sprinkle it on the entire length and surface of the figure; and so the old Teutons sprinkled or smeared the blood drawn from the heart of the victim upon the image of the god, and especially upon its base; sometimes, as in Norway and in the great temple at Hofstader in Iceland, the blood was received in a cauldron specially placed on the altar, and containing the sacrificial twig or rod, with which the blood was marked on the image.

After the blood was sprinkled followed

8. THE FLAYING OF THE ANIMAL.

In ordinary holocausts, the skin was taken off before the victim was burnt, and fell to the share of the officiating priest. This was probably the case whether the offering consisted of a bullock, a sheep, or a goat, although it is expressly stated with regard to the bullock only.¹¹ In sin-offerings of the High-priest or of the whole people, the skin was burnt together with the flesh,¹² as was occasionally done by heathen nations; but it was not so destroyed in sin-offerings of a chief or a common Israelite.¹³ The flaying was probably performed by a Levite under the direction of the officiating priest, not by the Israelite who presented the offering, since his permissive functions ceased with the slaughtering of the animal, after which commenced the duties of the appointed mediators. But the paschal lamb was, in accordance with its specific nature as an individual and domestic sacrifice, probably flayed by the offering head of the family himself, as the Levites would scarcely have sufficed for the vast number of victims killed simultaneously and within a few hours. The ancient Hebrews seem to have employed a peculiar mode of flaying not known or practised at present; they began to draw off the hide by the feet in a manner that it remained entire and completely connected. For this purpose there were in the Court of the second Temple eight columns with three rows of iron hooks, adapted for beasts of different sizes, since the victims were, during the operation, not to touch the ground; the animals were suspended on the hooks, and flayed on tables placed between the columns.

¹¹ Lev. I. 6; VII. 8.

¹² Lev. IV. 11, 12, 20, 24; comp. VIII. 17; IX. 11.

¹³ Comp. Lev. IV. 26, 31, 35.

9. DISSECTING OF THE ANIMAL.

If the entire animal was to be devoted to the flames, as was the case with burnt-offerings, the body was "cut into its pieces",¹ that is, into its natural limbs or members. Although this arrangement probably originated in the eastern custom of serving up the meal cut into pieces or portions, and of roasting it in very small bits, and was perhaps partially devised for placing the animal more conveniently upon the altar, and for facilitating its consumption by the fire; it is not impossible that it tended, besides, to make each member appear as a distinct offering, pleading in itself for Divine mercy, in addition to the aggregate bulk of the animal. Hence the parts were probably not divided again into smaller pieces, lest the victim appeared as a confused and chaotic mass of unseemly fragments. Nor is it quite inconceivable that it was designed to characterise the sacrifice as a means of *covenant* between God and the offerer; for it is well known that compacts and treaties were frequently ratified by dissecting animals into pieces through which the contracting parties passed.² In thank- and expiatory offerings, the division of the victim into parts to be burnt upon the altar, and others to be handed over to the priest, was almost tantamount to dissection, which is therefore not specially enjoined with respect to those classes of sacrifice. If turtle-doves or pigeons were employed as a holocaust, the head was wrung off and burnt separately;³ if as a sin-offering, the head was merely wrung at the neck, without, however, being separated from the body;⁴ and in either case, the wings were only broken, without being severed entirely; for it evidently appeared expedient to consecrate to the holy flames the small body of the birds as complete as possible; and the wings could scarcely be presented to God as a distinct offering. A proceeding analogous to dissection of quadrupeds, took place in the bloodless oblations that were baked in a pan; they were divided into pieces, before a part was burnt on the altar as a memorial.⁵ Therefore, "an offering of pieces" was common from early times, and remained in use during long periods.

Some similar practices are found among other ancient nations. The sacrificial tablet of Marseilles enjoins that the honorary portion "be cut off in pieces." The Egyptians, on the great festival of Isis, cut off the legs, the extremity of the hips, the shoulders, and the neck of the victims; filled the body with fine bread, honey, raisins, figs, and various perfumes; burnt the latter with a profusion of oil,

¹ Lev. I. 6; VIII. 20; IX. 13; comp. Exod. XXIX. 17.

³ Lev. I. 15.

⁴ Lev. V. 8.

² Gen. XV. 10, 17, 18; Jer. XXXIV. 18—20; and Comm. on Gen. p. 234.

⁵ Lev. II. 5, 6; VI. 14 (an offering of small pieces shalt thou offer).

and consumed the pieces at a common banquet. The Romans cut off morsels of meat from the hip, the chine-bone, or other parts, and either burnt them on the altar or laid them before the gods as food. The Greeks cut the animal into small pieces, not at random, but according to certain well-devised rules, probably in order that all who attended at the offering might obtain a piece; so at the great festival in honour of Zeus Polieus, the body of the bull sacrificed to the god, was divided into pieces and distributed among all. In China, the large clay-cow which, at the grand vernal festival, was in solemn procession carried round richly decorated, was finally broken up into fragments which were allotted to the crowd. The ancient Germans dissected the victim, offered one piece to the god, and left the rest to be consumed by the people.

10. WASHING OF THE PARTS OF THE VICTIM.

The bowels and legs of holocausts, previous to being placed upon the altar, were carefully washed,⁶ since they are chiefly liable to uncleanness. This reason sufficed to suggest the law; it is hardly necessary to look for hidden motives or symbolical explanations, such as are pointed out by Philo, who supposes that the cleaning of the bowels exhorts us to purify our appetites, while the cleaning of the feet signifies that "we must no longer walk upon the earth, but soar aloft through the air" by following the impulses of the soul which yearns for Divine truth and longs "to move in concert with the sun, the moon, and all the rest of the most sacred and most harmonious company of the stars, under the immediate command and government of God." As a necessary preliminary to being placed upon the altar, all the offerings were salted, and thus rendered fit to serve as a covenant between God and the worshipper.

11. THE RITE OF WAVING.

Certain offerings or portions of offerings mostly belonging to the eucharistic class, before being put upon the altar, were to pass through a ceremony which the Levitical law calls *waving*. The rite is not described in the Bible; but according to Jewish tradition, it was performed in the following manner. The priest placed the offering into the hands of the offerer, and his own hands under the offerer's hands, after which he made first a motion forward and backward, and then upward and downward, which rites were supposed to indicate, first, that the offering was really the gift of him who presented it; secondly, that it was laid before God by His chosen priests, to whose share it

⁶ Lev. I. 9; VIII. 21; IX. 14; comp. 2 Chr. IV. 6.

partially fell; and lastly, that it was devoted to the Lord of heaven and earth who rules in every sphere and region; while in the waving of the firstfruit-sheaf, the movement to and fro is said to have been designed to avert obnoxious winds, the movement upwards and downwards, to avert injurious dews. This rather complex conception is hardly in harmony with the spirit of the Pentateuch. On the one hand, the offerer did not at all co-operate in the rite, which was exclusively performed by priests even in absolutely private offerings. On the other hand, the Hebrew term does not authorise a movement to the four parts of the globe, but merely one forward and backward, it may be, several times repeated, to mark the gift as *presented* and *dedicated* to God, since men also were "waved."

The following oblations, including both animals or portions of them and vegetables, were associated with the ceremony: the firstfruit-sheaf offered on the second day of Passover; the two firstfruit-loaves presented on Pentecost, and the two lambs which accompanied them; particularly the breast of the ordinary thank-offerings, to which, in the ram of consecration of Aaron and his sons, and in the thank-offerings at the conclusion of the priests' installation, the fat and fat parts, and the right shoulder were exceptionally added; the cereal offerings which accompanied the ram of consecration, the fore-shoulder of the ram together with the cereal oblation presented at the completion of the Nazirite's vow; the lamb and the log of oil brought by the leper after his recovery; and lastly the offering of jealousy presented by the suspected wife.¹ With the exception of the last, all these sacrifices were, or bore the character of thank-offerings, in which indeed a symbolical acknowledgment of the blessings bestowed by the Lord of Creation was eminently appropriate. Whenever the rite was performed with the entire victim, it preceded the slaughtering. In some cases, the offerings so hallowed were burnt on the altar, while in others, they belonged to the priests. Thus the ceremony, from whatever point it may be viewed, manifests itself as a consecration and surrendering of the gift to God. But its character is still more distinctly revealed by the fact that the Levites also, on their initiation into their solemn functions, underwent the same procedure: for Moses was commanded, "Thou shalt bring the Levites before the Lord; and the children of Israel shall put their hands upon the Levites; and Aaron shall wave the Levites¹ as a wave-offering before the Lord from

¹ Probably by making them walk forward and backward before the altar, but hardly by conducting them up the elevation that leads to it, or to the door

of the Sanctuary, since the Levites officiated before, not at the altar, and in the Court, not in the Holy; see the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. I.

the children of Israel, that they may execute the service of the Lord":² which words leave no doubt with regard to the deeper meaning of this peculiar act. The shew-bread was not waved, because it was marked as holy to God by the very place which it occupied on the golden table of the Sanctuary; nor was the holocaust or the bloodless oblation of the High-priest and the priests at their consecration waved, because they were burnt entirely to God; nor the bloodless offering that accompanied a holocaust or thank-offering, because the latter were sufficiently characterised as sacred; nor the expiatory offerings, whether animal or vegetable, because they were no "food of the Lord."

12. THE RITE OF HEAVING.

In some passages the rite of *heaving* is mentioned in conjunction with that of waving. It is in the Pentateuch no more described than the latter; nor does the etymology of the Hebrew term suggest a clear notion; for it merely implies that the offering was passed upwards and downwards, or more probably that it was raised to or towards the altar, which was high, in order to dedicate it to God. The various conjectures hazarded are purely imaginative. The ceremony took place, except in a few extraordinary cases, with the right shoulder of thank-offerings, after which this belonged to the priest.

It is, however, probable that originally the identical rite of waving was performed both with the right shoulder and with the breast, those two chief portions of the victim, which in thank-offerings were allotted to the priests, evidently after those parts had been placed upon the fat and the fat pieces; for the term (הרומה), occasionally employed in connection with the shoulder, signifies merely the consecrated gift or the offering; and it is used in this sense with reference to all oblations presented to God and to all imposts paid to the priests, to taxes consisting of animals and productions of the soil, as firstborn beasts and tithes, of gold and silver, of territory and pious contributions of any kind. However, it seems impossible to deny that in several passages the *heaving* appears as a distinct ceremony in some way analogous to the *waving*; as, for instance, "Thou shalt sanctify the breast of the wave-offering, and the shoulder of the heave-offering, which is waved and which is heaved up, of the ram of consecration"; here the parallel cannot be mistaken, and it must be admitted that Hebrew ritualists of a later date, understood the former term as the rite of heaving, in the sense above described.

No decided analogy to the Hebrew rites of waving and heaving

² Num. VIII. 10, 11.

can be discovered among other nations. The supposed allusions on the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles are too uncertain for clear inferences. It is true, the Romans designated the act of offering to the gods the entrails of victims, or of laying them upon the altar or at any other appropriate place, by the special and technical term *porricere*; but that term, merely retained from the old religious phrasology, implied no ceremony or fixed form of dedication. The eastern and imaginative character of the Hebrews was more fertile and inventive in significant religious symbols.

13. THE BURNING OF THE OFFERING.

The sacrificial rites were completed by the combustion of the offering or of those parts of it that were destined for the Deity. Though common to animal and vegetable sacrifices, the act and its meaning are best understood in reference to the former. In bringing the victim to the door of the Sanctuary, the worshipper signified his intention of devoting it to God; by the imposition of the hand he marked it as his own gift and his substitute; as such he proved and surrendered it by the act of killing; then the sprinkling of the blood signified the devotion or wrought the justification of his soul; while lastly the burning, that is, not the annihilation but the rising up of the offering in smoke, represented the soaring of the soul, cleansed and hallowed, heavenward to the throne of God, who graciously accepts the humble oblation. It indicated that the end of the sacrifice was fully attained; for it practically gave up the sacrifice as "the food of God", and as "the offering made by fire, a sweet odour to the Lord." It was, therefore, the final consummation of the pious deed. In holocausts and thank-offerings, it symbolised the worshipper's unlimited submission to God, whether in reverence or gratitude, but in expiatory sacrifices, it typified the complete removal or covering of the transgressions thenceforward effaced in the sight of God. It was equal in significance to the imposition of the hand and the sprinkling of the blood. For these three rites mirrored the chief stages in the inward transformation of the offerer — from his feeling of meek dependence or of sinfulness, through the hope of moral liberty and atonement, to the certainty of acceptance and spiritual regeneration. One of them possessed pre-eminent weight in one of the three chief classes of sacrifice — the burning in holocausts, the sprinkling of the blood in expiatory offerings, and the imposition of the hand in thank-offerings; and thus the specific character of each is unmistakably marked. In any case a portion of the victim was burnt on the *altar*, and it was this circum-

stance that stamped the animal as a *sacrifice* — in holocausts, the whole animal with the exception of the skin; in eucharistic and most of the expiatory offerings, the fat and some fat parts which might well be taken to represent the whole victim; while in the most solemn of the sin-offerings, those killed for the High-priest or the whole people, the remaining flesh together with the hide was burnt, in a clean place, without the camp or town, where the ashes, temporarily preserved in the Court eastward of the brazen altar, were poured out by a priest not clad in his pontifical robes or his official garments of white linen, but in his ordinary dress; for the flesh could, in those cases, not be burnt on the altar, nor within the camp or holy city which represented the community of God, because the victims had been laden with the punishment of those in whose name they had been offered: yet it could be burnt in a clean spot only, because it was the flesh of sacrifices, which could never be divested of their sacred character, and inherently differed from ordinary animals.

The bloodless offering of the High-priest and the priests was burnt entirely; for it could not be consumed by priests, because they were the offerers, nor could it be allowed to the Israelites, because none of them was entitled to touch the "food of God." In all other vegetable oblations, which, with a few remarkable exceptions, were invariably accompanied by incense and oil, a small portion only, generally a hand-full, was burnt by the priest on the altar, together with all the frank-incense, as "a sweet odour" or as a "memorial" to God, significantly so called, because it was designed to bring the worshipper into the grateful remembrance of God, whether the *minchah* was the usual cereal gift, or the extraordinary offering presented in cases of conjugal jealousy, or merely the frank-incense put on the shew-bread and then burnt. This explanation, simple and obvious as it is, seems in harmony with the whole sacrificial ritual, and therefore preferable to the various conjectures that have been ventured. But we are utterly unable to understand the process of reasoning which suggested the opinion, that the burning of the sacrifice — the hope and means of grace — typified the *eternal punishment of hell*, wherefore the fire on the brazen altar, miraculously kindled by lightning from heaven, was to burn perpetually, and salt, the emblem of permanence, was to be employed with every offering: an opinion which confusedly throws the flesh of sin-offerings into the same category as the oil and incense of vegetable oblations, and which interprets the "sweet odour" ascending to God to mean the unspeakable and ever relentless torture of wretched sinners.

It is true that the smell of the burnt animals or of parts of them must have been most offensive; we can well understand the surprise of strangers who asked, "whether the smoke and stench of burning hides, bones, bristles, fleeces, and feathers, a smell intölerable to the sacrificers themselves, could possibly be pleasing to the deity"; and it is not impossible that the desire to counteract that ill-odour originally prompted the addition of the frank-incense. But it ought to be remembered that the sacrifices had an ulterior or symbolical significance; that the burning of the victim or of its best parts, whatever the attendant circumstances, was an act of self-denial, or of pious submission, or of grateful acknowledgement, and that the physical inconvenience which it engendered, was utterly insignificant compared with the noble and spiritual ends desired.

The sacrificial portions, unless placed before the gods as *lectisternia*, were by most other nations also devoted to them by means of the flames; in which respect we find even the curious notion that the smoke of the burning oblation carried the worshipper's name to the knowledge and the abode of the deity. The Thebans in Egypt buried in a sacred vault the ram which they annually killed in honour of Jupiter and Hercules; and the Phocaeans in Tithorea buried in an appointed place the remains of victims killed at the festivals in honour of Isis. The Scythians, after having strangled the victim, completed the sacrifice "without kindling any fire." The Greeks generally buried the animals slain to propitiate the lower gods or to ratify oaths; and both Greeks and Romans threw the dedicated portions of victims destined for marine deities into the sea. But flesh buried or thrown into the water is inseparable from putrefaction, a notion scrupulously avoided in connection with sacrifices; while the burning not only makes the offering *rise* heavenward towards the Divine abode, but secures a complete and perfect removal, free from all impurity, on which subject more will be said in another place.

11. SACRIFICIAL MEALS.

Lest any act connected with pious offerings should have been meaningless, a symbolical significance was attached even to those parts that were not burnt on the altar, but eaten either by priests or Israelites. Indeed sacrificial meals formed, in one of the chief classes of offering, the most prominent and characteristic feature. They could of course not take place in holocausts which were burnt on the altar entirely, with the exception of the skin; nor in the most important sin-offerings — those slain for the whole people or for the High-priest —, which were

partly burnt on the altar and partly without the camp; nor in the bloodless oblations of the High-priest and the common priests, which were also delivered to the flames entirely, since they could appropriately be eaten neither by the offering Aaronites nor the inferior Israelites. But the meals were ordained in reference to all other offerings, though they differed in meaning and in the degrees of importance. The bloodless oblations presented by Israelites fell to the share of the priests, with the exception of the "memorial", and were to be consumed by the *males* among them alone, in the holy place, that is, in the Court of the Sanctuary, near the altar, where the solemn act had been performed, and later in special cells at the side of the Court of the Temple; for those oblations were "most holy": in which respect the provident arrangement was made that some of the oblations — namely those prepared in an oven, a pan, or a cauldron — were allotted to the officiating priest individually, while others — especially those consisting of flour only whether mixed with oil or not — were assigned to all the Aaronites collectively, to serve as their common sustenance.¹ In praise-offerings, four kinds of cake accompanied the animal sacrifice; one cake of each sort was delivered up to the priest who performed the sprinkling,² and who had to eat his portion also on the consecrated spot, near the Divine abode. Though in these cases the ordinances served chiefly the material subsistence of the elected tribe, they aimed also at hallowing the remains of the gifts that had been dedicated to God and which He graciously allowed to His servants. Analogous to these bloodless oblations were the trespass-offerings, the flesh of which belonged, in the first instance, to the acting priest, but might be shared by him with all the males of his order, and was to be consumed in the Court of the sacred edifice.³

But the case was different with respect to those less important sin-offerings of which no blood had been brought into the interior of the Sanctuary; the priests received as their portion all the flesh that had not been burnt on the altar, and they, the male Aaronites exclusively, were *bound* to eat it in the holy place, to indicate by that meal, that they were the appointed mediators of propitiation between God and the Israelites; for God gave them the sin-offering "to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord":⁴ the repast was a part of their official functions; its omission was a grave offence and a criminal dereliction of duty certain to provoke the dire anger of God.⁵ — The nature of the sacrificial meal

¹ Lev. VII. 9, 10; see Sect. XI.

⁴ Lev. X. 17.

² Lev. VII. 12—14.

⁵ Comp. Lev. X. 16—18; see also

³ Comp. Lev. VII. 6, 7.

Sect. XV.

was still more marked in reference to eucharistic sacrifices; for it constituted their distinctive trait. It appears indeed that the public thank-offerings were entirely handed over to the priests, with the exception of the fat and fat parts which were burnt on the altar; this is at least certain with respect to the two lambs which, on Pentecost, were presented with the first-fruit loaves as thank-offerings¹, and is fully in accordance with the character of the class, though a general and distinct precept is not given in the Pentateuch: thus the public thank-offerings would, with regard to the meals, fall into the same category as the trespass-offerings. But the flesh of private thank-offerings was so divided that the fat and fat parts were burnt on the altar,² the right shoulder was surrendered to the officiating priest, and the breast to all the Aaronites as common provision,³ while the remainder was left to the offering Israelite. Now the portions reserved to the priests could be eaten by them together with their families and servants, both males and females, at any place, provided it was levitically clean:⁴ the meal had therefore not, like that connected with sin-offerings, an official or symbolical character, but it was merely designed for the external support of the priests and the maintenance of their households, or as a compensation and return for their services at the Sanctuary. But very different was the repast of the offering Israelite on such occasions. He had to eat his portions of the eucharistic sacrifice, within a fixed and limited time,⁵ not only with his family, his wife, his sons, and his daughters, nor only with his man-servants and his maid-servants, but he was enjoined to invite also as his guests poor people, especially Levites who had no certain or regular income; the meal was to be held, not at any place the offerer might chose, but within the town of the common Sanctuary alone; and all those who partook of it were rigidly ordered to be free from uncleanness, a contravention of which command was threatened with excision.⁶ Similar regulations obtained with regard to the tithes of corn, wine, and oil, the firstlings of the herds and flocks,⁷ to vows and free-will gifts of any kind.⁸ The character of these feasts cannot be mistaken; it was that of joyfulness tempered by solemnity, of solemnity relieved by joyfulness: the worshipper had submitted to God an offering from his property;

¹ Lev. XXIII. 20.

² Lev. III. 3—5, 9—11, 14—16; VII. 31. ³ Lev. VII. 31—34; X. 14, 15.

⁴ Lev. X. 14

⁵ Lev. VII. 15—18; XIX. 5—8; XXII. 29, 30; comp. Exod. XII. 10; XXIX. 34; Lev. VIII. 32.

⁶ Comp. Lev. VII. 19—21; Deut. XII.

6, 7, 11, 12; comp. XVI. 11, 14; 1 Sam. IX. 12, 13, 19, 22—24; XVI. 3, 5; 2 Sam. VI. 18, 19.

⁷ According to the Deuteronomist; see Treatise on Priesthood, section III.

⁸ Deut. XII. 6, 7, 11, 12, 17, 18.

he received back from Him a part of the dedicated gift, and thus experienced anew the same gracious beneficence which had enabled him to appear with his wealth before the altar; he therefore consumed that portion with feelings of humility and thankfulness; but he was bidden at once practically to manifest those blissful sentiments by sharing the meat not only with his household, which thereby was reminded of the Divine protection and mercy, but also with his needy fellow-beings, whether laymen or servants of the Temple. Thus these beautiful repasts were stamped both with religious emotion and human virtue. The relation of friendship between God and the offerer which the sacrifice exhibited, was expressed and sealed by the feast which intensified that relation into one of an actual *covenant*; the momentary harmony was extended to a permanent union; and these notions could not be expressed more intelligibly, at least to an eastern people, than by a common meal, which to them is the familiar image of friendship and communion, of cheerfulness and joy: thus when Isaac and Abimelech made a league, the former "gave a feast, and they ate and drank";⁹ and when Jacob concluded a treaty with Laban, they made a pile of stones, "and they ate there upon the pile."¹⁰ Thus the eucharistic repasts were the emblems of that community into which the sacrificer entered with the Deity; a conception found among other nations also. Some critics have expressed an opposite view, contending that the offerer was not considered as the guest of God, but, on the contrary, God as the guest of the offerer: but this is against the clear expressions of the Law; the sacrificer surrendered the whole victim to the Deity,¹¹ and confirmed his intention by burning on the altar the fat parts, which represented the entire animal; he could not well invite as his guests at once God and his household together with strangers; and the apostle Paul says distinctly, "are not they who eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar" or "of the Lord's table?"¹² Philo observes, therefore, aptly: "the sacrifice, when once placed on the altar, is no longer the property of the person who offered it, but belongs to Him to whom the victim is sacrificed, who, being a beneficent and bounteous God, makes the whole company of those who offer the sacrifice, partakers at the altar and messmates, only admonishing them not to look upon it as their own feast, for they are but stewards of the feast, and not the entertainers."

⁹ Gen. XXVI. 28, 30.

¹⁰ Gen. XXXI. 46; comp. Josh. IX. 14, 15; Ps. XXIII. 5; Matth. XXII. 4; Luke XIV. 15.

¹¹ Comp. Lev. III. 1, 6, 7, 12; VIII. 12, 29; see also XXI. 22.

¹² 1 Cor. X. 18, 21; comp. Mal. I. 12 (the table of the Lord is polluted).

The matter being so understood by the Hebrews, a participation in the meals of idolatrous sacrifices was deemed a fatal offence;¹ for it was almost tantamount to the acknowledgment and worship of heathen gods; the Israelites who shared the feasts of Baal-Peor in the time of Moses, were represented as having been directly devoted to the service of that idol; the Moabites "called the people to the sacrifices of their gods; and the people ate and bowed down to their gods; and Israel joined himself to Baal-peor";² for which aberration they had to atone by a fearful pestilence.³ The pious, therefore, scrupulously avoided the repasts of heathen sacrificers;⁴ nay, as a matter of precaution, they shunned all convivial intercourse with idolaters, from fear that any of the viands or of the wine had been dedicated to some heathen deity,⁵ since meat of sacrificial animals was frequently offered for public sale. But the early pagan converts to Christianity could not so easily disengage themselves from a habit so deeply ingrained in their lives and minds; they often joined their heathen friends at the meals held in the temples of their idols;⁶ and they more commonly attended their sacrificial feasts in their own houses.⁷ The apostles struggled perseveringly to eradicate the dangerous propensity; they emphatically enjoined all their followers "to abstain from meats offered to idols",⁸ which they also called "pollutions of idols."⁹ Nevertheless, more distant congregations remained in uncertainty or disagreement on the matter; and the Corinthians, agitated by serious disputes, invoked the advice and decision of St. Paul; for some maintained that as the idols are "nonentities" or "nothings" and imaginary phantoms, with which a covenant or communion is an impossibility, the sacrifices offered to them can have no reality or force, and they might, therefore, without danger be shared by believers; while others were not disposed to take this view of the nature of the heathen deities. Now St. Paul indeed permitted the Christians to buy and to eat all meat that was offered to them even by heathens, "without asking questions for conscience sake";¹⁰ but if they were informed or convinced that it was meat of victims presented to idols, they were rigidly to abstain from it, for, he said, "You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils, you cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and of the table of devils";¹¹ it is true that "an idol is nothing in the world", since "there is no other God but one";¹² but there are many persons weak enough to consider the idols

¹ Exod. XXXIV. 14, 15.

⁶ 1 Cor. VIII. 10.

² Num. XXV. 1—3; comp. Ps. CVI. 28, 29.

⁷ 1 Cor. X. 21, 27, 28.

⁸ Acts XV. 29; XXI. 25.

³ Num. XXV. 9; Ps. CVI. 29, 30.

⁹ Acts XV. 20. ¹⁰ 1 Cor. X. 25, 27.

⁴ Tob. I. 10—12. ⁵ Dan. I. 12; etc.

¹¹ 1 Cor. X. 21. ¹² VIII. 4; X. 19.

as real beings, and who, therefore, by eating meat sacrificed in their honour "defile their conscience";¹³ therefore the intelligent also should eschew such meals, because their presence at them might mislead the feeble and become to them a stumbling-block;¹⁴ moreover, though the idols are nothing, yet "the gentiles offer the things which they sacrifice to devils", with whom the Christians ought to have no fellowship whatever.¹⁵ Yet in spite of this thoughtful and decided opinion of the apostle, the objectionable habit lingered for centuries in many congregations.

From these remarks alone it will be sufficiently obvious how common and far-spread sacrificial repasts were among heathen nations.¹⁶ They formed indeed an essential element in pagan religions. In Greece and Rome, it was customary, whether the offerer held the feast within the precincts of the temple, or, as was more frequently the case, at his own house, to send a portion of the meal to friends as a present; and it was considered an act of mean and niggardly shamelessness to forget the acquaintances on such occasions. The old Teutons, eager to feast in honour of the gods and to offer food for their statues to whom they not only attributed human reason and speech, but also human wants and desires, peculiarly extended and developed the sacrificial repasts, at which they indulged in wild and noisy mirthfulness, in music, dance, and varied games; which they frequently employed for conciliating the feuds of enemies; and which were commonly held on the fresh graves of the departed, as the notorious funeral solemnities of the Suedes and Danes repeated every nine years and disgraced by human sacrifices. The German converts to Christianity clung long and tenaciously to their ancestral habits; they rendered necessary rigorous edicts of the popes, and the imposition of heavy penalties by Christian princes; yet the former found it expedient to permit believers, if compelled by force, to eat of heathen offerings provided that in doing so they made the sign of the cross; or they judiciously transformed the public feasts of sacrifice, which were principally celebrated to mark the chief phases in the course of the sun, or the seasons with their produce, into Christian festivals or days of penitence, as for instance the splendid repasts in the middle of the winter into Christmas, the vernal banquet of the Norwegians into Easter, and that of midsummer into Pentecost. Thus sacrificial festivities were, far into the middle ages, celebrated in honour of Christ, of the virgin Mary, and especially of the saints, whose birthdays and anniversaries were

¹³ VIII. 7. ¹⁴ VIII. 9—13; X. 23, 24.

¹⁵ X. 20.

¹⁶ Comp. Exod. XXXIV. 15; Num. XXV. 2; 1 Cor. VIII. 10.

commonly transferred to such days on which heathen feasts had previously been held; and a remnant of the grand sacrificial revelries kept by the old Norwegians in mid-summer, has been preserved to this day on the island of Bornholm, where it is annually solemnised, on the 24th day of June, in a grove and enclosure in the parish of Rutha.

XI. THE BLOODLESS OFFERING.

1. ITS GENERAL CHARACTER.

VEGETABLE offerings presented to the Deity from early ages, were at least co-eval with animal sacrifices.¹ But in the course of time, the latter class was regarded as peculiarly acceptable, not only because of its superior value, implying a higher degree of self-abnegation, but also on account of the power of atonement specially attributed to the blood. Therefore vegetable oblations were predominantly presented by people of humbler means, and probably formed but a subordinate gift even of agriculturists. Gradually, however, the notion evidently prevailed that, as human repasts do not consist of meat alone, but require the addition of vegetable or cereal food and of wine, all sacrifices offered to the Deity ought to be composed of the same leading elements. Hence the Greeks and Romans invariably accompanied animal sacrifices with salted grits; and the Levitical law ordained that all usual holocausts and thank-offerings, whether presented on ordinary days or on sabbaths and festivals,² whether in consequence of vows or as voluntary gifts, whether by Israelites or strangers, should be supplemented by vegetable and drink-offerings;³ it never omitted to repeat that injunction with respect to the regular and public burnt-offerings, those killed every morning and evening,⁴ on every sabbath⁵ and day of the new-moon,⁶ on the three great agricultural festivals,⁷ on the "Day of Memorial", the first of the seventh month,⁸ and the Day of Atonement;⁹ and it extended the regulation to a variety of special sacrifices, as those presented after recovery from leprosy, or at the end of the Nazarite's time of seclusion.¹⁰ The cereal oblation was, with regard to the quantity of the materials, nicely varied according to the species of animals which composed the bloody sacrifice, and increased in proportion to their numbers, that it might strikingly retain its cha-

¹ Comp. Gen. IV. 3; see Sect. II.

² Comp. Num. XV. 3.

³ Num. XV. 3—9, 14—16; comp. Lev. VII. 12, 13.

⁴ Exod. XXIX. 40, 41.

⁵ Num. XXVIII. 9.

⁶ Num. XXVIII. 12—14.

⁷ Num. XXVIII. 20, 21, 28, 29; Lev. XXIII. 13, 18.

⁸ Num. XXIX. 3.

⁹ Num. XXIX. 9, 10.

¹⁰ Comp. Lev. XIV. 10, 20, 21, 31; Num. VI. 15, 17; comp. Exod. XXIX. 2, 23; Lev. VIII. 26.

racter as a subordinate accessory. For the Law prescribed that each lamb or goat was to be accompanied by a *minchah* of one tenth of an ephah of flour, mingled with one fourth of a hin of oil; each ram by two omers of flour, mingled with one third of a hin of oil; and each bullock by three omers of flour, mingled with half a hin of oil: if more than one animal was sacrificed, the *minchah* was to be multiplied accordingly.¹¹ It is evident that these arrangements were based on customs dating from very remote epochs, when the idea of sacrifice was still associated with the rude and gross conception of food offered to the deity;¹² though this view is neither sanctioned in the Pentateuch, nor attributable to the Levitical legislators.¹³ Bloodless offerings were, however, ordered only with quadrupeds; they do not seem to have been ordinarily coupled with birds, probably because the latter were, as a rule, presented by poorer persons, to whom an additional oblation would have been burdensome; although in exceptional cases the rule was departed from.¹⁴ Nor is it difficult to account for their omission with the paschal lamb, or with the firstlings and tithes of animals; for the former, peculiar in various points and almost *sui generis*, was in itself and exclusively characteristic of the occasion, and the latter were gifts rather than sacrifices, and therefore required no complements. But it is certainly remarkable that they were also suppressed in connection with sin-offerings, the latest class of sacrifice, which may be said to have been properly regulated in the Pentateuch only; this exception may indeed have been partially suggested by the circumstance that the sin-offerings were pre-eminently the *expiating*, that is, symbolically, the *bloody* sacrifices, but partially also by the legislator's desire of divesting those most solemn offerings from all accessories that have no bearing upon their innermost nature and import, and of absolutely depriving them of the character of social cheerfulness.¹⁵ However, he preserved the custom of the *minchah* in conjunction with holocausts and thank-offerings; he could apprehend no abuse of it, because its meaning was unmistakably disclosed by the whole spirit of his code; he might reasonably expect that its earliest origin would gradually be effaced and forgotten, and that it would be understood in harmony with the Levitical system, which commanded the Hebrews to offer to the Deity the chief objects of their wealth and their food, of their cattle and cereal productions. And he himself made an important step towards maintaining the spiritual character of the

¹¹ See Num. XV. 4—12; comp. XXVIII. 5, 9, 12, 14, 20, 21, 28, 29; XXIX. 3, 4, 9, 10, 14, 15; Lev. XIV. 21.

¹² Comp. Judg. VI. 19, 20. ¹³ See p. 6.

¹⁴ Comp. Lev. XIV. 21, 31.

¹⁵ See Sect. XV.

minchah by rigidly excluding, except in a few significant instances,¹ leavened bread, and by thus marking the oblations as holy.

However, a *minchah* was, under various circumstances, also presented as an independent sacrifice — by the nation every sabbath when the twelve cakes of shew-bread were placed on the golden Table in the Holy, on the second day of Passover when the first sheaf of ripe barley,² and on Pentecost when the first loaves from the new wheat were presented;³ by the High-priest on the day of his initiation, when the offering, like every bloodless oblation of priests, was burnt entirely;⁴ by the very poor as a sin-offering for certain offences, instead of an animal sacrifice, when oil and frank-incense, the emblems of holiness and devotion, were excluded;⁵ and by the wife suspected and accused of infidelity, when not only oil and incense were avoided, but ordinary barley-meal was employed instead of fine wheaten flour required for every other *minchah*.⁶ In nearly all these cases the *minchah* was prescribed to consist of not less than one tenth of an ephah, or an omer,⁷ of flour,⁸ from the reason above alluded to, that so much was supposed to be required for the daily food of one man.⁹ The only exception admitted in the Law was the bloodless oblation presented by the High-priest on the day of his consecration, which was limited to one half of an omer, from considerations pointed out in another place.¹⁰

The instances above enumerated prove sufficiently that it is idle to deny, as has frequently been done, the independent character of the bloodless offerings; the facts that they accompanied the greater number of animal sacrifices, and that for such cases the quantity of the materials to be used was fixed by the Law, afford no conclusive proofs; for holocausts and burnt-offerings were very frequently killed together; can it thence be inferred that they were never presented separately? The *minchah* is, no less than the animal sacrifices, called "an offering made by fire to the Lord" or "food of the Lord."¹¹ The sheaf on Passover and the loaves on Pentecost were manifestly the principal offerings of those festivals, to which the animal sacrifices were joined as collateral, if not subordinate, as is manifest from the wording of the commands,

¹ Lev. VII. 13; XXIII. 17.

² Lev. XXIII. 10, 11.

³ Lev. XXIII. 16, 17, 20; Num. XXVIII. 26.

⁴ Lev. VI. 12—16; see notes in loc.

⁵ Lev. V. 11—13; comp. vers. 1—5; see Sect. XV.

⁶ Num. V. 15, 16, 25, 26; comp. Lev. II. 1, 4, 5, 7.

⁷ See notes on Exod. XVI. 16, 36.

⁸ Lev. V. 11; comp. XXIII. 17.

⁹ Exod. XVI. 16—18; see p. 76.

¹⁰ Lev. VI. 13; see Comm. in loc.

¹¹ Lev. II. 16; XXIII. 7; comp. XXI. 6, 8, 17, 21, 22; XXII. 25; etc.

“On the day when you wave the sheaf, you shall offer a lamb without blemish” etc.;¹² and, “You shall bring out of your habitations two wave loaves . . . and you shall offer with the bread seven lambs without blemish of the first year” etc.¹³ Nay on the second day of Passover, the holocaust of one lamb was, contrary to the general rule, accompanied by a *minchah* of two tenths of an ephah of flour instead of one, evidently because the firstfruit-sheaf presented on the same day was regarded as equivalent to a sacrificial animal.¹⁴ It is even not improbable that for long periods, reaching to the later times of the monarchy, a bloodless offering alone was publicly presented in the evening, and not an animal holocaust with its accompanying *minchah*, as ordained in the Pentateuch. If some passages are indistinct,¹⁵ one at least is conclusive: the king Ahaz commanded the priest Uriah to burn on the great altar which he had erected after the admired pattern of one of Damascus “the burnt-offering of the morning and the *minchah* of the evening”;¹⁶ so that the latter was evidently a chief offering exactly like the former; and if it be contended that the term *minchah* is there, as in some other instances, synonymous with sacrifice in general and therefore means animal holocaust, this supposition is overthrown by the words which follow, “and the burnt-offering of the king and his *minchah*. and the burnt-offering of all the people of the land and their *minchah* and their drink-offering.” Moreover, the very laws which enjoin merely flour with oil as an accompanying *minchah*, prove that the varied and very different forms of bloodless offerings mentioned in the introductory sections of Leviticus were meant as independent oblations. For as the first chapter treats of holocausts and the third of thank-offerings, so the second details the commands regarding the *minchah*, which, according to the whole tenour of that code of laws, is no less a distinct class of sacrifice than the two kinds between which it is introduced, and than the expiatory offerings by which it is followed. It may be that the bread and flour (or corn) of the bloodless offerings corresponded with the body or flesh of the bloody sacrifices, the oil of the one with the burnt fat of the other, and the (red) wine of the former with the blood of the latter; but these very analogies tend to corroborate the independent nature of the *minchah*, which in every essential point consisted of its own components and rites, and did not require the support of the more imposing class of offerings.

¹² Comp. Lev. XXIII. 12.

¹³ Lev. XXIII. 17, 18.

¹⁴ Lev. XXIII. 13.

¹⁵ 1 Ki. XVIII. 29; 2 Ki. III. 20; Dan. IX. 21.

¹⁶ 2 Ki. XVI. 15.

2. MODE OF OBLATION.

The *minchah* which formed the accompaniment of burnt-offerings and thank-offerings, was always fine wheaten flour, merely mingled with oil.

Now, if it belonged to a holocaust, it is most natural to suppose that it was, like the animal, burnt entirely on the altar, in accordance with the nature of the class; and thus the Law ordains it in one particular case;¹ though it appears that the practice was not settled in this respect, and that, in some instances, a small part only was burnt, so that the *minchah* strikingly maintained its distinct character, as is clearly stated in one passage at least.² If it belonged to a thank-offering, it sufficed in all cases to devote to the altar a part only, as was the case with the victim which constituted the principal sacrifice.

But if the *minchah* was presented alone as a voluntary gift or in consequence of a vow, it could be offered in various forms and with different ceremonies.

If it simply consisted of fine flour, unprepared, the offerer mixed it with salt, poured oil, and put frank-incense upon it. In this state he handed it over to the priests, one of whom then took off a portion, designated as "a handful",³ of the flour together with the oil that was upon it and all the frank-incense, and burnt it to God on the brazen altar in the Court, as "a memorial" or a tribute of homage; the rest belonged to "Aaron and his sons", that is, to the priests generally, as common property.⁴

If the oblation was composed of unleavened cakes or wafers *baked in the oven*, the offerer carefully mingled the former and "anointed" or brushed over the latter with oil, not forgetting the indispensable salt, and brought them to the officiating priest; the latter took off a part, probably a handful, and burnt it on the altar of holocausts as "a memorial" to God; the remainder belonged to himself,⁵ or was, according to a later regulation, left to his whole order, like the offerings of the preceding class.⁶

If the *minchah* was to be *baked in the pan*, the offerer mingled it with oil and salt, and after having baked the dough, divided it into

¹ Lev. XIV. 20, "and the priest shall burn the burnt-offering and the bloodless offering upon the altar."

² Lev. IX. 16, 17, "and he brought the burnt-offering, and offered it according to the law; and he brought the bloodless offering, and took a hand-

ful thereof and burnt it upon the altar."

³ Lev. II. 2; V. 12; VI. 8.

⁴ Lev. II. 1—3, and Comm. in loc.; VII, 10; p. 143.

⁵ Lev. VII. 9.

⁶ Lev. II. 4; 8—10; VII. 9.

small pieces, over which he again poured oil; the priest then acted precisely as in the former case.⁷

If it was *cooked in a pot or cauldron*, it was mixed with salt and oil, and when ready, taken by the offerer to the priest, who proceeded in precisely the same manner as has just been stated.⁸

The *minchah* which formed a part of the praise-offering consisted of unleavened cakes mingled with oil, unleavened wafers anointed, and cakes poured over with oil and prepared of fine flour that had been soaked in that fluid; to these three kinds of cake were added loaves of leavened bread to be eaten at the repast which followed the offering: the acting priest received one piece of each of the four cereal oblations.⁹ — The High-priest, on the day of his inauguration, presented both in the morning and in the evening half an omer of fine flour, thoroughly saturated with oil, prepared in a pan, and divided into small pieces, after which it was burnt entirely.¹⁰ — As a first-fruit-offering from the harvest it was ordained to present roasted ears of corn from the choicest fields, upon which oil and frank-incense were put; then the priest took off and burnt “the memorial” with all the incense upon the altar, and kept the rest for his own use.¹¹

These were the principal private *minchahs*. Besides them some were to be presented in the name of the nation.

A regular and permanent oblation of this kind were the twelve unleavened *shew-bread* which, each consisting of two omers of fine flour, and arranged in two equal rows on the Table of the Holy, were renewed every Sabbath, and then eaten by the priests in the sacred place; on each row frank-incense was put in a golden cup to be burnt “as a memorial”, and to typify that the cakes were consecrated to God, to whom the people of Israel submitted their supplication for their daily sustenance and who bountifully grants their prayer.

The firstfruit-sheaf of barley prescribed for Passover was presented with the rite of waving; a part of it was burnt as “a memorial” on the altar; the rest was left for the benefit of the priests. The ceremony, but slightly touched upon in the Pentateuch,¹² is thus described in the Mishnah. After the corn that was to compose the omer had been cut, in the night of the fifteenth of Nisan, with much ceremonial by three persons with three scythes, and put into three baskets, it was taken to the Court of the Temple; the grains were gently beaten out with

⁷ Lev. II. 5, 6, 8—10.

⁸ Lev. I. 7—10.

⁹ Lev. VII. 12—14.

¹⁰ Lev. VI. 12—16.

¹¹ Lev. II. 14—16.

¹² Lev. XXIII. 10, 11.

canes or stalks of plants to prevent their being crushed, thrown into an iron pan perforated at the bottom to allow the fire to pass through everywhere, and then spread on the ground of the Court, so that the wind blew through them; they were next put into a coarse grits'-mill, and ground till one tenth of an ephah of flour, that had passed through 13 sieves, was obtained. Oil, then the flour, and oil again were put into a vessel, mixed, and waved together with frankincense; a handful was taken off by the priest and burnt, and the rest reserved to the sacerdotal order. Such minute and pedantic observances were derived from a few general statements of Scripture, which do not even warrant the grinding of the grains; and indeed Josephus mentions a much simpler mode of procedure.

The two leavened loaves from the new wheat presented on the Feast of Weeks, and consisting of one omer of fine flour each, were also submitted to the rite of waving, like the two lambs at the same time killed as thank-offerings, and then entirely given over to the priests for food; for being leavened, nothing of them could be burnt on the altar. The Mishnah describes the manner as follows: the priest places the two loaves on the two lambs, puts both his hands underneath, and lifts them to and fro, upwards and downwards.

XII. THE DRINK-OFFERING.

IN harmony with the anthropomorphic notions which guided early generations in their religious customs, a complete sacrifice, like a complete meal, was composed of meat, bread, and wine. This practice obtained among the Hebrews also,¹ and it was in the Levitical code consolidated by the law that every animal holocaust and thank-offering, whether private or public, if consisting of a quadruped, was to be accompanied not only by a cereal gift but also by a libation of wine, the quantity of which was, like the flour and the oil of the bloodless oblations, carefully graduated according to the animal which constituted the chief sacrifice; for the measure was in every case identical with that of the oil, the fourth part of a hin being prescribed with each lamb, the third part of a hin with each ram, and half a hin with each bull.² Whether a libation was to be added to the independent cereal offerings also, is not distinctly stated, but it is not improbable, and accords well with the nature of the *minchah*; and the circumstance that the vessels used for libations were ordinarily placed on the golden

¹ See 2 Ki. XVI. 13; Hos. IX. 4; Joel I. 9, 13; II. 14; comp. Gen. XXXV. 14; 1 Chr. XXIX. 21; 2 Chr. XXIX. 35 (the drink-offerings for every burnt-offering).

² Num. XV. 3—11; comp. XXVIII. 7, 9, 14; XXIX. 6, 16, 24; VI. 15, 17, etc.; Exod. XXIX. 40, 41; XXX. 9; Lev. XXIII. 13, 18; Num. VI. 15.

Table,³ seems to justify the conclusion that the shew-bread also was coupled with a drink-offering. In later times, wine and oil were kept, in casks, in the inner Court of the Temple, and the overseer of the drink-offerings was one of the fifteen chief officers of the Sanctuary.

We need hardly remark, that the libation as ordained in the Pentateuch reveals no trace of its pagan origin; it was evidently understood as an additional means of marking the victim as consecrated to God and of hallowing the ceremony; it was retained as essential because wine formed, like cattle and corn, a chief part of Palestine's wealth; and it was, therefore, like the meat and the flour, also termed "a sweet odour to the Lord."⁴ But it is significant that the expiatory sacrifices were, according to the enactments of the Pentateuch, not coupled with drink-offerings,⁵ for reasons probably kindred to those which recommended the omission of cereal accompaniments in the same solemn classes of sacrifice. A libation of wine was also suppressed in burnt-offerings of birds which were generally confined to the poor, and the purification-offering of the leper which involved peculiar and exceptional rites.⁶ In later times, libations of wine could even be offered alone as free-will gifts.

The mode of libation is not described in the Law, but it appears that at least a part of the wine was out of golden vessels poured into the flames, and thus came upon the brazen altar, like the meat and the fat, the flour and the cakes, the oil and the incense, as "food to the Lord" or "an offering made by fire, a sweet odour to the Lord", while the rest was probably either, like the blood, poured at the sides of the brazen altar, and perhaps partly round its base, as is confirmed by statements of later Jewish writers, or at the south-western corner of it, as Rabbinical tradition fixed. In this manner all the wine was disposed of, and the priests who were forbidden to drink any strong beverage when they entered the holy precincts, received no part of it.

Libations of wine very commonly accompanied ancient sacrifices, even if these consisted of human victims. They were, at all periods, offered by the Israelites to the worshipped idols of surrounding tribes. They formed in some instances the chief religious act connected with offerings, as among the Syrians in Hierapolis, who in certain cases simply led the victim before the altar, and there poured the libation upon it, after which it was conducted home, and killed by the offerer with suitable prayers. They were indispensable at the sacrifices of the Greeks and Romans, who put a part of the wine on the head of the

³ Exod. XXV. 29; Num. IV. 7.

⁴ Num. XV. 7.

⁵ Comp. Num. XV. 5; VI. 17.

⁶ Lev. XIV. 10 *sqq.*

victim which was thereby consecrated, or into the flame by which the flesh dedicated to the gods was burnt. But they were also offered by themselves, before the cup was tasted, as a tribute and homage due to the gods; at the commencement of meals, or after their conclusion when the "pledge-cup" was presented to the good Deity, or if the party remained for drinking, in which case three libations were usually poured out, one to the Olympian Zeus and the other celestials, one to the heroes, and the third to Zeus the Saviour and Accomplisher, although the custom varied according to time and place; or as "sleep-libations" before retiring to rest to ask the gods of night, especially Hermes, for propitious dreams; or merely to add solemnity to prayers, and sometimes to impart strength and sanctity to treaties and alliances, whence they occasionally were compounded of wine and blood. They consisted not only of wine, whether pure or mixed with water — the former especially at offerings, the latter at or after meals — but also of honey, oil, or milk, whether pure and individually, or diluted with water, or mixed together. Some deities, solemn and severe, required "sober libations" not comprising wine; others, as the gods of Hades, were honoured with libations of honey currently considered as an emblem of death. Oedipus to propitiate the Eumenides was advised, first to draw water from a perennial spring, to put it into skilfully wrought urns which he was to wreath with the new-shorn wool of a young lamb, and to pour it out as a libation, turning to the rising morn; but then he was to fill another cup "with water and with honey but to add no wine", and to pour it out on the ground, after which, fixing on the spot with both his hands three times nine olive-boughs, he should pronounce a prayer to the goddesses with inaudible voice, and then depart, taking care not to turn back — an instructive ceremony combining many characteristic features of ancient worship.

For water also was deemed acceptable as a libation. The early Greeks used water with their victims, in times of urgency and in default of wine, and sometimes water and milk together with wine. Fire and water were by the Egyptian priests frequently presented to the statues of the gods, because they were considered both by the Egyptians and Persians as the two purest elements; and every day when the temple of Serapis in Alexandria was opened, a singer standing on the steps of the portico, sprinkled water over the marble-floor, while he held forth fire to the people. For it was an axiom extensively held, "the water is the best of all things", or "the water sanctifies"; it was deemed sacred, because "free from putrefaction", and conducive to generation and calm reflection, in fact "to add vigour to the mind and body";

it was believed to possess nutritious and remedial powers, and was therefore chiefly used for libations in cases of danger and illness, or at offerings for the dead, as was the case among the Hindoos, and is still usual among the Dahomans; especially the water of certain rivers, as the Nile and Ganges, was regarded as hallowed and divine, and pre-eminently desirable for all solemn lustrations, for which purposes it was sent in vessels sealed by priests to all parts of the country and even into foreign lands. Now the Hebrews also seem primitively to have employed water for libations. Thus it is related that in the time of Samuel, at a period of distress and misfortune, they assembled in Mizpah, "and drew water and poured it out before the Lord, and fasted on that day",¹ when wine, the great exhilarator, which rejoices God and men, would not have been in harmony with the mournful occasion; and David is stated to have "offered as a libation to the Lord" the water which three of his heroes had procured for him at the peril of their lives.² A later Jewish custom, alleged to be founded on a tradition from Moses, but not acknowledged by the Sadducees, was the solemn ceremony of drawing water from the river Shiloah for the sacrifices of the Feast of Tabernacles, a ceremony carried out with such rejoicings that the saying became proverbial, "whoever has not seen the joy of carrying the water, has never in his life seen joy": the water was poured out at the altar together with the wine, and allowed to flow off through one of the two apertures at the south-western side of the altar. However, the sacrificial system of Leviticus could not sanction libations of water, since it started from the fundamental principle that all offerings must represent the life, the labour, or the wealth of the worshipper.

XIII. THE BURNT-OFFERING.

1. ITS GENERAL CHARACTER.

HOLOCAUSTS form probably the most important kind of primitive offerings; for they involve most strikingly the idea of *sacrifice*, and express most completely the absolute submission to the power of the deity. They were certainly a principal characteristic in the public worship of the Hebrews, nay its very foundation. Their interruption at the common Sanctuary was regarded as a national disaster involving almost the annihilation of the theocracy.³ They sometimes represented the whole class of animal sacrifices.⁴ Killed at the central

¹ 1 Sam. VII. 6.

³ 2 Chr. XXIX. 7; Dan. VIII. 11; XI.

² 2 Sam. XXIII. 16; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII.

³ 1; 1 Macc. IV. 38—59.

⁴ Am. V. 22; Jer. XIV. 12.

Sanctuary, they were designed by the Law to keep alive the feeling of humble dependence on Jehovah, and were used as a chief acknowledgment of His theocratic rule. They marked the habitual tone of the religious life of the nation, for which reason the fire was to be permanently maintained on the brazen altar, both by day and night.¹ They were the most unselfish offerings, "sacrificed for God Himself alone, who ought to be honoured for His own sake and not for that of any other being or thing." Therefore, they were to be presented in the name of the people, regularly and throughout the year, every morning and every evening² as "continual burnt-offerings",³ on every sabbath⁴ and day of the new-moon;⁵ on the three great agricultural festivals,⁶ when the people assembled "to appear before the Lord";⁷ on the Day of Memorial celebrated on the first day of the seventh month,⁸ and on the Day of Atonement.⁹ They were moreover prescribed to individuals on various important occasions — after recovery from leprosy¹⁰ or "a running issue",¹¹ to women after childbirth,¹² and to the Nazarite, when he had been defiled by contact with a corpse,¹³ and when the time of his separation terminated.¹⁴ And they were ordained as a part of ceremonials of consecration — when the Tabernacle or Temple was dedicated,¹⁵ when Aaron and his sons were initiated into the functions of hereditary priesthood,¹⁶ and the Levites were appointed the privileged ministers of the priests;¹⁷ they typified, on such occasions, the Divine authority to which the offices were subjected, and to which the functionaries owed their power as delegates and instruments. But their principal weight lay in applications unconnected with positive precepts of the Law. They were, in a great measure, left to the option of the pious, when anxious to testify in any emergency of life, whether sorrowful or joyous, their reverential allegiance

¹ Lev. VI. 2, 5, 6.

² Exod. XXIX. 38—42; Num. XXVIII. 3—8, 23, 31; XXIX. 11, 16; 2 Ki. XVI. 15.

³ Exod. XXIX. 38, 42; Num. XXVIII. 3, 6, 23, 31; Ezek. XLVI. 15; Ezer. III. 5.

⁴ Num. XXVIII. 9, 10.

⁵ Num. XXVIII. 11—14; XXIX. 6.

⁶ Exod. XXIII. 15; XXXIV. 20; Lev. XXIII. 12, 37; Num. XXVIII. 19, 27; XXIX. 13, 17, 20, etc.; Deut. XVI. 6, 7; 2 Chr. XXXV. 12, 14, 16.

⁷ Exod. XXXIV. 24; Deut. XXXI. 11; comp. Isai. I. 12.

⁸ Num. XXIX. 2.

⁹ Num. XXIX. 8; Lev. XVI. 24. The public burnt-offerings amounted annually to no less than 1244 animals; see the computation in Sect. XX.

¹⁰ Lev. XIV. 19, 22, 31.

¹¹ Lev. XV. 14, 15.

¹² Lev. XII. 6—8.

¹³ Num. VI. 9—11.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* vers. 13, 14.

¹⁵ Num. VII. 15, 21, 27, etc.; Ezra VI. 17; comp. 1 Chr. XXIX. 21, 22; 2 Chr. XXIX. 31, 32.

¹⁶ Exod. XXIX. 18, 25; Lev. VIII. 18; IX. 2, 7, 12, 16.

¹⁷ Num. VIII. 8, 12.

to God's sovereignty;¹⁸ and on national occasions their vast numbers indicated the spontaneous impulse of the heart.¹⁹ Indeed they preponderated so decidedly among the Hebrews that foreign observers and historians described them as their only kind of offerings. Thus particularly calculated to foster the feeling of humility, because not presented after a special trespass, but as a general expression of frailty and sinfulness, they partook of the character of expiatory offerings, and in earlier periods formed their substitute,²⁰ as, on the other hand, even in the time of Ezra, sin-offerings were occasionally burnt as holocausts.²¹ If the whole congregation had unwittingly erred and transgressed a Divine commandment, they were ordered to offer for their expiation both a bullock as a burnt-offering and a goat as a sin-offering.²² Holocausts were professedly designed as an atonement for those who presented them in a proper spirit; and the imposition of the hand had there nearly the same meaning as in sin-offerings;²³ hence the Rabbinical maxim is justified "the burnt-offering expiates the transgressions of Israel"; there is some truth in the paraphrase of Jonathan, who after the command, "the one lamb — for a burnt-offering — thou shalt offer in the morning", adds the explanation, "to atone for the sins of the night", and after the words, "and the second lamb thou shalt offer towards the evening", inserts, "to atone for the sins of the day"; and Abarbanel described them not incorrectly, if vaguely, to aim at "uniting man's intellectual aspirations with God." Their true nature is, perhaps, most clearly discernible in the account that Job, whenever his sons had completed their cycle of feasts, "sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt-offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, 'It may be that my sons have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts.'"²⁴ — It is, therefore, hardly an exaggeration if Philo, Ebn Ezra, and others termed the holocaust the "best" and "highest", the "choicest" or "most exquisite" kind of sacrifice; it was certainly, according to the Pentateuch, to consist of an unblemished *male* animal — whether bullock, ram or goat — which was considered the superior species; and though the Law permitted or prescribed also holocausts of pigeons and turtle-doves of either sex, particularly in order to render them accessible to persons of limited means, the larger quadrupeds were selected in

¹⁸ Judg. XX. 26; 1 Sam. VII. 9; Ps. LXVI. 13—15; 2 Chr. XXXI. 2.

¹⁹ Comp. 2 Sam. VI. 13; 1 Ki. III. 4; VIII. 5; Ezra VI. 17; VIII. 35; 1 Chr. XXIX. 21; 2 Chr. XXIX. 32, 33.

²⁰ Comp. Lev. XVII. 11; see Sect. XV.

²¹ Ezra VIII. 35.

²² Num. XV. 22—26.

²³ Lev. I. 4, comp. XIV. 20; XVI. 24; also Gen. VIII. 21.

²⁴ Job. I. 5; comp. XLII. 8 (offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering).

preference, and slain in unlimited numbers, to prove the offerer's readiness and self-abnegation. In this sense their spiritual character was vindicated by Rabbinical writers, who set forth the canon, "the holocaust is offered only for the cogitations of the heart", and explained that the victims were burnt "to atone for the thoughts that rise in the mind."

2. ITS HISTORY.

As burnt-offerings were probably the most ancient sacrifices, they are, in the Book of Genesis, fitly attributed to some of the earliest patriarchs — to Abel, the first breeder of cattle, anxious to mark his gratitude for the increase of his flocks;¹ to Noah who had been delivered by the special intervention of the Divine power, together with the germs of a new animal creation, over which his descendants were thenceforth to have unlimited dominion;² and to Abraham, when he had received back his son Isaac from the hand of God.³ They are reported, later, in the time of Moses,⁴ when Jethro desired to manifest his reverence for God's greatness shown in the redemption of Israel from Egypt,⁵ when the Hebrews solemnly received the "Book of the Covenant",⁶ when they recklessly inaugurated the worship of the golden calf,⁷ and when Aaron and his sons were consecrated for their holy offices;⁸ in the time of Joshua, when this general engraved the precepts of the Law on Mount Ebal;⁹ in the epoch of the Judges, when Gideon destroyed the altar of Baal to secure the worship of God alone;¹⁰ during the leadership of Samuel, when the Ark of the Covenant was conveyed from the Philistine territory to Beth-shemesh,¹¹ when a war with the Philistines was imminent,¹² and when Saul was anointed as king;¹³ in all periods of the Hebrew monarchy,¹⁴ and at its restoration after the exile.¹⁵ Most of the events just alluded to clearly imply the characteristic ideas of holocausts — the humble and contrite acknowledgment of the Divine sovereignty: but as an occurrence may at the same time mark the successful attainment of some desired end, holocausts were not unfrequently coupled with joy-offerings;¹⁶ and as the general confession of sinfulness may be qualified

¹ Gen. IV. 4.

² Gen. VIII. 20; comp. IX. 2, 3.

³ Gen. XXII. 13; comp. vers. 2, 3,
7, 8.

⁴ Comp. Exod. X. 25.

⁵ Exod. XVIII. 12.

⁶ Exod. XXIV. 5.

⁷ Exod. XXXII. 6.

⁸ Exod. XXIX. 16—18; comp. Num.
XXIII. 1—3, 14, 15, 29, 30.

⁹ Josh. VIII. 31; comp. XXII. 23.

¹⁰ Judg. VI. 26; comp. XI. 31; XIII. 16.

¹¹ 1 Sam. VI. 14, 15.

¹² 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10; XIII. 9.

¹³ 1 Sam. X. 8.

¹⁴ Comp. 2 Sam. VI. 17, 18; XXIV.
25; 1 Ki. III. 4; VIII. 64; IX. 25; 2 Ki.
V. 17; X. 24.

¹⁵ Ezr. III. 2, 3.

¹⁶ Comp. Exod. X. 25; XVIII. 12;
XXIV. 5; XXXII. 6; Num. X. 10; Deut.

by an anxiety of expiating a particular trespass, holocausts were often combined with sin-offerings.¹⁷

Yet the notion of internal atonement was a growth of a later time; it formed a distinctive feature of the theology of the Pentateuch, and was developed gradually, in the course of centuries, and after many struggles and fluctuations.¹⁸ We are, therefore, compelled to suppose that the expiatory character which the burnt-offerings manifestly bear in the Levitical law, was stamped upon them by the subsequent compilers of this code, and was then superadded to their original meaning as offerings of awe and propitiation, a meaning which they had long shared with the sacrifices of other religious systems of antiquity.

3. THE MODE OF SACRIFICING.

1. If the holocaust was a bullock, a sheep, or a goat, the offerer, after the usual preparation, took the animal to the Court of the Sanctuary before the brazen altar, and there placed his right hand on its head, after which he killed it at the northern side of the altar. A priest received the blood, and another sprinkled it round the sides of the altar,¹⁹ while a third, or a Levite who assisted at the menial duties of the service, flayed the victim and reserved the hide as a perquisite of the priest "who offered up the burnt-offering", that is, who sprinkled the blood.²⁰ The same minister cut the animal "into its pieces" or its natural limbs, carefully washed the bowels and legs with water, and salted all pieces. Priests then placed wood on the fire which was perpetually kept on the altar of burnt-offerings, laid upon the wood the head, the bowels, and the legs, together with the other parts and the fat that had been taken out of the flesh and the entrails, so that the entire animal, except the skin, was consumed on the altar as "a sweet odour to the Lord",²¹ of course accompanied by the legally prescribed cereal and drink-offerings.²² It is of the nature of the *holocaust* to suppose that, primitively, the hide also was delivered up to the flames, as was done with some kinds of sin-offering; but the latter were burnt without the camp, the holocausts on the altar; and as the

XXVII. 7; Josh. VIII. 31; Judg. XX. 26; XXXI. 4; 1 Sam. X. 8; XIII. 9; 2 Sam. VI. 17, 18; XXIV. 25; 1 Ki. III. 15; IX. 25; 1 Chr. XVI. 1, 2; 2 Chr. VII. 1; XXXI. 2; Ps. LI. 18, 21; LXVI. 13—15; Isai. LVI. 7; 1 Macc. IV. 56.

¹⁷ Lev. V. 7; VIII. 14, 18; IX. 3; Num. VI. 11, 14; XXVIII. 11, 15, 19, 22, 27, 30, etc.

¹⁸ See Sect. XV.

¹⁹ Lev. I. 5. 11; VIII. 19; IX. 12; Ex. XXIX. 16; comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 15.

²⁰ Lev. I. 6; VII. 8; comp. vers. 7, 14, 33.

²¹ See Lev. I. 3—9; VIII. 18—21; IX. 12—14; Exod. XXIX. 15—18; and the explanation of the ceremonies in Sect. X.

²² Sect. XI. XII.

smell thus caused within the hallowed precincts must have been too offensive to admit even figuratively of the designation of "sweet odour", the hide was subsequently excepted from the general destruction, but was indirectly dedicated to God through His representatives, the priests.

When the holocaust was a turtle-dove or a pigeon, the following ceremonies, exclusively performed by the priest, were observed: the priest brought it to the altar, wrung off its head, and in doing so pressed out the blood on the side of the altar. He then salted the head and put it on the altar into the flames. Next removing the crop with its excrements and casting it on the eastern side of the altar, to the place of the ashes, he cleft the wings with his hand, without, however, breaking them off, and then burnt on the altar what remained of the bird.

XIV. THE THANK-OFFERING.

1. ITS GENERAL CHARACTER AND HISTORY.

SACRIFICES intended as an acknowledgment for some temporal boon, were naturally associated with elements of joy and homeliness excluded from the severer classes of offering; the solemnity was tempered by cheerfulness; the diviner aspirations were mingled with human feelings and cravings. God, the Master and Judge, was merged in God, the Benefactor and Rescuer. The holocaust and the sin-offering represented the life and person of the worshipper; the thank-offering was pre-eminently his gift or a part of his property; the former typified self-sacrifice, the latter grateful reciprocity of benefits; the former were prompted by a feeling of disturbed harmony with God, the latter was presented in a state of virtual union with Him. Hence the *shelamim* may well be explained as *safety-offerings*; for they were connected with wants deemed essential to happiness and a secure existence.

It cannot, therefore, be difficult to understand and account for the peculiar regulations fixed by the Law with respect to thank-offerings. The victims, whether of the herd or the flock, were not required to be males; female animals were equally acceptable.¹ The bloodless oblation added to the thank-offering, consisted, in some cases, not only of unleavened cakes and wafers, but also of leavened bread, to remind the Israelite of his ordinary life and subsistence.² Not the whole animal was burnt, but some special parts only were delivered to the Deity as

¹ Comp. Lev. III. 1, 6, 12; IX. 4, 18; XXII. 21; XXIII. 19; Num. VI. 14; XV. 5; 1 Ki. VIII. 63; see p. 70.

² Lev. VII. 13; comp. Am. IV. 5; Num. VI. 15; see p. 96; compare also the notes on Lev. VII. 11—21.

“an offering made by fire, a sweet odour to the Lord”;³ two choice portions, the breast and the right shoulder, were reserved for the priests, who ate them with their wives, their children, and their servants, within the precincts of the Sanctuary, while the rest was consumed in convivial feasts, in any part of the sacred town, by the offerer himself with his family and household, together with the Levite, the poor, and the stranger, his invited guests.⁴ This social element connected with the *shelamim* strengthens the conclusion derived from internal reasons that this class of sacrifice, at least in its Levitical development, is of much later origin than the holocausts; for it pre-supposes a degree of legal and political organisation considerably in advance of primitive existence. Now let it be observed that all the fat, together with the members and organs to which it is chiefly attached, as the kidneys and the fat tail of certain kinds of sheep,⁵ was burnt to God on the altar; and let it be considered that the *minchah* which belonged to the thank-offering, was in an unusual degree prepared with oil; for not only were the cakes and wafers mingled and anointed, but the flour itself of which they were made, was sometimes saturated with it: therefore *fatness*, typical of abundance and prosperity, of joy and gratitude, appears to be the leading characteristic of thank-offerings.⁶ It is hence obvious, that they did not, as has often been contended, form a mere accessory to holocausts supposed to have invariably preceded; they emanated from a frame of mind so peculiar, so important, and so beneficial for religious education that they could well be prescribed in the Law independently of any other class of sacrifice. Holocausts were indeed frequently accompanied by thank-offerings; but this combination originated in the nature of the former rather than of the latter kind; for as holocausts flowed from a general feeling of dependence and moral deficiency, and as their oblation by private individuals was not tied to fixed times, they were often delayed till a peculiar event of a joyful nature reminded the Israelite, to his humiliation, both of God’s goodness and his own unworthiness; and then he joined a holocaust to his thank-offering. The combination of both was indeed singularly appropriate; though according to its character, either of them was fitly offered alone and at different seasons.

Again, it is true that the thank-offering also possessed atoning power; its ritual with regard to the sprinkling of blood, quite generally described as an atonement of the soul,⁷ was exactly identical with

³ Lev. III. 5, 11, 16.

⁴ See Sect. X. 14.

⁵ Lev. II. 3—5, 9—11, 14—16; comp.

IV. 26; VI. 5; 1 Ki. VIII. 64.

⁶ See pp. 92, 93. ⁷ Lev. XVII. 11.

those ordained for holocausts.¹ But the sprinkling formed the kernel and centre of the animal thank-offering only in so far as it marked the slaughtered beast as a *victim*; it characterised the category in general, but was not the specific peculiarity of the individual class, which consisted in the burning of the fat parts and in the common meals which followed the sacrifice. The thank-offering expiated because, prompted as it was by gratitude for mercies and blessings received, it naturally called forth in the pious mind not only the feeling of submission but also of defects and shortcomings, and therefore spontaneously invited to purification, moral improvement, and to earnest efforts for effecting a closer approach to God's holiness. But these were the *effects* of the thank-offering rather than its primary *object*: it originated in a state of inward peace, or from a supposed union with God: but the self-examination occasioned by the offering, necessarily proved that that union was capable of a higher intensity and power.⁴ As eucharistic offerings were presented in gladness of heart and out of the abundance of man's property, they never consisted of vegetable oblations alone or of birds, as pigeons and turtle-doves, the less so as these would not have sufficed for the altar, the priests, and the convivial meals which formed so essential a part of the sacrifice. A legal command was not given on the subject; it was hardly required considering the strongly marked nature of the eucharistic sacrifice.

Now the thank-offerings, originally forming one great class, were by the Levitical code divided into two separate kinds² — those that were obligatory and prescribed by the Law, as the two lambs offered on the Feast of Weeks,³ and the ram presented by the Nazarite at the end of his term of seclusion,⁴ and those that were presented in consequence of a vow or as a voluntary gift.⁵ In the former case, they received in the Levitical legislation the distinctive name of *praise-offering*. They were naturally regarded as more solemn, and therefore surrounded with more stringent regulations. For it appears that at first the time for the repasts connected with thank-offerings, was the day of the sacrifice and the next following, so that what remained on the third day was to be burnt.⁶ But after the adoption of the sub-division it was deemed desirable to distinguish the praise-offerings by more rigid observances, and to restrict the time of their consumption to the very day of the sacrifice, including, however, the succeeding night up to the next morning;⁷ while the primitive arrangement was retained with regard to the thank-

¹ See Sect. X. 7; comp. Lev. VII. 14, 33. XXIII. 38; Num. XV. 3, 8; XXIX. 39;

² Comp. p. 32. Deut. XII. 6, 17. ⁶ Lev. XIX. 5—8.

³ Lev. XXIII. 19. ⁴ Num. VI. 14. ⁷ Lev. VII. 15; VIII. 32; XXII. 29,

⁵ Comp. Lev. VII. 12, 16; XXII. 21; 30; Exod. XXIX. 34.

offerings presented as vows or voluntary gifts.⁸ Again, the praise-offering was accompanied by an extraordinary bloodless oblation not demanded with the voluntary or vowed sacrifice.⁹ Besides, there was this gradation fixed between a thank-offering as a vow and as a free-will gift that, in the former case, the animal was required to be absolutely perfect; while, in the latter, it was accepted even if its members were either abnormally long or short.¹⁰

The motives of the Law in limiting the time for the consumption of the sacrificial flesh, do not seem so uncertain or so recondite as has often been represented. The flesh of an animal piously slaughtered before God, was to be clearly distinguished from ordinary meat; the repast was, therefore, not to be separated from the act of sacrificing by an interval so long as to efface the connection between the one and the other, and what remained beyond the second day was fitly removed by fire, though of course, as it had ceased to bear any relation whatever to the sacrifice or its rites, not by the fire of the altar. The legislator insisted upon this point with almost surprising rigour, "If any of the flesh of the thank-offering be eaten at all on the third day, it shall not be accepted; nor shall it be imputed to him that offers it; it shall be an abomination, and the soul that eats of it shall bear its iniquity"—¹¹ a rigour prompted by the anxious zeal of maintaining the sacred character of everything appertaining to the sacrifice. These conclusions are confirmed by some other precepts. If the flesh by chance came into contact with any unclean thing, it was to be burnt. Clean persons only were allowed to eat of it; but if any one partook of it who was in a state of impurity, whether this lay in his person or was occasioned by touching impure objects, the Law declared "that person shall be cut off from among his people",¹² because "he has profaned the holiness of the Lord."¹³

This is the character of the *shelumim* as it appears in the laws of the Pentateuch; but in early times they seem to have been offered also when blessings were not thanked but prayed for;¹⁴ and during long periods, they were, besides, employed for the ratification of solemn covenants, treaties, and alliances,¹⁵ for which purpose, according to eastern notions and customs, the common meals which followed rendered them peculiarly appropriate.¹⁶

⁸ Lev. VII. 16, 17.

⁹ Comp. Lev. VII. 11—13.

¹⁰ Lev. XXII. 23; see p. 69.

¹¹ Lev. VII. 18.

¹² Lev. VII. 19—21.

¹³ Comp. also Lev. XIX. 8. See in general notes on VII. 11—21.

¹⁴ 1 Sam. XIII. 9; 2 Sam. XXIV. 25.

¹⁵ Comp. Judg. XX. 26; XXI. 4; see also Exod. XXIV. 5. ¹⁶ Comp. p. 29.

2. THE MODE OF SACRIFICING.

The first ceremonies — the imposition of the hand, the slaughtering, the receiving and sprinkling of the blood — were precisely identical with those observed at holocausts of quadrupeds:¹ but then the offerer presented to the officiating priest all the fat and the fat parts — namely the fat that is on and round the bowels, the two kidneys with the fat that is upon them by the flanks, together with the great lobe of the liver to be taken off by the kidneys; and if the victim was a sheep of that peculiar species termed “long-tailed”, he added to them its fat tail;² he was not permitted to send them or to order them to be fetched, but had to take them himself to the altar “with his own hands”,³ that they might visibly appear as his personal and ready free-will gift offered with a grateful heart; he then handed over the breast and the right shoulder to the priest who “waved” the former and “heaved” the latter,⁴ after which he burnt all the fat and fat parts as a fire-offering to God on the altar. Now, if the thank-offering were presented in the name of the whole people, the priests received all that remained after the burning of the fat; but if presented by a private individual, they claimed as their portions the right shoulder and the breast, the former to be assigned to the officiating functionary, the latter to be reserved for all Aaronites in common; while the rest was allowed to the offering Israelite to be eaten by him and his guests on the same or the following day.⁵

XV. THE SIN-OFFERING AND THE TRESPASS-OFFERING.

THE consciousness of moral frailty, the most unfailing source of truly religious impulses and the surest indication of an ideal yearning after moral improvement, strongly pervaded the character of the Hebrews. “There is not a righteous man upon earth that does good and sins not”,⁶ is a sentiment which recurs in the most varied shades and modifications.⁷ A sufferer overwhelmed by anguish, breaks forth in the desponding cry, “O Lord, rebuke me not in Thy wrath, nor chasten me in Thy hot displeasure... There is no rest in my bones on account of my sin; for my iniquities have passed over my head; as a heavy weight they are too burdensome for me.”⁸ One of Job’s friends knows no stronger reason for patient endurance under trial and distress than

¹ See p. 161.

² Lev. III. 3, 4; comp. IV. 8, 9; see notes on Chapt. III, and Comm. on Exod. p. 421.

³ Lev. VII. 30.

⁴ See Sect. X. 11, 12.

⁵ See Sect. X. 14; comp. in general

Lev. III. 1—16; VII. 30—34; and on the *minchah* which accompanied the praise-offering, Sect. XI. 2.

⁶ Eccl. VII. 20.

⁷ Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 46; 2 Chr. VI. 36.

⁸ Ps. XXXVIII. 1, 3, 4.

the general truth, "How can man be justified with God, or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold, even the moon shines not and the stars are not pure in His eyes: how much less man, the worm, and the son of man, the maggot."⁹ The humble feeling of sinfulness cannot be felt more deeply, nor expressed more earnestly. It traces spontaneously suffering to trespass. "Innumerable evils", exclaims the Psalmist, "encompass me; my iniquities take hold of me, and I cannot survey them; they are more abundant than the hairs of my head, and my heart fails me."¹⁰ It longs after deliverance from its own oppressive torments, "Have mercy upon me, o God", prays an unhappy sinner, "according to Thy lovingkindness; according to the multitude of Thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions; wash me thoroughly from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin."¹¹ It is irresistibly prompted to frank and lowly confession, "I acknowledge my sin to Thee, and I hide not my iniquity; I say, I will confess my transgression to the Lord."¹² It finds the most soothing relief, the sole rescue from moral despair, the only safeguard against hardened recklessness, in the hope of Divine pardon and atonement, which are accorded as the result or reward of internal regeneration: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered, and blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputes not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile."¹³ And it finally recognises as the most acceptable offering which God never rejects, "a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart."¹⁴ — Simultaneously with these noble notions, the Hebrews developed the conception of the merciful attributes of God, who, though unable to efface the evil deed, can "pass over" it,¹⁵ remember it no more, and blot it out,¹⁶ or annul its direful effects upon the mind and the fate of the offender; and who is slow to wrath and willing to pardon, "The Eternal is merciful and gracious, longsuffering and abundant in goodness and truth; keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin."¹⁷ They commonly accepted the doctrine, "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return to the Lord, and He will have mercy upon him; and to our God,

⁹ Job XXV. 4—6; comp. IV. 17—19; comp. also Gen. XXXII. 11; 2 Sam. VII. 18.

¹⁰ Ps. XL. 13.

¹¹ Ps. LI. 3, 4; comp. XIX. 13.

¹² Ps. XXXII. 5; comp. XXXVIII. 19; LI. 5. ¹³ Ps. XXXII. 1, 2. ¹⁴ Ps. LI. 19.

¹⁵ 2 Sam. XII. 13; XXIV. 10; Mic. VII. 18; comp. Ps. LI. 11.

¹⁶ Jer. XVIII. 23; XXXI. 34; Isai.

XLIII. 25; XLIV. 22; Ezek. XVIII. 22; XXXIII. 16; comp. Isai. XXXVIII. 17; Jer. L. 20; Mic. VII. 19; Ps. LXXXV. 3.

¹⁷ Exod. XXXIV. 6, 7; comp. XXXIII. 19; Num. XIV. 18—20; Deut. XXX. 1—3; 1 Sam. XII. 19; Isai. LVIII. 15, 16; Joel III. 13; Jonah IV. 2; Ps. LXXXVI. 15, 16; Ch. 8; CXI. 4; CXLV. 8; 2 Chr. XXX. 9; Neh. IX. 17, 31.

for He pardons abundantly":¹ in harmony with which view a later Jewish writer justly observed, "The most precious benefit attending the expiatory offerings is this that the sinner becomes aware and is sure in his mind, that his transgressions have been remitted; for if he were not persuaded of God's readiness to pardon him, he would despair of mercy, and add iniquity to transgression."

But long periods of religious education are required to arrive at similar ideas and convictions. The sense of awe, of dependence, and of gratitude in relation to an all-powerful, all-wise, and all-loving Ruler of the World, precedes by long epochs the dawning notion that purity of the heart is, in a great measure, the source of our happiness, that it is certainly the end of all religious life, and the indispensable condition of peace and serenity and every true blessing. At first, no doubt, the belief prevailed that sin demanded the death of the sinner. "David said to Nathan, I have sinned to the Lord: and Nathan said to David, Indeed the Lord has passed over thy sin, thou shalt not die."² "Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? says the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live?"³ Next the notion was entertained that the sinner's life might be saved if another life was surrendered in its stead, whether that of a human being⁴ or of an animal.⁵ Thus the doctrine of substitution or vicarious suffering gained ground; and after the lapse of new and long intervals, the death of the victim came to be regarded as a symbol of atonement wrought by repentance and inward reform. Therefore the Book of Genesis thoughtfully refrains from introducing sin-offerings; it seems justly to regard them as bespeaking a stage decidedly in advance of patriarchal simplicity; and it employs, in their place, the burnt-offerings, which indeed involve the general notions of unworthiness and expiation, but more distinctly convey the homage due to the Divine sovereignty, and hence express not so much an internal as an external relation between God and man. Thus a grand sin-offering would have been most appropriate when Noah had been saved from the universal destruction caused by the wickedness of the human race; but he is described as having presented a magnificent holocaust.⁶ The compilers and revisors of the Pentateuch were evidently guided by the principle that an intimate and direct communion between the Israelites and Jehovah was justified or even possible only after the nation had been elected and appointed as

¹ Isai. LV. 7; comp. Mic. VII. 19;
2 Chr. XXX. 8.

² 2 Sam. XII. 13; comp. 1 Sam. XII. 19.

³ Ezek. XVIII. 23; comp. 30, 31;
XXXIII. 10 *sqq.*

⁴ Mic. VI. 7; 2 Sam. XII. 14; comp.
XXI. 9.

⁵ Gen. XXII. 12, 13; see, in general,
Sect. XVIII.

⁶ Gen. VIII. 20.

“a kingdom of priests and a holy people”;⁷ when the demand had been proclaimed, “You shall be holy, for I am holy”;⁸ when a mutual covenant had been concluded on the basis of a special revelation; when, therefore, the trespasses of the individual, though they could not destroy, were considered to defile the sacredness of the community.

As the Hebrew sin-offerings were based upon the consciousness of human weakness and corruption, they were, as a rule, admitted only in cases of *inadvertent* and *unintentional* transgression,⁹ but were not accepted for reckless and wanton impiety manifesting itself in deeds of wicked defiance;¹⁰ concerning any one guilty of such iniquity the Law ordained, “he shall be cut off from among his people; he has despised the word of the Lord and broken His commandment; his iniquity shall be upon him.”¹¹ David was not permitted after his deliberate crime against Uriah, to present a sin-offering, but he was to expiate his guilt by Divine punishment. The knowledge that “the cogitation of man’s heart is evil from his youth”¹² was to afford no pretext for leniency to premeditated malice, but was, on the contrary, to stimulate to enhanced vigilance and self-control. Divine forgiveness should be granted to the imperfection, but not to the perversion of human nature. The precepts of the Law being the emanation of Divine wisdom, they bore the stamp of holiness; they could not, without offence to their all-wise Author, be violated under any circumstances or in any manner whatever; they required, therefore, atonement even if transgressed involuntarily, unconsciously, and accidentally: their absolute sanctity marked every trespass as a deplorable guilt to be expiated by a sacrifice of self-humiliation. It may be for this reason that the term “to his” or “to your acceptance before the Lord”, which occurs so frequently with respect to other offerings,¹³ is never employed in reference to expiatory sacrifices; these were prompted by occasions which could not be pleasing in the eyes of God; for though He delights in true repentance, He must look upon its necessity with mingled feelings of grief and pity. Hence the sin-offering, if an animal, was unaccompanied by a *minchah* and a libation of wine,¹⁴ and if a cereal oblation, it was presented without oil and frank-incense;¹⁵ in the former

⁷ Exod. XIX. 5, 6.

⁸ Lev. XI. 44; XX. 26; Deut. VII. 6.

⁹ Num. XV. 22—26; see notes on Lev. IV. 1, 2. ¹⁰ Num. XV. 27—29.

¹¹ Num. XV. 30, 31; comp. Hebr. X. 26, “for if we sin wilfully, after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remains no more sacrifice for sins.”

¹² Gen. VIII. 21; comp. VI. 5.

¹³ Lev. I. 3, 4; XIX. 5; XXII. 19, 20, 21, 29; XXIII. 11; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38; Lev. VII. 18; XIX. 7; XXII. 27; Isai. LVI. 7; LX. 7; Ezek. XX. 41; Am. V. 22; Mal. I. 10, 13.

¹⁴ Comp. Num. XV. 1—13; 27—29; XXVIII. 15, 22; XXIX. 16, 19, 22, etc.;

¹⁵ Lev. V. 11; Num. V. 15.

case, it was evidently to be deprived of the character of social and domestic enjoyment, since it was "no food of the Lord"; and in the latter, it was not to recall the ideas of cheerfulness and festive serenity, of abundance and ornament, of spiritual enlightenment and elevation, wherefore it is not designated as "a sweet odour to the Lord": the flesh of those animal sin-offerings whose blood did not come into the Holy, was indeed eaten by the male Aaronites,¹ but the repast was serious and severe, devoid of genial conviviality, and forming a part of the ritual of expiation. From all this it is manifestly erroneous to contend that the commands with respect to sin-offerings apply only to transgressions of the ceremonial law or to "theocratic sins", but not "to moral offences in a stricter sense": are not fraud, abuse of trust, theft, perjury, and the like, for which expiatory offerings were ordained,² "moral offences in a stricter sense"? and do the words which almost uniformly introduce the precepts concerning sin-offerings, "if a person sin in one of all the commandments of the Lord, which ought not to be done, and he does one of them",³ do these words not imply the moral injunctions which form so important a part of the Pentateuch, and constitute the second half of the Decalogue? The opinion that the word "Law" is identical with "ritual law", is an assertion unsupported by the usage of the language, and repudiated by the spirit of the Pentateuch, which code alone, not the life of the Hebrew people as mirrored in their history, can in this question be considered. It is true that any direct opposition to God, as the king of the holy community, or to any of the fundamental institutions of the theocracy, was regarded as a most heinous crime, as high treason and impious revolt; but such disobedience was so viewed only because it implied a contempt and rejection of the whole religious and moral edifice deemed essential for the virtue and happiness of the Israelites. It must, on the contrary, be maintained that sin-offerings were expected to be presented for all the multifarious moral aberrations to which man is liable, and not only if these consisted in actual deeds, but if they were merely sinful thoughts and feelings: for as every unintentional sin required a sacrifice, and as evil intentions and designs were so clearly regarded as reproachful that even the Decalogue prohibited them, they demanded undoubtedly the atonement of expiatory offerings.⁴ It is equally manifest that the sacrifices did not aim at an external purification only, much less at "a conciliation with the offended Deity by means of a present": opinions which betray nothing less than an utter misconception of the spirit of the sacrificial

¹ Lev. VI. 19, 22, 23.

² Lev. V. 21, 22.

³ Lev. IV. 2, 13, 22, 27; V. 17; etc.

⁴ Comp. Ps. LXXIII.

laws; for what, for instance, did the symbolical act, performed at the rite of initiation, of sprinkling with the blood of the sin-offering an ear, a hand, and a foot of the High-priest and the priests, signify, if it was not intended as an allegorical exhortation to piety of heart and conduct?⁵ Those objectionable views seem to be advanced and defended chiefly in order to establish a more striking contrast between the theocracy of Israel and the creed of the New Testament. But the two systems do not involve such a contrast on the subject. The great principle itself — the atoning power of the sacrifice — is identical in both; the distinction consists mainly in the nature of the victim and in the extent and degree of its efficacy; and that distinction does not concern the vital point of the notion: sacrifice is, in the New Testament, not rejected, but differently interpreted.⁶ The sin-offerings were intended not to appease God but to “cover” or remove the sin itself, although naturally the satisfaction and favour of God were hoped for and expected from the expiation of the offence: in harmony with which views the Talmudical maxim was propounded, “Sin-offerings and trespass-offerings have no efficacy unless they are prompted by penitence of the heart.” Expiatory offerings were frequently, if they were not regularly, accompanied by a confession of the sins for which they were designed as an atonement;⁷ they were therefore meant to release the heart from the burden of guilt by which it felt itself oppressed, and which it hoped to conquer not by concealment but by ingenuous and humble avowal; and they were hence aptly termed “a reminder” of trespasses rather than their oblivion or annihilation. Sin was not to be pardoned without an earnest effort and an active co-operation on the part of the sinner himself; it was not to be rendered innocuous without an inward and external act of repentance. This is clearly the doctrine of the Old Testament. But, on the other hand, the atonement was a gracious gift of God granted by His love and paternal compassion; while therefore holocausts and thank-offerings, if spontaneously presented, might consist of several animals, one victim only was prescribed for any expiatory sacrifice; in the former case, the offering of man or his self-abnegation, in the latter, the mercy of God and the atonement wrought by the blood, predominated; there the oblation itself, here its symbolical effect was chiefly considered.

Moreover, any one who had fraudulently or unlawfully appropriated foreign property, whether it belonged to the Sanctuary and its ministers

⁵ Comp. Lev. VIII. 15, 23, 24, 30, and notes in locc.; see also XIV. 13—18, 25—29.

⁶ Comp. pp. 46, 47, 118; Sect. XIX.

⁷ Lev. V. 5; XII. 21; Num. V. 7; Ps. XXXII. 5.

or to private individuals, was obliged, upon confessing his misdeed, to restore his unrighteous gain increased by one fifth of its value; and then only, after having "shown the sincerity of his repentance not by declarations but by works, taking with him no contemptible intercessor, namely, that conviction of the soul which has delivered him from his incurable misfortune, healed him of the deadly disease, and entirely changed it into good health", then only was he permitted to present a ram as a trespass-offering: he had thus to obtain the pardon both of his wronged fellow-man and of God; and so invariably was this law enforced, that if the defrauded person was no longer alive at the time of the offender's confession, and left no legal heir, the amount itself together with the addition was to be made over to the priests, the representatives of God.¹ Thus the spirit of the ordinance disclaims the supposition that the increase of one fifth was a kind of interest due to the owner for the temporary loss of his property; but much more objectionable is the view that the sin-offerings in general, as enjoined in the Pentateuch, were devised as a civil or criminal punishment, or as a pecuniary fine calculated to deter the sinner from future neglect, since even inadvertent contamination, illness, and similar mischances never happen to the pious, but to the wicked only who deserve to be taxed with the penalty — an application of the principle which alone suffices to disclose the absurdity of the principle itself. The end of the sin-offering could not be a remission of *punishment* involving the satisfaction of God's justice as avenging Judge: for, from a religious point of view, such punishment was utterly out of the question in connection with unintentional offences, for which alone expiatory sacrifices were prescribed. The term "he or they shall be forgiven" sometimes employed with reference to them,² implies properly that the intimate relation between God and the Israelite which had been temporarily disturbed by an involuntary sin, was restored by the sacrifice. The expiatory offerings had no political or social but a purely personal and religious character; they were not presented to Jehovah as the Ruler of Israel, but as the Searcher of hearts; they were indeed the oblations of theocratic citizens bound to give an account to their invisible King of their most secret thoughts; but this resulted necessarily from the theocratic organisation of the commonwealth. Hence even crimes which could not be traced to their perpetrators, were to be expiated by confession, sacrifice, and prayer.³ — The solemnity in the mode of expiation was varied in accordance with the position occupied by the

¹ See Lev. V. 15—26; Num. V. 6—8;

² Lev. IV. 20, 26, 31, 35; V. 10, 13,

comp. Lev. XXII. 14—16; see notes on

16, 18, 26; XIX. 22; Num. XV. 25—28.

Lev. V. 14—16.

³ Deut. XXI. 1—9; see *infra*.

offender in the theocratic community; for it was more significant in transgressions of the High-priest or the whole people of Israel than in those of a chief, and it was more significant in transgressions of a chief than of a common Israelite. And on one day in every year, on the Day of Atonement, Israel was purified as a united body, as the holy nation and the kingdom of priests; and the expiation did not concern special offences, but the human weakness in general which cannot be admitted into a communion of God except by an act of grace and mercy.⁴

Hence the sin-offerings were naturally placed in the class of "most holy" sacrifices;⁵ they were to be scrupulously shielded from every, even the slightest profanation; if any of their blood had fallen upon a garment, the latter was to be washed in the holy place, in the Court of the Sanctuary; their flesh could be touched by holy persons or priests only; it was burnt entirely whenever the blood had been sprinkled on the vail and put upon the horns of the altar of incense in the Holy;⁶ it was eaten, with the exception of the fat and the fat parts, by the male Aaronites in the holy place, whenever the blood had been put upon the horns, and poured out at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering in the Court,⁷ and then symbolised that the priests were appointed "to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord",⁸ and that the expiation, which had been prepared and commenced by the sprinkling of the blood, was now accomplished by a last and crowning act of God's holy ministers; if the flesh was boiled in an earthen vessel, the latter was to be broken, if in a brazen vessel, it was to be carefully scoured and rinsed with water.⁹ For the blood of sin-offerings was brought into the Holy or Holy of Holies only in cases of atonement of the High-priest himself or of the whole people which was represented by him; therefore the officiating High-priest, who was as much the offender as the mediator, could not eat the flesh, which could neither be permitted to a priest of a lower grade. But the blood came upon the altar in the Court in cases where priests acted as intercessors for chiefs or private Israelites, when therefore the priests were not concerned in the sins to be expiated, and then they could be allowed to consume the victim. In the former instances, the flesh was burnt, not because it was unclean, but because there was no one to whom it could rationally and lawfully be assigned; while in the latter instances, it could be eaten by the priests, because

⁴ Lev. XVI. 16, 30; see *infra* and Comm. in loc.

⁵ Comp. p. 45.

⁶ Lev. IV. 5—12, 16—21; XVI. 27; comp. Hebr. XIII. 10—13.

⁷ Lev. VI. 19, 22, 23; VII. 6.

⁸ Lev. X. 17; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 35.

⁹ Comp. Lev. VI. 18, 20—22; see Comm. in locc.

the victim, not laden with the sins, but having taken upon itself the punishment of the suppliant, was almost like the priest himself a sacred mediator between God and the worshipper, and a restorer of peace and purity, and the eating of its flesh on the part of the priests was a symbolical act, not belonging to the sacerdotal *privileges*, like the eating of the flesh of thank-offerings, but to the sacerdotal *functions*, which demanded them to consume a part of the sacrifice as the intercessors between God and the worshipper. But in no case was the flesh of sin-offerings, like that of holocausts, burnt entirely *on the altar*; it was no "food of the Lord", but served merely to implore His forgiveness and to avert His displeasure; it was designed to *remove* the offerer's guilt, as the victim bore his punishment; the fat only and the fat parts, the portions of God's sacrifice that belonged to Him as a due tribute, were there consumed; the rest of the animal was burnt without the camp, which represented the holy community of Israel, "in a clean place."¹

The importance of the blood, properly typifying the life of the animal, and especially possessing the power of atonement, is self-evident in connection with these rites: more directly than any other victims, those killed as sin-offerings were considered to die as substitutes for the offerers; and therefore the ceremony of sprinkling the blood was in sin-offerings pre-eminently significant; it was varied according to the peculiar character of the occasions; it was even in the least solemn sin-offerings more significant than in the noblest burnt-offerings; for though the blood of a sin-offering presented for a chief or a common Israelite was put on the brazen altar in the Court, it was not, as was the case with all holocausts, sprinkled on the altar "round about", but put on the horns of it;² but if the sin-offering was slain in the name of the people of Israel or of the High-priest, the blood was put, not on the brazen, but on the golden altar of frank-incense in the Holy itself, and more properly on its horns, while a part was sprinkled seven times on the vail at the western side of the Holy,³ evidently pointing, though indirectly and distantly, to the mercy-seat in the Holy of Holies, which was the proper source of expiation; and on that most sacred implement the blood was indeed sprinkled, likewise in sevenfold repetition, at the most awful ritual of the whole year, on the Day of Atonement, when the High-priest entered the Holy of Holies to seek forgiveness for his own sins and those of the people.⁴ These ceremonies intelligibly and pointedly indicate the various degrees of sanctity existing in the relation between God and the whole people or its different elements and

¹ See pp. 140, 141.

² Lev. IV. 25, 30, 34.

³ Lev. IV. 6, 7, 16, 17.

⁴ See *infra*; comp. pp. 94, 95.

sections. The burnt-offerings also, as indeed all sacrifices, possessed in a certain sense expiatory power, and they were during many generations so employed;⁵ but they bore that character neither in the same directness nor with the same depth as the sin-offerings; the sense of sinfulness was still merged in the feelings of awe and submission; the mind of the worshipper was directed to the grandeur of God, rather than his own littleness; he was more anxious to conciliate his Master than to be justified before his conscience; atonement was a collateral consequence rather than the exclusive end of the sacrifice; hence the principal characteristic of the holocaust was its entire consumption by the flames, that of the sin-offering the sprinkling of the blood in the most striking manner that could be devised, so decidedly so that the mode of proceeding with the blood was different even with pigeons and turtle-doves when burnt-offerings and when sin-offerings; in the former case, the blood was merely pressed out on the side of the altar,⁶ in the latter, a part of it was sprinkled on the side of the altar, and the rest pressed out at the base; thus the act was purposely divided, and the sprinkling, bearing the character of distinctness and individuality, was significantly added. In many and not the least momentous cases, especially of purification, an expiatory offering was joined to a holocaust,⁷ and this combination aptly expressed that the mind must first be tuned to a religious disposition generally, before it can effectually expiate an individual transgression — only after the ground has been prepared by humility, the seed of regeneration can be safely entrusted to it. However, the Law was so anxiously intent upon securing the expiation of sin under all circumstances that it was induced to deviate from the fundamental principle of the atoning force of blood; for, lest the poorest be excluded from the priceless benefit of a restored peace of mind, they were permitted to present, as a sin-offering, a cereal oblation consisting of a tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, unadorned by oil and incense,⁸ of which the priest took off a handful as a memorial and burnt it on the brazen altar, while the rest belonged to the priest, and then the poor man's "sin was atoned for, and he was forgiven."⁹ Again, not the whole sin-offering was burnt on the altar, but precisely those parts which in thank-offerings were delivered to the holy flames, because an expiatory sacrifice also might not inappropriately be called an "offering of safety", and perhaps with greater

⁵ Comp. Lev. XVII. 11, and Ezek. XLV. 15, 17.

⁶ Lev. I. 15.

⁷ Lev. XII. 6—8; XIV. 10, 12, 19; Num. XV. 24; XXVIII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX.

5, 16, 19, 22, *sqq.*; comp. Lev. VIII. 14, 18; IX. 3, 12, 15, 16; Ps. XL. 7; Ezra VI. 17; 2 Chron. XXIX. 21, 31—33.

⁸ See *supra* p. 150.

⁹ See Lev. V. 11—13.

justice even than the thank-offering; for the victim having taken upon itself the punishment of the offerer, thereby rescued him from misfortune or death, and his deliverance from the miseries of a guilt-laden mind was a cause of even greater rejoicing than the possession of external boons and blessings.

The Pentateuch distinguishes two kinds of expiatory sacrifices, the *Sin-offering* (חטאת) and the *Trespass-offering* (עוון). It is impossible to doubt that they were indeed two distinct classes, not subordinate but co-ordinated to each other. For the precepts concerning the one are followed by separate regulations concerning the other.¹ In several cases, a trespass-offering is prescribed in addition to a sin-offering.² They are in various parts of the Old Testament mentioned together as two kinds of sacrifice.³ The rituals of the sin-offering were, in no case, identical with those of the trespass-offering.⁴ The flesh of the one was, in some instances at least, burnt entirely, while that of the other belonged, in all cases, to the priests. The animals ordained for the former were much more varied than those permitted for the latter, which were limited to rams and male lambs, neither of which were accepted as sin-offerings. The one differed, as regards the victim and the ceremonies, in accordance with the particular position or dignity of the offerer, while the other was precisely identical for all classes of the people. The one could, in cases of poverty, be reduced to two pigeons or turtle-doves, and even to one tenth of an ephah of flour, while the other was required to be of a certain and defined legal value. And, lastly, the one could be offered for the whole nation or a larger portion of the community, the latter only by private persons. Accordingly, the ancient versions render both by two different terms. Yet it is not easy to indicate the exact nature of the difference. Both Hebrew words (חטאת and עוון) are properly synonymous. The terms employed in reference to either are frequently identical. There seems scarcely one characteristic clearly traceable to either of them exclusively. The statements of the Pentateuch are, in fact, so singularly vague and perplexing, that the matter has been hopelessly abandoned by earnest critics and antiquarians; while others have groundlessly asserted that the distinction, originally clear and decided, has been greatly obliterated in our present Hebrew text dating from a much later time; or that "the

¹ Compare Levit. IV. 1—V. 13 and V. 14—26; or Lev. VI. 18—23 and VII. 1—7; see especially VII. 7 ("As the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering; there is one law for them"); and also XIV. 13; Num. XVIII. 9.

² Lev. XIV. 12 and 19, 21 and 31; Num. VI. 11 and 12.

³ See 2 Ki. XII. 17; Ezek. XL. 39; XLII. 13; XLIV. 29; XLVI. 20; which passages leave no doubt.

⁴ See *infra*.

account in Leviticus is full of confusion"; or that the legislator prescribed the one class or the other capriciously and without design; or that the writer failed from "unskilfulness" to make the difference clear; or that both, originally adopted in different parts of the land and by different tribes, as two distinct forms of sin-offering, were co-ordinated by the compilers of the Pentateuch. But all these conjectures are repudiated by the thoughtful character of the laws of Leviticus, which neither justify the reproach of "confusion", nor of "capriciousness", nor of unmeaning conglomeration of heterogeneous materials. Nor are the numerous opinions proposed to explain the distinction generally more fortunate; and few of them are supported by the Biblical text.

However, by faithfully following the Biblical statements, we may hope to arrive at some satisfactory conclusion. Trespass-offerings were enjoined in the following cases: if a person inadvertently appropriated to himself any portion of the sacred property,⁵ for instance, if he failed to bring the firstlings and tithes, or to give up to the priests any of their appointed emoluments, or if he ate holy food which belonged to them;⁶ if he abused a trust or deposit committed to his charge, or robbed or defrauded his fellow-men; if he had found lost property, and denied it; if he tried to obtain advantages by false oaths;⁷ if a free-man cohabited with an unredeemed bond-woman betrothed to another man;⁸ if unconsciously any of the Divine precepts had been contravened;⁹ if a leper was restored to health;¹⁰ and lastly if a Nazarite had unawares defiled himself by contact with a corpse.¹¹

It is obvious, at the first glance, that with a few exceptions, all these cases are connected with the *rights of property*, and that the trespass-offering was commanded for their unintentional violation. In most instances this is so manifest that it requires no proof or illustration. As regards illicit intercourse with a betrothed bond-woman, it must be remembered that the slave was the *property* of the master; the same offence, if committed with a free woman was, according to circumstances, visited with death of one or of both parties.¹² Respecting the general law of contravention "of any of the Divine precepts",¹³ it is obvious that, preceded as well as followed by regulations connected with property, it was meant to refer to the same category; though the comprehensive wording, "If a soul sin, and commit any of the things that are for-

⁵ Lev. V. 15, 16; comp. Josh. VII. 1 *sqq.*

⁶ Lev. XXII. 14—16; comp. also 1 Sam. VI. 3.

⁷ Lev. V. 21—26; comp. Num. V. 6—10.

⁸ Lev. XIX. 20—22; see Comm. on Exod. XXII. 15, 16. ⁹ Lev. V. 17—19.

¹⁰ Lev. XIV. 12, 21. ¹¹ Num. VI. 12.

¹² Deut. XXII. 23—27; see Comm. on Exod. XXII. 15 16.

¹³ Lev. V. 17—19.

bidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord",¹ leads to important historical inferences tending to prove that the law had originally a very different meaning.² There remain, therefore, only the two instances of the leper and the Nazarite; but it is remarkable, that, in both of them, a sin-offering was coupled with the trespass-offering,³ and it is, therefore, impossible to deduce therefrom the true character of the one or the other class.

Now, offences against property were naturally considered lighter than those committed against the principles of monotheism or the foundations of the theocratic commonwealth; they were indeed by the code of the Pentateuch punished with a leniency the more striking if compared with the corresponding legal enactments of other ancient nations.⁴ However frequent, varied, or daring, they could not endanger the purity of faith in the same degree as a contempt for Divine authority, or for religious worship, or even for the purely ceremonial obligations. Nay an encroachment upon the property of a priest was not deemed a graver offence than injustice done to the property of a common Israelite;⁵ and a theocratic gradation was out of the question. We could, therefore, not be surprised, were we to find that unconscious offences against property were expiated by a kind of sacrifice regarded as less solemn and less severe. And this character of the trespass-offering in relation to the sin-offering, which we are *a priori* prepared to expect, is indeed manifest from the nature of the rites which attended its performance.

The blood of the trespass-offering was, in all cases, merely sprinkled *round about* the altar,⁶ while that of the sin-offering, even of the least important description, was put *on the horns* of the altar — a difference in itself significant enough to suggest a distinct conclusion.⁷ Let it besides be remembered that the one was identical for all offenders, while the other was carefully modified according to their rank and theocratic position; that the latter consisted frequently of bullocks, the former, at the utmost, of rams (see *infra*); and that this could only be offered by individuals, but the other for larger communities or the whole nation both on week-days and festivals, — and the inference above stated will appear irresistible. We may, therefore, not be justified in adopting the Talmudical rule that a sin-offering was offered for such unintentional offences as, if committed advisedly, would have caused the awful penalty of excision; while a trespass-offering was accepted

¹ Ver. 17.

² Comp. Comm. on V. 14—26.

³ Comp. Lev. XIV. 12 and 19, 21
and 31; Num. VI. 11 and 12.

⁴ See Comm. on Exod. pp. 316—318.

⁵ Lev. V. 14—16, and 20—26.

⁶ Lev. VII. 2.

⁷ See *supra* p. 134.

for slighter offences not relating to the holiness of God, His Sanctuary, or His Law. But this distinction, though too sweeping and too vague, is not incorrect in principle. For if we consider that a more rigorous application of the Levitical views occasionally caused a sin-offering to be ordained, where a trespass-offering might have been sufficient, and that the weakness and sinful propensities of man were supposed inevitably and even without his knowledge to engender offences which required a periodical expiation, we shall be able to account for the cases in which a sin-offering was prescribed. It was to be presented, in the name of the people, on all the great festivals and days of solemn convocation, on Passover, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of Tabernacles,⁹ on the Day of Memorial, or the first day of the seventh month,⁹ and on the Day of Atonement;¹⁰ for rejoicing no less than contrition was to remind the holy community of its unworthiness and its failings; and hence a sin-offering was offered on the days of the new-moon also¹¹ which, marking a fresh period in the cosmic cycle of time, invited to pious reflection. For similar reasons, a sin-offering accompanied the inauguration of important public functionaries or their services, as the consecration of Aaron and his sons by Moses,¹² and seven days later, the commencement of their new duties,¹³ on which occasion the people, for whose sake the priests had been installed, likewise presented a sin-offering;¹⁴ again, at the initiation of the Levites¹⁵ and the dedication of a new Sanctuary;¹⁶ it hence preceded momentous religious acts, as the expiation of Israel by the High-priest on the Day of Atonement, when he began by presenting for himself a bullock as a sin-offering.¹⁷ It was connected with deliverance from serious perils or diseases, as with the purification of a woman after childbirth,¹⁸ of a leper after his recovery,¹⁹ or of a house that had been infected with leprosy,²⁰ of a man who had suffered from a "running issue",²¹ or of a woman who had recovered from an unusually long or irregular flow of blood,²² since disease and all physical infirmities of man were regarded either as the consequence of some transgression or as resulting from the general imperfection of his nature. It was commanded for intentionally withholding judicial evidence,²³ or for swearing in rash heedlessness,²⁴ or even for touching

⁸ Num. XXVIII. 22, 30; XXIX. 16.

⁹ Num. XXIX. 5.

¹⁰ Lev. XVI. 9, 15; Num. XXIX. 11.

¹¹ Num. XXVIII. 15.

¹² Exod. XXIX. 14, 36; Lev. VIII. 14—17.

¹³ Lev. IX. 2—15.

¹⁴ Lev. IX. 3.

¹⁵ Num. VIII. 8, 12, 21.

¹⁶ Num. VII. 16, 22, 28, etc., 87; see Ezra VI. 16, 17; comp. VIII. 35.

¹⁷ Lev. XVI. 3, 6, 11.

¹⁸ Lev. XII. 6, 8. ¹⁹ Lev. XIV. 19, 22.

²⁰ Lev. XIV. 49.

²¹ Lev. XV. 11, 15.

²² Lev. XV. 29, 30.

²³ Lev. V. 1.

²⁴ Lev. V. 4.

an unclean body or object unawares, whether this happened to a common Israelite or a Nazarite,¹ who had to offer a similar sacrifice likewise at the end of his time of seclusion.²

All these facts force upon us the inference that no precise and exact definition of the two kinds of expiatory offerings can be based upon the statements made in the Pentateuch in respect to them, if these statements be all referred to the same time and to one author; for they prescribe both sin- and trespass-offerings in cases of Levitical impurity, and they command both the one and the other for moral offences; thus taken, they must appear confused, arbitrary, and unintelligible; and all devices attempting to establish palpable distinctions must inevitably fail. The only possible solution of the embarrassing question seems to lie in an historical survey of the origin and progress of expiatory offerings; and we believe that such analysis may satisfactorily account for the two separate kinds, and help to remove all essential difficulties.

We have proved that expiatory offerings were the latest and last class of sacrifice developed in ancient systems of religion, and especially in that of the Hebrews.³ It is not improbable, that offences at once the most common and the most dangerous in primitive and imperfectly organised societies, offences against property, were the first to be atoned for by expiatory sacrifices, or by trespass-offerings. It will be expected that originally *intentional* offences of that nature were particularly, though not exclusively, expiated by a trespass-offering, not only because they are the most frequent and the most fatal to the safety of the community, but because they are most apt to rouse compunction and repentance; and as they were regarded as political not less than moral transgressions, the trespass-offering was naturally accompanied not only by restitution of the property unjustly acquired, but by an additional compensation to the owner, which might indeed have been regarded as a deterring fine against similar cases of misdemeanour. History has preserved to us the account of the Philistines, who had violently taken from the Hebrews the Ark of the Lord, and who, roused to the consciousness of their guilt by a terrible calamity, were instructed by their priests and sooth-sayers indeed to return the Ark, but by no means to return it "empty", but to send with it, as a "trespass-offering", golden presents symbolically pointing to the offenders and the deserved infliction. The Pentateuch itself contains some enactments regarding the trespass-offerings, which would be utterly inexplicable except on some supposition like that just stated, because they stand in absolute contradiction to the fundamental rule

¹ Lev. V. 3; Num. VI. 10, 11.

² Num. VI. 14.

³ See Sect. I.

concerning expiatory sacrifices, the rule of *unintentional* and *inadvertent* transgression; for the Law prescribes such offering in various cases of open or premeditated fraud and violence, for theft and abuse of trust, for unlawful keeping of found property, and even for daring robbery and shameless perjury⁴ — laws which must date from a comparatively early period, when expiatory offerings, though suggested by religious impulses, were made subservient to the security of the state, and when the restoration of the property together with the fifth part of its value, was prompted by principles of civil or criminal legislation. A similar sacrifice may, in the same periods, have become usual in cases of recovery from serious illness, such as leprosy so frequent and distressing in the East, and of striking forms of impurity, such as the defilement of a God-devoted Nazarite,⁵ since disease was looked upon as the punishment for some sin, and contamination was apprehended as provoking the anger of the Deity.⁶ However, these latter applications of the trespass-offering proved the transition to a higher and more specific form of expiatory sacrifices, the sin-offering. For when the Hebrews, or rather the nobler and more earnest minds among them, advanced in religious education and purity, it was deemed necessary to atone not only for intentional but also for involuntary offences, not only for defraudment of property but for all sins committed against God or men, not for a few cases of disease or impurity merely but for every misfortune or pollution; for not the state merely, but above all the *theocratic* state, was to be shielded; Israel was considered not simply as a political, but as a *holy* community; and every transgression of whatever kind defiled its purity and disturbed its relations towards God. In the mean time, the social organisation of the people also had greatly improved; the worldly authorities had become strong enough to enforce order and to protect the life and property of subjects; the Pentateuch could, therefore, boldly come forward with the principle that all intentional offences must be rigorously punished in accordance with the criminal code; while misdeeds involving a rejection of the Divine authority or of the promulgated Law were to be visited by "excision" and an expiatory offering was accepted for inadvertent or unconscious sins only. The old trespass-offering was certainly retained, but was deprived of its judicial or penal character; it was indeed chiefly reserved for derelictions connected with the rights of property; but the restitution and addition, likewise kept as of old, ceased to bear the character of a *fine*; for all such derelictions were viewed as frauds and iniquities perpetrated against God;⁷ hence when the restitution was not feasible, it

⁴ Lev. V. 21—26.

⁶ Comp. *supra* p. 172.

⁵ Lev. XIV. 12, 21; Num. VI. 12.

⁷ Lev. V. 19, 21.

was symbolically replaced by the value of the victim¹ or by some other retribution.² Thus the trespass-offering was regarded as an expiation for guilt contracted at once against man and God; it conciliated the Deity, the holy and theocratic King, and satisfied the defrauded fellow-being; it involved both a material and an ethical element. It was, on the whole, confined to involuntary offences, in conformity with the principle then sanctioned; and one statute only resting on a different foundation was allowed to be incorporated with the sacred code,³ because it had probably been so fixed at a much earlier date. It appears, however, that the principle of pecuniary fine so long connected with the old-established kind of expiatory offerings, was for some time preserved in connection with the new class; for we read in the historical Books not only of "money of trespass-offerings" but also of "money of sin-offerings", which, the offence being committed against God, was of course holy and therefore assigned to the priests. Such was the case at least in the reign of Joash, king of Judah (B. C. 877—838).⁴ But even this slight external admixture was afterwards deemed incompatible with the deeper nature of the sin-offerings; the pecuniary addition was wholly abolished; it was, in Leviticus, never enjoined in connection with the later class; it was wisely and thoughtfully abandoned by the priestly framers of the sacrificial laws, evidently anxious to facilitate, as much as possible, the sin-offerings, the very crowning stones of their ceremonial edifice;⁵ and they could well afford to bear the material loss, because simultaneously with it their revenues had been very considerably enhanced and more firmly settled. Therefore, the new class of expiatory sacrifices, being both more comprehensive and more solemn than the older, was naturally made more exalted in its application, and surrounded by more striking and more solemn ceremonies; it was not restricted to individuals, but wrought atonement for the whole people; it was not merely a private, but a public offering regularly performed on days of festival; it was varied in accordance with the dignity of the worshipper; and hence arose all the distinctions in the ritual that have above been pointed out, and which are in no feature more significant than in the mode of disposing of the blood of the victim. It will, moreover, be understood why the legislators added a sin-offering in a few cases, in which they had found a trespass-offering as an adopted custom. As they saw fit to enjoin the former for any ordinary defilement by contact with an unclean body or object,⁶ they could not consider the latter sufficient for the pollution of a Nazarite invested with peculiar

¹ Lev. V. 17—19.² Lev. XIX. 20.⁵ Comp. Lev. V. 11—13.³ Lev. V. 20—26.⁴ 2 Ki. XII. 17.⁶ Lev. V. 3.

holiness;⁷ and as they prescribed the former even for the purification of a house that had been infected with leprosy⁸ and for other less serious lustrations, they were naturally induced to superadd one in the case of a convalescent leper,⁹ especially as in the course of time the idea was more distinctly developed that illness is the result of moral guilt; but they judiciously modified, they did not lightly or recklessly destroy, the ancient usage which had possibly taken deeper root; for not only did they, in either case, retain the trespass-offering and allowed it to remain the *principal* of the two expiatory sacrifices, but they ordered even the poorer man at any rate to bring a lamb as trespass-offering, while a turtle-dove or a pigeon was deemed sufficient for the sin-offering and the holocaust. In this manner we may try to harmonize history and the legislation of the Pentateuch both within themselves and with each other.

But what protracted periods were required before the expiatory offerings could pass through the numerous and decided stages that lay between the primitive trespass-offering of the Philistines consisting of "five golden emerods and five golden mice", and the highly refined sin-offering of the Pentateuch, beyond which the Hebrews did not advance during the ages of their national existence! To contend that the sin-offerings, as prescribed in Leviticus, were introduced in the time of Moses, implies an utter perversion of the history of religious institutions among the Hebrews: "the money of sin-offerings" mentioned even in the time of Joash and so entirely at variance with the regulations of the Levitical code, suffices alone to prove how gradually and how late the latter received its final seal and revision.

In cases of man-slaughter no expiatory offering of any kind was ordained;¹⁰ the sad exile of the homicide in the distant cities of refuge, till the death of the High-priest restored him to his relations and his usual abode, was evidently deemed an atonement commensurate with a deplorable accident. Nor was one prescribed in lighter cases of defilement by contact, such as carrying the carcase of an unclean animal,¹¹ when bathing and washing of the garments was sufficient; while, in other instances, merely sprinkling with "the water of purification" was commanded.¹²

The animals appointed for *sin-offerings* comprised nearly every species of clean domestic beasts legally permitted for sacrifices, namely the bullock and the calf, the kid of the goats, whether male or female,

7 Num. VI. 11 and 12.

¹⁰ Num. XXXV. 10—15; Deut. XIX.

8 Lev. XIV. 19, 22.

1—10.

¹¹ Lev. XI. 24, 28.

9 Lev. XIV. 12 and 19, 21 and 31.

¹² Num. XIX. 19, 20.

the female lamb, the turtle-dove and pigeon, or "birds": the cow, the ram, and older goat were alone excluded. The choice was not, as in burnt-and thank-offerings, left to the option of the worshipper, but the victims were prescribed and regulated by the Law in accordance with the nature of the occasion and the character of the suppliant; namely, 1. *a bullock* for the High-priest or the whole congregation to expiate a public offence unconsciously committed and later made manifest;¹ at the consecration of the priests and Levites;² and on the Day of Atonement to ensure forgiveness for the High-priest and his house;³ 2. *a calf*, for Aaron at the installation into his sacred functions;⁴ 3. *a male kid of the goats*, in the name of the whole nation, on the days of festivals and new-moons,⁵ or on solemn occasions, as on the first day after the inauguration of Aaron and his sons;⁶ for a chief in case of unconscious guilt;⁷ and at the consecration of the Sanctuary;⁸ 4. *a female kid of the goats*, for a common Israelite, when he became aware of an involuntary trespass;⁹ for suppression of judicial evidence, for inadvertent contact with unclean bodies or objects; and for a heedless oath¹⁰ — in all which cases could also be offered 5. *a female lamb*,¹¹ and the same animal was sacrificed at the end of the Nazarite's term of seclusion,¹² and at the recovery of a leper living in prosperous circumstances;¹³ while 6. *turtle-doves or pigeons* were accepted in the last mentioned case, if the convalescent was poor;¹⁴ or if a person guilty of withholding judicial evidence, of contact with unclean bodies or objects, or of a heedless oath, was unable to afford a kid of the goats;¹⁵ moreover, at the purification of a woman after childbirth,¹⁶ or after a protracted or an unusual issue of blood;¹⁷ at the recovery of a man affected with "a running issue";¹⁸ and when a Nazarite had defiled himself by the proximity of a corpse;¹⁹ and 7. in one case, *two birds*, when a house had been freed and purified from leprous infection.²⁰ In a few extraordinary emergencies, a red cow and a heifer were employed for purposes of purification.²¹

¹ Lev. IV. 3, 14. On Num. XV. 24, where a kid of the goats is prescribed as a sin-offering of the whole community, see p. 33.

² Exod. XXIX. 11, 36; Lev. VIII. 14—17; Num. VIII. 8.

³ Lev. XVI. 3, 6, 11.

⁴ Lev. IX. 1—8.

⁵ Lev. XVI. 9, 15; XXIII. 19; Num. XXVII. 15, 22, 30; XXIX. 5, 11, 16, 19, 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 38.

⁶ Lev. IX. 3, 15.

⁷ Lev. IV. 3.

⁸ Num. VII. 16, 22, 34, etc.; comp. Ezra VI. 17; VIII. 35.

⁹ Lev. IV. 28.

¹⁰ Lev. V. 1—6.

¹¹ Lev. IV. 32; comp. Num. XV. 22—29.

¹² Num. VI. 14.

¹³ Lev. XIV. 19.

¹⁴ Ibid. ver. 22.

¹⁵ Lev. V. 7—10.

¹⁶ Lev. XII. 6, 8.

¹⁷ Lev. XV. 29, 30.

¹⁸ Lev. XV. 14, 15.

¹⁹ Num. VI. 10, 11.

²⁰ Lev. XIV. 4, 49.

²¹ Num. XIX. 2—22; Deut. XXI. 1—9; see notes on ch. XI.

The animals killed for *trespass-offerings* are not so distinctly specified; they were males in all cases; most commonly a *ram* seems to have been chosen,²² because, as has been supposed, sheep and especially rams constituted the primitive medium of currency, chiefly for paying fines, and were, therefore, peculiarly appropriate for trespass-offerings originally presented as penalties for defraudment of property: but a lamb was ordained for a convalescent leper, or a Nazarite contaminated by the presence of a dead body.²³ Indeed, as the trespass-offering related to material damage done to another, it could not consist of anything less than an animal, be it only a lamb, because the compensation was at least to have a material character; but the sin-offering, being offered mainly for theocratic offences against God, could be lowered to fowls, and even a small quantity of flour, for a symbol sufficed.

The following ceremonies were observed at the performance of *sin-offerings*.²⁴

1. If the High-priest, having sinned "to the guilt of the people", that is, whether in his official capacity as spiritual chief of the nation or privately,²⁵ presented a sin-offering for himself, he selected a faultless young bullock, brought it to the door of the Sanctuary, imposed his hand upon its head, and killed it at the place where the holocaust was killed, that is, on the northern side of the altar of burnt-offerings;²⁶ he then took a part of the blood into the Sanctuary, sprinkled with it seven times the vail which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies, and put some of it upon the horns of the golden altar of incense; he next poured out the rest of the blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering in the Court; laid all the fat and the fat parts of the victim upon the same altar, while the rest of the animal, namely, the skin, all the flesh, the head, the legs, the inwards, and the dung, were carried without the camp, and burnt in a clean place, on the spot where the ashes were usually poured out.²⁷

2. When a sin-offering was presented for the whole community of Israel, the proceedings differed from those just stated only in a few particulars. The *congregation* brought the young bullock to the door of the Sanctuary; the *elders* imposed their right hands upon its head, and *one of them* killed it; then the High-priest acted in every respect as if the victim were offered for himself.²⁸

²² Lev. V. 15, 16, 18, 25; XIX. 21; Num. V. 8.

²³ Lev. XIV. 12; Num. VI. 12.

²⁴ See Lev. IV. 1—V. 13.

²⁵ See notes on IV. 3—12.

²⁶ Comp. I. 11; IV. 24; VI. 18; VII. 12; see p. 124.

²⁷ See Levit. IV. 3—12.

²⁸ See Lev. IV. 13—21; see in general the notes on ch. IV.

3. When a sin-offering was presented by a single Israelite, whether a chief or a private individual, the rituals were identical, except that in the former case the animal required was a male kid of the goats, in the latter either a female kid of the goats or a female lamb — a gradation in the choice of the victim the significance of which is self-evident.¹ The offerer brought it before the door of the Sanctuary, imposed his hand upon its head, and killed it at the usual place; then a priest — not as in the preceding instances, the High-priest — put some of its blood upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, poured the rest at the bottom of it, and burnt upon it all the fat and fat parts, while he was permitted, together with other male Aaronites, to consume the flesh; but the meal was required to be held in the Court of the Sanctuary, in the sacred place, to guard against any possible defilement of the holy offering.²

These observances were necessarily varied in special cases whose peculiar character and tendency required the modification.

4. When Aaron and his sons were initiated into their holy offices, they placed indeed their hands upon the sin-offering then presented, but Moses performed all the other ceremonies above described;³ for he officiated on that exceptional occasion as High-priest; and though the blood of the victim was not brought into the Holy, yet the entire animal was burnt, partly on the altar and partly without the camp.⁴ The ceremonial of the Day of Atonement which comprised several anomalous features suggested by the solemnity of the festival, will be explained in its proper place.⁵

5. If in cases of poverty two turtle-doves or two pigeons were presented as a sin-offering instead of a female lamb or goat, the priest offered one of them as an expiatory sacrifice, wringing its head behind the neck, without, however, severing it,⁶ sprinkled some of its blood upon the side of the altar, and pressed out the rest at the bottom; and then, after having removed the crop with its excrements, and thrown them on the place of the ashes,⁷ he retained the bird for himself, to eat it in the holy place:⁸ after which he offered the other bird as a holocaust in the usual manner.⁹

6. The rites adopted at the presentation of *trespass-offerings* were identical with those of sin-offerings brought by a chief or a common

¹ See pp. 62, 63.

² See Lev. IV. 22—35.

³ See Lev. VIII. 14—17.

⁴ Vers. 16, 17.

⁵ See notes on ch. XVI.

⁶ Whereas if the bird was a burnt-

offering the head was wrung *off*, and burnt separately on the altar (Lev. V. 8; see p. 162).

⁷ Comp. Lev. I. 16, 17.

⁸ VI. 19, 22.

⁹ Lev. V. 7—10; see p. 162.

Israelite, and the flesh was likewise given over to the priests for consumption: but there was this one important distinction, that the blood was not, as was done with sin-offerings, put on the *horns* of the altar, but "upon the altar round about", not, however, a portion of it only, but all the blood, as was the case with holocausts and thank-offerings, no part being, as in the sin-offerings, poured out at the bottom of the altar.¹⁰

As we survey the expiatory offerings of the Hebrews, which for purity stand unrivalled in the ancient world,¹¹ we are bound to admit that they were pre-eminently calculated to keep alive among the nation those feelings on which all religious life depends, and from which it flows as its natural source, the feelings of human sinfulness and the conviction of the Divine holiness, by the standard of which that sinfulness is to be measured; they fostered, therefore, at once humility and an ideal yearning; and they effectually counteracted that sense of self-righteousness natural indeed to the pride of man, but utterly destructive of all nobler virtues. They were well suited to secure in the directest and completest manner that singleness of life and heart, which is the true end of all sacrifices. Their division into the two classes of sin- and trespass-offerings contributed much to maintain and to enhance the conviction of moral insufficiency; the more so as such a division was scarcely a necessity, since both classes virtually referred to kindred offences, and indeed differed so little in their nature and tendency that the discovery of a broad and palpable distinction almost defies the antiquarian's research. Every Israelite was to feel his transgression personally and individually; hence the sin-offerings were carefully and designedly varied according to the sinner's rank and position, both with regard to the choice of the victim and the mode of the ceremonial; whereas the holocausts, symbolising as they did merely a general admission of the common frailty inherent in human nature, were uniform for all persons.

But the religious legislation was not to be brought into collision with the civil and political enactments; it was, on the contrary, meant to support and to strengthen them; so far from endangering the safety of the state by an ill-advised leniency, it helped to eradicate the natural propensity to crime and lawlessness; its operation was therefore limited to involuntary trespasses; while the secular authorities were left free to deal with pre-meditated offences; it even abstained from interfering in some important cases of unintentional misdeeds, such as homicide, for which it prescribed no sacrifice, but admitted a worldly punishment: satisfied to act as a silent instrument in the reformation

¹⁰ See notes on VI. 17—VII. 6.

¹¹ See Sect. XX.

of the hearts, it indeed effectually contracted the application, but did not injudiciously weaken the authority of the criminal code. Hence, though bearing the character of vicariousness, the sin-offerings were far from encouraging an external worship by lifeless ceremonies; in themselves the spontaneous offspring of religious repentance, and thus naturally helping to nourish the same beneficent feeling, they were the strongest guarantee for a life of honesty and active virtue.

XVI. THE OFFERING OF JEALOUSY.¹

If a man believed that he had well-founded grounds for suspecting his wife of conjugal infidelity, without being able to prove the charge legally by witnesses or otherwise, and thus to make her amenable before the ordinary tribunals, or, as the Pentateuch expresses it, "If a man's wife go astray and commit faithlessness against him, and another man lie with her carnally, and it be hidden from the eyes of her husband and be kept secret, and she be defiled, and there was no witness against her, neither she be taken in the act, and the spirit of jealousy come upon him and he be jealous of his wife, whether she be defiled or not", the law prescribed or sanctioned a very singular mode of ascertaining her guilt or innocence, a proceeding rooted in rude and primeval notions of a direct interference of the Deity in the operation and natural properties of matter, and analogous to ordeals still employed in similar cases by barbarous and untutored tribes.² If an oblation so antagonistic to the general spirit of the sacrificial laws of the Pentateuch can at all be classified among them, it falls under the category of sin-offerings, though in the case of the woman's innocence no atonement was required, and in the case of her guilt none was granted. For the ceremonies, manifestly devised at once to terrify the conscience and to excite the imagination, were as follows. The husband took his wife to the place of the national Sanctuary before "the priest", and handed over to him an offering on her account, which consisted simply of an omer of the common flour of the inferior grain of barley, to signify the baseness and infamy which must attach to the accused, should the suspicion prove well-founded, and to which he added neither oil nor frank-incense, the emblems of spiritual life and elevation; for "it was an offering of memorial, bringing iniquity to remembrance" and the person for whom it was presented was possibly guilty of moral worthlessness and unholy conduct. An offering was necessary, because the husband forced his wife to appear before God to receive from Him, the Searcher of hearts and the Revealer of secrets, her judgment; and

¹ Num. V. 11—31.

² Comp. Sect. XXVI.

he could therefore not make her appear empty-handed; and a bloodless oblation was preferred to an animal sacrifice, because, as we have observed, expiation was out of the question, whatever the issue of the trial. The priest then placed her "before God", that is, before the altar in the Court of the Sanctuary, poured "holy water", namely water kept in the laver which stood in the Court, into an *earthen* vessel or the most common and least valuable sort of utensils, and strewed upon the water dust to indicate the despicable meanness of the offence to be tested, though he was to take that dust from the floor of the Sanctuary, since everything appertaining to the sacred ceremonies was to be associated with the holy place, sanctified by the presence of God. He kept the vessel in his own hand, while he gave the *miuchah* to the woman, who was properly considered to present it as a means of appealing to God's propitious intercession, because it was she who had come before Him for judgment or vindication; he uncovered her head as a symbol of her public accusation and open trial, and also as a mark of degradation, since the veiling of the head was a sign of chastity and female propriety and especially indicative of the married state; and passing to the most important part of the memorable ritual, he addressed to her this solemn adjuration, designed to rouse and, under circumstances, to torture her conscience into anguish and confession, "If no man has lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone astray to uncleanness from thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water that causes the curse. But if thou hast gone astray from thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some one has lain with thee beside thy husband... then the Lord make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, so that the Lord shall make thy thigh to rot and thy belly to swell, and this water that causes the curse shall enter into thy bowels, to make thy belly to swell and thy thigh to rot": — to which the woman shall say, "Amen, amen." The priest next wrote down on a scroll this curse and oath, which implied a strict retaliation or measure for measure, in harmony with the penal enactments of the Pentateuch generally, and then blotted the words out with, or rather in, the bitter water, probably by dipping the scroll into the vessel, to put, as it were, the curse symbolically into the water, and thereby to impart to the latter the power of destruction; he took the *miuchah* from the woman's hand, waved it before God, burnt a handful of it upon the altar as a memorial meant to call forth a manifestation of God in her favour if she were innocent, as she contended to be, and then gave the woman to drink from the water. And the Hebrew text adds gravely, that if she were guilty, the water would "make her belly to swell and her

thigh to rot", that is, vitiate or destroy the organs of conception and thenceforth condemn her to the curse and shame of barrenness; but if she were innocent, "she would be free and conceive seed." In the former case, she "bore her iniquity"; the disgrace, the separation from her husband, and the disease that befell her, were deemed sufficient punishment; in the latter case, the mutual and conjugal confidence was fully restored, and the husband could not be blamed for having exposed his wife to so awful an ordeal; for he did not act, as Philo observes, "like a false accuser or treacherous enemy, seeking to gain the victory by any means whatever, but as a man may do who wishes accurately to ascertain the truth without any sophistry", and had accused his wife "not out of insult, but with an honest intention", and perhaps from the ardour of his love. It cannot be denied that the procedure here prescribed falls virtually into the category of *ordeals*; the fact that, after its completion, the human judges took no action in the matter, while this was usually done after ordeals, constitutes no essential difference: the principal point is the supernatural mode of discovering the *guilt*: this was perfectly analogous in both cases, while the *punishment* was in our instance left to God, in other ordeals carried out by human tribunals. The Talmud believes that the test was applicable only if the husband had been absolutely faithful to his wife — of which condition the Biblical text is altogether silent; and that it ceased to be effectual when adulterers increased — which may be a convenient mode of accounting for constant failures of an experiment dangerous to the authority of the Pentateuch. The rite was abolished by Jochanan ben Saccai about the beginning of the Christian era — a commendable measure whether suggested by enlightenment or prudence. From that time, divorce alone was customary among the Jews in cases of manifest and well-proved faithlessness.

XVII. THE PASCHAL SACRIFICE.

It requires no proof that the paschal lamb, even that killed in Egypt, was in reality a *sacrifice*; it is in the Pentateuch distinctly called "an offering of the Lord",¹ and "service" or "worship";² it was prescribed to be male and faultless,³ the ordinary requirements of the holiest sacrifices; it was to be eaten at once and entirely, or if anything remained it was to be burnt the same night;⁴ in later times, it was to be killed at the common Sanctuary, and consumed in the holy town,⁵ and the

¹ Num. IX. 7, 13 (comp. 1 Cor. V. 7).

² Exod. XII. 25, 26.

³ Exod. XII. 5.

comp. p. 165.

⁴ Exod. XII. 10;

⁵ Dent. XVI. 5—7.

blood was to be sprinkled upon the altar.⁶ Nor can it be doubted that the paschal sacrifice, though in some respects entirely singular and exceptional, must be classed among the *thank-offerings*, to which it is analogous not only in the name and in the disposal of the portions left on the morrow of the sacrifice,⁷ but its flesh, even including the breast and right shoulder, was eaten by the Israelites who offered it, and was thus marked as distinct both from the holocausts and the expiatory offerings. Some have indeed laboured to represent it, either fully or conditionally, as a sin-offering designed to atone for the idolatry practised by the Hebrews during their sojourn in Egypt: but the term *pesach* never signifies *absolution* or *expiation*, whatever its meaning in Arabic; and the blood of the lamb, which in Egypt was put on the lintels and the door-posts, did not symbolise the unworthiness of the Hebrews of being exempted from the calamity that was to afflict the Egyptians, but it signified the occupation of the houses by Hebrews and the belief of the latter in God's promise of rescue. And in the later form of the Passover sacrifice, the blood, so eminently essential in sin-offerings, was of such subordinate importance, that its use and application were not even specified in the Law. Jewish tradition distinctly marked the *Pesach* as a thank-offering by declaring that while it was killed the Israelites chanted the great hymn consisting of the Psalms CXIII to CXVIII. The rites by which it was attended differed indeed from those observed in ordinary *shelamim*; but these very deviations serve to recall its true character more strikingly. It was by the Hebrew historian, who placed its origin in the time of the exodus from Egypt, evidently conceived as a *sacrifice of covenant* in a double sense — to typify the alliance between God and the people of Israel, and to cement the union between the members of the Hebrew households. For it was to be killed by the head of every family; its blood, to be put on the lintel and the door-posts, was to sanctify the house to God; it was to be roasted entire, without any part or member being cut off; for which reason nothing, not even the fat, was burnt on the altar; nor did the priests receive any portion; it was to be eaten in family groups, and to be consumed completely in the night of the fourteenth day of Nisan, without anything being left to the following day.⁸ But this character which the paschal sacrifice bore at its first institution, was naturally modified in subsequent periods of Hebrew history, and especially after the settlement in the promised land. Then the Israelites properly presented it as a

⁶ Comp. 2 Chr. XXXV. 11; see Comm. on Exod. p. 137. ⁷ Comp. Exod. XII. 10 and Lev. VII. 15—17.

⁸ See Comm. on Exod. pp. 134, 135, 148; and generally the same treatise pp. 131—142.

thank-offering for the miraculous redemption of their ancestors from Egyptian bondage, and in grateful remembrance of the mercy which God had manifested in choosing and accepting them as His own people;¹ they considered it indeed as an annual renewal of the national convention between God and themselves; but joy and gratitude obtained a chief, if not predominant share in its performance. Thus the history of the paschal sacrifice exhibits the same change in its nature, which the *shelamim* generally seem to have undergone in the course of centuries. How and for what reasons the sacrifices of the firstborn were, from holocausts, converted into thank-offerings, will be explained elsewhere.²

XVIII. THE DOCTRINE OF VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.

It is impossible to doubt that the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice was entertained by the Hebrews, as it was held by other nations, both ancient and modern. If the principle of substitution be not at once apparent in holocausts and thank-offerings presented as an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty and beneficence, it is plainly obvious in expiatory sacrifices. It is unmistakably implied in that important passage which some have even regarded as the very foundation of all sacrificial laws, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes an atonement by the soul",³ where the soul of the offerer is clearly placed in juxtaposition with the soul of the victim employed as a means of expiation. That principle is also certain and manifest in the imposition of the hands as commanded with regard to the scape-goat, "And Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over it all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, and shall put them upon the head of the goat, and send it away by the hand of an appointed man into the wilderness; and the goat shall bear upon it all their iniquities into a land not inhabited";⁴ wherefore the messenger who had driven away the goat was unclean and forbidden to come within the camp till he had bathed and washed his garments.⁵ It is embodied in the narrative of the intended sacrifice of Isaac, instead of whom a ram was offered as a holocaust,⁶ and in the law concerning the heifer killed at or near the place of an undiscovered murder;⁷ and it is symbolised by the dissected animals at the conclusion of covenants, foreshadowing the deserved fate of the transgressor.

¹ Comp. Exod. XIII. 14—17.

² See the Treatise on Priesthood, ch. 3.

³ Lev. XVII. 11, and notes in loc.

⁴ Lev. XVI. 21, 22; see Comm. in loc.

⁵ Ibid. ver. 26; comp. ver. 28.

⁶ Gen. XXII. 13; see *infra* Sect. XXI. 3.

⁷ Deut. XXI. 1—9.

It involves a deep consciousness of sin and guilt, and marks a decided progress in the path of spiritual religion.

The doctrine of vicariousness has been acknowledged and adopted by many Rabbins and Fathers of the Church, who held that the Bible sanctioned the principle of "life for life", and supposed the killing and burning of the victim to imply that the blood of the offerer ought to have been shed, and his body burnt, on account of his sins, had not the mercy of God accepted from him, as a substitute and atonement, the life and the blood of the animal; and it has been defended by the majority of orthodox writers and critics, though it has by some been either opposed or wrongly understood.

This doctrine is, however, widely different from the so-called *judicial* view, which considers the sacrifice as a penalty or fine; for the Pentateuch cannot possibly be said to start from the principle, "man offers the sacrifice in order to escape from punishment, because without punishment the disturbed relation between God and man cannot be restored": this would not be a *covering* of the sin or *wiping out* of it, no *pardon* and no *mercy*, in which the sacrificial system is centred. Moreover, in expiatory offerings not the killing of the animal, but the proceeding with the blood was the principal act, which effected atonement. Hence the priest, the representative of God, did not necessarily execute the slaying, but he invariably performed the sprinkling of the blood. And though the victim gave up its life for the life of the offerer, it was not laden with his sins; hence the flesh, so far from being impure, became most holy, and was, in certain cases, eaten by the priest who had been instrumental in the offering. The scape-goat alone, on the Day of Atonement, which bore the sins of the people, was not "most holy", but was sent into a desert land to perish far away from the abodes of men.

The subject may, therefore, briefly be thus summed up. The animal dies to symbolise the death deserved by the offerer on account of his sins; while its blood which represents its life and existence, is put on the altar and on other parts of the Sanctuary to typify the Divine atonement solicited and granted. The death of the animal is far from unessential, for it involves the indispensable preliminary or the negative side of the sacrifice, the remission of the punishment; after which the sprinkling of the blood follows as the emblem of the positive effect or end, the remission of the guilt, the restoration of peace and grace, the sanctification or the re-union with God. Thus understood, the sacrifice is not "merely an external, a formal, and mechanical act", and still less "an act of penal execution." It is, moreover, obviously

erroneous to deny all significance to the killing of the animal, and to look upon it simply as an act of transition and a means for obtaining the blood: if so, it would not have been so regularly recorded in the text, nor would the *mode* have been so characteristically varied in different sacrifices. The ceremony was entrusted, or rather left, to the offering Israelites, and not confided to the priests, because the former were to testify, in the most signal manner possible, their submission, their ready gratitude, or their death-deserving guilt. It could not well be performed on the elevated altar itself; it was sufficiently connected with this holy structure by being necessarily performed *near* it. And the sprinkling of the blood was lawful and effectual only if the blood was obtained by *killing* the animal, not if it flowed from a wound or even a vital organ.

Simultaneously with the principle of substitution of *animals* for men, the notion of substitution of *men* for men began to gain ground. Traces of it are met with at different periods of Hebrew history. It is indirectly implied in the narrative concerning the seven descendants of Saul "hanged up before the Lord" as an atonement for the unjust warfare alleged to have been waged by Saul against the Gibeonites;¹ it renders intelligible the story of the death of the child of David and Bath-sheba, intended as an expiation for the king's crime;² it is almost distinctly expressed in the adages, "The wicked shall be a ransom for the righteous, and the transgressor for the upright",³ and, "The righteous is delivered out of trouble, and the wicked comes in his stead";⁴ it underlies the description of the servant of God "who has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows, who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities, who suffered chastisement for our salvation, and by whose stripes we are healed, upon whom the Lord has laid the iniquity of us all, and who was stricken for the transgressions of the people, who delivered up his soul to death, bore the sins of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."⁵ In the time after the exile, it was developed with more and more distinctness; and it gave birth to the idea of the Messiah or the son of God suffering death to secure atonement and salvation for mankind.⁶

¹ 2 Sam. XXI. 1—14; see Sect. XXIII.

² 2 Sam. XII. 13 *sqq.*; comp. also Mic. VI. 7, "shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?"

³ Prov. XXI. 18. ⁴ Prov. XI. 5.

⁵ Isai. LIII. 4—12.

⁶ Comp. Matth. I. 21; XX. 28; XXVI.

28; Mark X. 45; XIV. 24; Luke I. 76, 77; VI. 51; XXII. 19, 20 (comp. Exod. XXIV. 5); John I. 29; X. 15; Acts X. 43; Rom. III. 24, 25; VIII. 32; V. 8, 10, 11; 1 Cor. V. 7; XV. 3; 2 Cor. V. 18, 19, 21; Gal. I. 4; Eph. I. 7; V. 2; Col. I. 14, 20, 24; 1 Tim. II. 6; Hebr. I. 3; IX. 13, 15; XIII. 11, 12; Tit. II. 14; 1

But this doctrine was not allowed to spread unopposed. The more enlightened leaders of the Israelites, perceiving the fatal dangers inseparable from such a view, began to combat it with every weapon of argument and eloquence. The Pentateuch relates that when Moses, after the sin of the golden calf, offered himself as a substitute for appeasing the Divine indignation, God replied, "Whoever has sinned against Me, him will I blot out of My book";⁷ and that when God, after the revolt of Korah and his associates, determined to visit the Israelites with general annihilation, Moses and Aaron "fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, shall one man sin, and wilt Thou be wroth with all the congregation?"⁸ When a plague smote myriads of Israelites on account of David's supposed trespass in ordering a census of the people, the king exclaimed, "It is myself that have sinned and done evil indeed; but as for these sheep, what have they done? Let Thy hand, I pray Thee, o Lord my God, be upon me, and on my father's house, but not on Thy people that they should be visited by the plague."⁹ The Law enjoins the general rule "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin";¹⁰ and this rule is confirmed by prophetic teachers, "The soul that sins, it shall die."¹¹ The proceeding of David in delivering up Saul's descendants to the Gibeonites must be viewed as an act of unjustifiable despotism probably suggested by political expediency;¹² and the picture of the servant of God "who was stricken for the transgression of the people, and found his grave with the wicked, although he had done no violence and no deceit was in his mouth", this picture implies no approval, but the strongest denouncement of the impious treatment inflicted upon God's holy minister, most probably representing a class of zealous and public-spirited men, like Jeremiah, preaching and warning, oppressed, scorned, and even massacred:¹³ these pious men did not take upon themselves the sufferings *spontaneously*; they remonstrated incessantly and most vehemently against the criminal persecutions; and no thoughtful Israelite could expect happiness and blessing from godless cruelty perpetrated against the best and noblest of their generation, but feared the direst retaliation from an incensed Deity.

Other ancient nations entertained similar views with regard to

Petr. II. 21, 24; III. 18; 1 John I. 7; II. 2; IV. 10; Revel. I. 5; V. 9.

⁷ Exod. XXXII. 33; comp. Lev. XXVI. 39, 40.

⁸ Num. XVI. 22.

⁹ 1 Chr. XXI. 17; 2 Sam. XXIV. 17.

¹⁰ Deut. XXIV. 16; comp. 2 Ki. XIV. 6.

¹¹ Ezek. XVIII. 4; comp. vers. 1 *sqq.*; XXXIII. 12—20.

¹² See ch. XXI.

¹³ We adhere to this acceptance of the "servant of God", for which the arguments will be given in the proper place.

substitution, though again significantly modified. It is true that not all their sacrifices bore the character of vicariousness; many were offered to express their gratitude for benefits enjoyed, or to implore a continuance of Divine favours, or to appease the anger of the gods in times of trial and danger. Yet we find indisputable instances of true substitution. In Egypt, at the great bull-offering in honour of Apis, the head of the animal was cut off, and then it was laden with imprecations by praying that "if any evil was impending either over those who sacrificed, or over universal Egypt, it might be made to fall upon that head"; in fact "these practices — the imprecations on the head and the libations of wine — prevailed all over Egypt, and extended to victims of all sorts, and hence the Egyptians would never eat the head of any animal." The seal with which the victims were marked by the Egyptian priests as duly qualified represented a kneeling man, with his hands tied to his back, and a sword put to his throat, which can hardly be interpreted otherwise than that the animal suffered death instead of the offerer who had deserved that penalty. At Athens, a ram was sacrificed instead of the eldest member of the Athamantid family, who had forfeited his life on account of an ancient stain of blood resting on his house, but who was allowed to escape into another country. In fact, ancient writers supposed, that primitively men were sacrificed, but were gradually replaced by animals, "the bodies of which they presented as offerings substituted for their own bodies." The curious custom which obtained in Syria, that the offerer kneeled on the hide of the lamb he had sacrificed, and put the victim's head and feet upon his own head, evidently expressed that the man's death was averted by the victim which had died in his stead. And lastly, both private and public calamities were extensively believed to be averted by the sacrifice of a human being, whether the latter died by self-immolation or by the hand of a priest, as has been explained in another place. The Gauls especially held the belief that "unless the life of a man be surrendered for the life of another, the divine majesty of the immortal gods could not be propitiated." Whenever the town of Massilia was visited by an epidemic, a poor man who offered himself was for a complete year fed at the public expense in the best possible manner; after which he was decked with wreaths and holy garments, conducted round the town, and at last struck down with imprecations that the misfortunes of the community might fall upon him alone.

It is scarcely necessary to express an opinion on the philosophical or religious value of the principle of substitution — a principle which is derived from most imperfect conceptions both of sin and of the divine

attributes, and which is little different in dignity and truth, whether it refers to the vicarious death of an animal for a man, or of a man for a nation, or of a God for the human race. It has indeed been assailed and rejected at all times. Cato observes with simplicity and common sense, "When thou art guilty thyself, why does the victim die for thee? It is folly to expect safety by the death of another." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews declared, "it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins",¹ without, however, perceiving how fatal the consistent application of this view is to his whole argument. Socinus declared that a beast cannot take upon itself the punishment of man, because there exists between the one and the other no manner of community. Arnobius puts into the mouth of a sacrificial animal the following pathetic words, "Say, o Jupiter, or any other deity, is it right, and honest, and just withal, that if some one else has sinned, I am killed, and that thou art satisfied by my blood, although I have never, whether consciously or unconsciously, offended thy majesty; for I am, as thou knowest, a dumb brute, following the simplicity of my nature, and unable to deceive by changeful and versatile artifices; etc."; and he concludes an impressive appeal thus. "Is it then not savage, fierce, and ferocious, does it not appear to thee, o Jupiter, iniquitous and barbarous, that I should be killed and slaughtered to pacify thee, and to secure the impunity of the wicked?" "Common sense will not allow us", observed John Taylor, "to imagine that sin, which can be truly imputed to the offender alone, whose alone it is, was ever *really* transferred to another; much less to a brute altogether incapable of sin"; and he insisted with rising earnestness that "vicarious punishment seems to be a contradiction in terms; for as there cannot be a vicarious guilt, or as no one can be guilty instead of another, so there cannot be a vicarious punishment; . . . punishment in its very nature commotes guilt in the subject which bears it"; and he had therefore recourse to the opinion that the victim presented the person of the offerer "in the symbolical, interpretative sense, to show him the demerit of sin in general, how he ought to slay the brute in himself, and devote his life and soul to God": many believe they have proved the non-existence of a doctrine in the Bible when they have proved its unreasonableness or its fallacy; but impartial interpretation must *study* the conceptions of ancient times from their own sphere of thought, though it may *judge* them by the standard of absolute reason. Kurtz confesses that the idea of vicarious suffering is "a conception contradictory to all human views of justice",

¹ Hebr. X. 4.

but approves of it in the sacrificial ritual, because it is there "Divinely appointed" — a distinction between human and Divine right suggested by despair, and tending to a blind confusion of the notions of virtue and crime, of sense and folly.

Now the progress in the idea of atonement among the Hebrews may thus be sketched. At first that idea was confined to *intentional* offences, and especially to murder, the most heinous of all, which could be expiated only by the death of the murderer, since, "blood defiles the land." For this reason an expiation was also required for a murder the perpetrator of which was unknown, and it was effected, with peculiar ceremonies, by the blood of an animal.¹ In course of time, misfortune or misery commensurate with the sin was regarded as an atonement,² and a voluntary gift devoted to God or His service was looked upon as an instrument for averting dangers or for securing future success.³ Then the Hebrews, advancing another step, adopted the belief that God could be induced to pardon offenders through the devotion and prayer of pious intercessors, especially prophets: thus expiation was secured by the holy zeal of Phinehas which stayed a fearful pestilence and reconciled the people to God,⁴ and by the supplication of Job who, though unjustly treated by his friends, had manfully upheld his innocence and vindicated the ways of God;⁵ it was expected through the mediation of Abraham and Moses, of Samuel and Elishah, of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and others.⁶ On one occasion, money was received as an atonement; namely, when the census was taken, every Israelite above twenty years of age gave half a shekel — the rich not more, the poor not less — as "a ransom for his soul to the Lord, that there be no plague among them", whence the money itself was called "atonement-money".⁷ At last religious education advanced sufficiently to require atonement even for inadvertent sins. For this purpose a fit symbol was sufficient; for no real guilt, impossible without intention, was to be expiated; it was only necessary to restore the holiness of the theocracy disturbed by the undesigned offence — a notion which, in the mean time, had been more fully worked out and practically acted upon: such a symbol was partially the flesh of expiatory offerings consumed by the priests in the holy place,⁸ and more universally the blood

¹ Deut. XXI. 1—8.

² Isai. XXVII. 9; comp. XLIII. 3, 4.

³ Num. XXXI. 50; Job. XXXVI. 18; Prov. XIII. 8; Ps. XLIX. 8; comp. also Ex. XXI. 29, 30.

⁴ Num. XXV. 11—13; comp. Ps. CVI. 30, 31.

⁵ Job XLII. 8, 10.

⁶ Gen. XX. 7; Exod. VIII. 4, 5, 24, 25; IX. 28, 33; X. 17, 18; 1 Sam. XII. 19, 23; 2 Ki. VI. 20; 2 Ki. XIX. 4; Jer. VII. 16; XI. 14; XIV. 11; XLII. 2; Isai. LIII. 12.

⁷ Exod. XXX. 12—16; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 426—428.

⁸ Comp. Lev. X. 17.

of a victim put upon the altar or some other part of the Sanctuary;⁹ though in earlier times the burning of incense seems also to have been employed as an emblem of atonement.¹⁰

It is obvious that some of the means of propitiation just sketched, involve the idea of vicarious substitution but very remotely, others not at all; and the conclusion offers itself that indeed every expiatory sacrifice embodied the notion of vicarious suffering, but that expiation, especially in remoter periods, was possible through other means besides sin-offerings.

In the course of these explanations, we have been repeatedly led to touch upon the great Christian sacrifice, to which we shall now specially devote a few remarks suggested by an impartial and historical review of the subject.

XIX. THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE.

It is vain to assert that the Christian doctrine is in harmony with the teaching of the Pentateuch. The principle of vicarious atonement is indeed common to both. But the Law permits solely the substitution of animals, the New Testament asserts the vicarious suffering of one whom it conceives at once as a "perfect man" and "perfect God" — itself a notion utterly unhebrew. The former rejects the idea of hereditary sin and punishment, as has above been proved;¹¹ while the latter considers the transgression of the first man to exercise a fatal effect upon all posterity for ever, and to require atonement by the blood of the son of God; "by one man", declares the apostle Paul, "sin entered into the world, and death by sin; . . . death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression; . . . through the offence of one many are dead."¹² The Messiah of the Old Testament, a man¹³ and not created supernaturally, was not expected at all to work expiation of sins. The hopes of a deliverer were roused in times of public or political calamity; and as according to the commonly received law of retaliation, the misfortune was looked upon as the consequence of moral and religious depravity, so the rescue was deemed impossible without previous atonement through inward regeneration.¹⁴ But this regeneration is never, in the Old Testament, represented as the work of the Messiah, but of the Hebrews

⁹ Comp. Lev. XVII. 11.

¹⁰ Comp. Num. XVII. 11, 12.

¹¹ Deut. XXIV. 16 ("The fathers shall not be put to death for the children", etc.); see p. 195.

¹² Rom. V. 12—15; comp. IX. 3.

¹³ Comp. Isai. VII. 14; XI. 1; Jer. XXIII. 5; XXXIII. 15.

¹⁴ Comp. Lev. XXVI. 3—15; Isai. XL. 2; L. 1; Ps. I; XXXIV. 12—23; XCI;

themselves, who were trusted to abandon their evil and idolatrous ways, and to turn to God with all their hearts;¹ it was by the better and profounder minds not deemed to result from sacrifice or any ritual exercise;² though the indolent and frivolous may have looked forward to it as the spontaneous bestowal of the Messiah. Again, the Old Testament never connects with the Messiah the notions of suffering, misery, or violent death; on the contrary, it delineates him as the glorious and powerful king of a happy and virtuous world, the restorer of the former splendour of David's house, at once ruler, law-giver, and prophet:³ even so late a writer as Zechariah, when symbolically representing the High-priest Joshua as Messiah, places a golden and a silver crown upon his head, with the words, "Even he shall build the Temple of the Lord, and he shall bear the glory, and shall go and rule upon his throne."⁴ The redemption was, indeed, like every well-secured felicity, to be preceded by heavy struggles and convulsions:⁵ but these were the struggles and sufferings of the *age*, not of the *person* of the Messiah. Indeed later Judaism, though wavering on the subject, conceived the Messiah as undying,⁶ and as having been born many generations before, openly to appear at the appointed time. When after the destruction of the Temple, atonement was no longer possible through sacrifice, it was expected from the Messiah ready to take upon himself the suffering of the world; which doctrine, therefore, in this form, cannot date from a time prior to the final overthrow of the commonwealth. Again, as on the one hand, the time of the Messiah's advent was believed to be fixed, and yet, on the other hand, to depend on the people's abandonment of all wickedness, the idea was naturally conceived that he himself would bear and annul the sins which at that glorious epoch might yet stain the world. It was, at this period, when the Jews began to understand many passages of the Old Testament as referring to a *suffering* Messiah — the same texts, on the whole, which were so interpreted by Christians. Such views were indeed felt to involve a most glaring opposition to the

XII; Prov. III. 1—10, 16, 17, 32—35; IV. 16—19; X. 3, 6, 9, etc.; XI. 3—8, 17; Dan. IX. 24; etc. etc.

¹ See Isai. I. 25—27; Ezek. XXXVII. 21—24; Zechar. III. 9; XIII. 1; Dan. IX. 24; comp. Matth. III. 2.

² See Sect. IV.

³ Isai. II. 2—4; IV. 2—6; IX. 3; XI. 1—16; Ezek. XXXIV. 23—31; XXXVI. 24—30; XXXVII. 21—28; Hos. II. 18—25; III. 5; Am. IX. 11, 15; Mic. IV. 6—8, 12, 13; V. 1—8; Dan. VII. 13,

14; etc.; comp. also Bar. IV. 21—V. 9; Tob. XIII. 7—18; XIV. 4—7; 2 Esdr. XIII. 32—40; Luke I. 71; II. 32; Acts I. 6 (the apostles asked Christ, "wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?").

⁴ Zechar. VI. 9—13.

⁵ Zech. XII. 10; XIII. 7—9; Dan. XII. 1; they are called by the later Jews "the throes of the Messiah."

⁶ John XII. 34 (Isai. IX. 5).

teaching of the prophets; but in order to reconcile the one with the other, the singular expedient was, in the course of time, adopted, that "the Messiah, the son of David", would be preceded by another or an inferior "Messiah, the son of Joseph or Ephraim", who was considered as the deliverer of the ten tribes, and was supposed to fight against the enemies of Israel and defeat them, to restore a portion of the exiles to the holy land, but was at last to be killed in a war against Gog and Magog, in order to expiate the sins of the people by his blood: which notion of a double Messiah was probably recommended, if it was not originally suggested, by the desire of typifying the future reconciliation of Judah and Ephraim, and their friendly concord in a happier age. But the Messiah the son of Joseph is not yet alluded to in the Mishnah, nor in the Targum Jerusalem; he is first mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud and the later Targums, as Pseudo-Jonathan which was not written before the 6th or 7th century of the present era. Certain it is that the Jews at the time of Christ and the Apostles did not expect a Messiah who by his suffering and death would expiate the sins of the people: such a notion occurs neither in the Apocrypha, nor in the works of Philo and Josephus, nor even in the Mishnah — nay more, it was not familiar to the contemporaries of Christ according to the New Testament itself, which indeed hoped from Jesus expiation and remission of sins,⁷ but also deliverance of the Jews from their enemies, and the inauguration of a glorious political era,⁸ not through his degradation and death, but through his honour and victory.⁹ When the disciples heard of his impending suffering, they were embarrassed and perplexed,¹⁰ because they could not reconcile it with the current notion of a triumphant Redeemer.¹¹ Though he called himself the Messiah,¹² the character attributed to his mission by contemporary Jews differed widely from the Messiah described by earlier writers and expected in his time.¹³ He renounced the aspiration of worldly power, and confined himself to the sphere of morality, and to the task of spiritualizing the traditional faith. He was well aware of the persecutions which he and his adherents would

⁷ Matth. I. 21; Luke I. 77; John I. 29; etc.; see p. 194.

⁸ Luke I. 68—75; II. 30—32.

⁹ See *supra*. The passage Luke II. 35 ("yea. a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also") cannot, in harmony with the context, refer to a vicarious and expiatory death of Christ.

¹⁰ Mark IX. 31, 32; Luke XVIII. 32—34; XXIV. 20, 21; Matth. XVI. 21, 22; 1 Cor. I. 23; comp. also John XVI. 12.

¹¹ Comp. also Acts VIII. 30—35.

¹² Matth. XVI. 13—20; XXVI. 23, 24; John IV. 25, 26; XVII. 1—26; XVIII. 37; comp. Matth. XI. 4 *sqq.* (Isai. XXXV. 5, 6; LXI. 1; Luke IV. 18).

¹³ Comp. Luke II. 25, 26, 38 ("she spoke of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem"); John IV. 25 ("I know that the Messiah comes who is called Christ"); *Joseph. Bell. Jud. VI. v. 4.*

have to endure on account of notions so strange and so unwelcome to his countrymen,¹ who, therefore, might well be exempted from blame if they failed or found it difficult to understand his Messianic mission, especially as he did not, at least at first, wish it to be divulged on any account.² But the desire of maintaining his influence, and of contributing, if possible, to greater holiness of life, made it appear to him expedient to promise a *second advent*, when he would realise all the predicted Messianic glory, and would judge the living and the dead. At last, deceived in his expectations and broken by resistance, he saw no hope but in his death, which, sealing his convictions, might rouse his disciples to abandon all worldly thoughts and to strive after the kingdom of heaven alone.³ He easily found allusions to that death in the Hebrew Scriptures,⁴ since his life and fate resembled in many points the life and fate of persecuted Hebrew prophets.⁵ He was not unwilling to see his end accelerated by the fanaticism of the powerful religious sects which he had embittered by his more liberal teaching; and he proclaimed that he gave up his life for the expiation, and therefore for the happiness, of the world — a doctrine repeated and expanded by his apostles and followers:⁶ but it was, in some measure, inconsistent with his principle which, rejecting all external forms, declares "God is a spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth":⁷ for the sacrifice of a Messiah for the purpose of securing atonement is no less a sacrifice than an offering of "bulls and goats"; it is designed to effect by an outward act that which a truly spiritual faith works by the moral exertion of the sinner himself and alone.

XX. THE SACRIFICES OF THE HEBREWS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF OTHER NATIONS.

SURVEYING the Levitical system of sacrifices, we are bound to admit that, as a whole, it is judicious and thoughtful, simple yet comprehensive, clearly and plainly symbolical, broad and intelligible in its principles, coherent and consistent, and skilfully adapted both to the requirements of individuals and of a theocratic community. Avoiding

¹ Matth. X. 23; comp. V. 11, 12.

² Matth. XVI. 20 ("then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ").

³ Comp. Matth. XXIII. 37—39.

⁴ Matth. XVI. 21; XXVI. 21, 54, 56; Mark IX. 12; XIV. 49; Luke XVIII. 31—34; XXII. 22, 37; XXIV. 26, 27, 44—46; Acts III. 18, 24; XVII. 3; XXVI.

22, 23; 1 Pet. I. 10—12; comp. Hebr. XI. 36—38; Matth. XXIII. 29—32; John XII. 27; Dan. VII. 13; IX. 26; Isai. LII. 13—LIII. 12; Jer. II. 30; XI. 19; XV. 10—18; XX. 7—18; Neh. IX. 26.

⁵ Comp. Matth. XXI. 33—39; Luke XX. 9—15; Acts VII. 52.

⁶ See p. 194.

⁷ John IV. 24.

fantastic capriciousness of detail, it is untainted by that spirit of pedantry and hairsplitting triviality, often childish and often profane, which characterises its later Talmudical development; and it appears simple and moderate, if contrasted with the complicated rituals of other eastern nations, as the Hindoos and even the Persians. It is so pure in its conceptions of the Deity and of the nature of sin, that the critic is compelled to assign it to a very advanced stage in the history of the Hebrew mind,⁸ in which conclusion he is not shaken by that one noteworthy exception, the "offering of jealousy" elsewhere explained, which certainly recalls the heathen ordeals, but is not properly a sacrifice, and was, as regards its principal features, retained by the compilers of the Law in the form which it had received in the practice of the people.⁹ The Levitical system is indeed framed on the basis of tradition and the general usage of antiquity; but it is modified in accordance with the distinctive religious views of the Pentateuch, deeper, purer, and more spiritual than any anterior ceremonial, simplified in many respects, and enlarged in several significant points. Free from narrow-minded exclusiveness, it permits strangers also to approach the central Sanctuary with sacrifices, certainly holocausts and thank-offerings,¹⁰ and if the spirit of the law be considered, probably sin-offerings also, a law which seems to have been acted upon at all times,¹¹ and is reflected in the Messianic hopes of the age when all nations alike will worship and sacrifice in the Temple;¹² though the bigoted intolerance of later centuries laboured to confine the permission of strangers to burnt-offerings of pigeons alone. Nor can it fairly be represented as unduly splendid and expensive; it mainly requires materials which, in an agricultural and cattle-breeding country of singular fertility, were furnished in abundance and formed the property of every citizen; and it prescribes for the whole year not quite 1300 animals as public sacrifices, or in the average 3 or 4 daily.¹³

The chief characteristic of the sacrifices of different nations necessarily coincides with the chief characteristic of their various creeds, since sacrifices formed the centre and kernel of religious worship. Now the multiplicity of the heathen gods naturally engendered a multiplicity of sacrifices, whereas the unity of the God of Israel permitted no more than a few broad classes of offering judiciously suited to all occasions and emergencies. Again, the God of the Hebrews is not only

⁸ See pp. 35 *sqq.* ⁹ See Sect. XVI.

¹² Isai. LVI. 6, 7; comp., however,

¹⁰ Lev. XVII. 5; XXII. 18; Num. XV. 14—16, 29.

Zech. XIV. 21.

¹¹ Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 41—43; 2 Macc. III. 35; XIII. 23.

¹³ The exact numbers are specified in the larger edition of this work.

the Creator and all-powerful Ruler of the universe, "a personal lord of an impersonal world", totally distinct from it in essence and absolutely swaying it according to His will, but also the merciful Father of mankind. He does not merely govern matter in majestic distance, but He lovingly cares and provides for His creatures; He is an all-pervading Providence; He feels pity for the weakness of man, and therefore tempers His justice with compassion. The gods of other nations are deifications of nature or her powers; they represent production, preservation, or destruction; they mostly bear even sexual distinction; their attributes are identified with those of the world; they represent the influences or forces of the cosmos; for they are themselves emanations of primeval matter: far from governing, they are governed by unalterable laws; they are held in subjection either by inexorable Fate or by superior divinities; they form either a creed of pantheism, as in many eastern religions, or of simple polytheism, as in the theology of the Greeks and Romans; they may exact homage from man, but they cannot raise him above his state of nature.¹ Therefore the sacrifices of the Hebrews have a *moral or ethical*, those of other nations a purely *cosmical or physical* character; the former tend to work upon mind and soul, the latter upon fears and interests; the one strive to elevate the offerer to the sanctity of God, the other lower the gods to the narrowness and selfishness of man. We are far from denying the numerous analogies that exist between the theology of the Hebrews and of other nations, and we readily concede that sporadically most of the conceptions of the former are, in some shape, found among the latter; and that even the Hebrew notion of God or Jehovah has a remarkable parallel in "the Mind" (*Νοῦς*) of Anaxagoras, who defines this Mind as a spirit, infinite, all-knowing, existing before the world and all finite things, ruling the universe, yet distinct from it, as the absolute Master directing all things and pervading all, as simple, undivided, unchangeable, and without community with any thing, as an immaterial being, the governing and discerning principle, of a substance different from that of which all other things are formed, incorporeal, a soul and the principle of life: yet this "Mind" is very different from Jehovah, a personal God who allows no other deity beside Him, who not only preserves the world but judges mankind, who is "merciful and gracious, long-suffering, abundant in goodness, and full of truth"; therefore the perfect identity of the Anaxagorean Mind and the Hebrew Jehovah can be asserted and upheld only by strange and insufficient analogies.

Human sacrifices, sanctioned and regulated in the religious codes

¹ See Comm. on Gen. pp. 41—47; Comm. on Exod. pp. 140, 141.

of nearly every other people, could not possibly be permitted or legalised among the Hebrews from the moment that the foundations of their theology were established:² for among the heathens man was an integral part of material nature, among the Hebrews he was the reflex of God Himself, the Holy One, in whose image he was created; among the former the shedding of human blood, for the purposes of worship, was the highest form of piety, among the latter it was, under all circumstances, an abomination to be punished with death; children especially were, by the one, regarded as due to the deities that personified the productiveness of nature, by the others as a free gift and blessing from Him who bestows or withholds fruitfulness in accordance with His wisdom; sacrifices of children, and more especially of the firstborn, were, therefore, among the pagans a merit and a privilege, among the Hebrews a horror and a crime.

Again, the offerings of maiden virginity largely prevailed in many parts of middle Asia, in Babylon and Cyprus in honour of Bel and Mylitta; in Armenia, in honour of Anaitis, identical with Mylitta; in Syria and Cappadocia, the Pontus and other regions; they were sometimes, as is reported of the Locrians, vowed to Venus in times of distress, to be performed as thank-offerings for deliverance; but they were absolutely impossible among the Hebrews according to the doctrines of the Pentateuch, which did not recognise separate deities of generation, sexually distinct, but was, on the contrary, partially framed to oppose such conceptions, and necessarily recoiled from the idea of appointing the chastity of virgins a "firstfruit-oblation" to the Deity in the very precincts of His Sanctuary. The castration of the priests, extensively connected with the worship of Cybele and Attis, and rooted in the same class of notions, forms an analogous point of contrast. As the Pentateuch avoided everything that could even remotely be referred to a deification of the powers of nature, it ordained no *vernal sacrifices*, designed to implore fertility, and all but universal among ancient nations, especially the Egyptians, Hindoos, and Romans, and most of the northern tribes, nor sacrifices at other seasons of the year, to pray for productiveness of the soil, as among the Chinese: for the Passover, whatever its first origin, lost in the Law every trace of a cosmical sacrifice, and received, like the offerings of the Feast of Weeks and of Tabernacles, the meaning of a eucharistic gift.³ Nor does it sanction *nuptial sacrifices*, meant to plead for progeny, as was customary among the Greeks and others who, on the day before the marriage, offered sacrifices to the tutelary gods of matrimony. It appoints

² See Sect. XXIV.

³ See Sect. XVII.

no sacrifices for the dead performed among the heathens with the most peculiar ceremonies, in accordance with the supposed nature of the lower gods and the infernal abodes; although later, when the belief in resurrection became an article of faith among the Jews, these also offered sacrifices for the departed, which the pious praised as highly meritorious.¹ It evidently shuns all rituals that might be connected with phenomena of nature, or might recall pagan conceptions. It repudiates, in connection with sacrifices, above all *divination*, almost universal in the pagan world, whether the augury be sought in the entrails, the heart or liver, the bile or the lungs, all considered as bound up with the principle of life, in their shape, their appearance, and their movements, or in the fall or the death of the victim, or any other incident. It contains no analogy to usages like that of the Egyptians who, in some seasons, impressed upon the sacrificial cakes the image of a tied ass, and at other times, the image of a fettered hippopotamus, to intimate that Typhon to whom those unclean creatures were subject, had been conquered and enthralled. Nor does it exhibit an analogy to the far-spread custom observed both by men and women, of depositing their hair, or that followed by young men of devoting their curls carefully cultivated from boyhood and the "firstlings of their beards", in gold or silver boxes, at the temple of some deity as a symbol of self-sacrifice. Its principles both in the selection and qualification of victims and vegetable offerings are of a simplicity and judiciousness the more striking if contrasted with the confusion elsewhere obvious on the same points. It knows no distinctions like those familiar to the Greeks and Romans, who worshipped the "upper" gods on high structures or *altars*, the "lower" deities on grates or low hearths; sacrificed to the one by day, to the others by night; killed the victims of the one from above downwards, of the others from below upwards; sprinkled the blood, in the one case, on the altar, but made it, in the other, to flow into a pit; offered to the former "the things of the first or odd number", and to the latter "the things of an even number." It could not adopt the rule that the victim should, as much as possible correspond with the peculiar nature of the divinity to whom it was offered.² For among the heathens, the animal represented the *deity*, whence for instance *pregnant* cows were offered to Ceres in the spring, but *barren* ones to the spirits of the lower world,³ whereas in the system of Hebrew sacrifices, the animal represented the *worshipper*. It may

¹ 2 Macc. XII. 43—45 (on which passage the practice of *missae pro defunctis* has been based by the Catholic

Church); comp. Isai. LXV. 4; see Sect. XXII.

² See pp. 64, 65.

³ See pp. 102, 103.

be for this reason that the pagans frequently wreathed the sacrificial animals with garlands of flowers, and adorned them with the leaves of the plants sacred to the honoured deity, or that they gilt the horns of victims, especially bulls and cows, and sometimes their hoofs, exactly as they decked the statues of the gods with leaves and festoons. From a similar consideration perhaps, the Greeks laid particular stress upon the tractable bearing of the victim; they avoided dragging it to the altar by force; they desired to see it approach with a willingness that might be construed as an approbation of the deity; they regarded its bellowing at the altar, and still more its attempt at escape, as highly ominous; the priest delayed the act of killing till the animal by a movement of the head seemed to have plainly intimated assent; he frequently procured that movement by pouring water into the victim's ears; and at Delphi he waited till a trembling considered as divine seized the limbs of the animal. Thus certainly the usage of employing the entrails of the victim as a celestial oracle, is more intelligible: if the animal represented the deity, its vital organs could well be considered to possess a mystic significance and to disclose the will of heaven. And similarly the perpetual fire on the altars of the heathens was a symbol of the divinity itself, on that of the Hebrews it was the emblem of divine worship, of the people of God, or of the holy nation; and therefore among the former, the fire that consumed the victim was an augury, among the latter simply a means of presenting "the food of the Lord";⁴ in short, the offering was among the heathens designed to conciliate the power of the deity, among the Israelites to cleanse and to satisfy the mind of the suppliant; it was among the former, a direct appeal to superior beings, among the latter, virtually a means to a moral end. Therefore the notion of atonement differed widely among the heathens and the Hebrews: the former desired by their offerings, for instance after pestilence, drought, or internecine war, to restore the harmony of nature or the even current of events, which was, or was feared to be disturbed; the latter endeavoured to strengthen or to renew that inward unity with the Deity which, if felt, was considered the highest blessing, if lost, the direst curse of existence. The former knew no expiatory offerings in the deeper meaning, the latter sanctioned none in the worldly or outward sense. Agamemnon was required to sacrifice his daughter in order to appease the wrath of an offended goddess and thus to secure her favour and assistance for a national enterprise; Job offered expiatory holocausts for his children, because he deemed it possible that they had trespassed and slighted God in their hearts.

⁴ See Comm. on VI. 1—4.

A Hebrew sacrifice analogous to that of Agamemnon was indeed that of David when he "hung up before the Lord" seven descendants of Saul in alleged deference to the Gibeonites,¹ but that act of barbarity and astuteness has nothing in common with the spirit of the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch.² One of the most liberal and enlightened of heathen writers observes, "we honour the gods with sacrifices either to seek deliverance from misfortunes, or to secure benefits, or to prove our gratitude for blessings, or to obtain some advantage"; he adds indeed vaguely, that we may also do so "merely from respect for the goodness of their nature"; but sacrifices prompted by such motives, though unselfish and pious, do not necessarily bespeak contrition or penitence. Paganism, ultimately identifying creator and creature, and therefore merging the individual in the general life of the universe, seeks the cause of man's estrangement from the deity in the contrast that exists between the finite and the infinite; it knows therefore only sacrifices destined to effect the removal of physical or cosmical evils; but the Hebrew Law, conceiving both man and nature in absolute dependence on the Divine will, attributes that estrangement to human wickedness or sin, because its standard of virtue is the holiness of God, and it ordains therefore sacrifices to ensure the removal of moral evils purely as such. The heathens — and this is another most momentous difference — deemed it possible to propitiate the anger of the gods for whatever offence or crime; so that, for instance, the so called "blood-chapter" in Kalika-Purana specified the length of time during which, according to Hindoo sages, the various sacrifices were efficacious in securing the goodwill of the gods — fishes or a crocodile, whether their flesh or their blood, for one month, a wild ox or guana for one year, an antelope or wild boar for twelve years, the wild sarabhas for five and twenty, the rhinoceros, buffalo, or tiger for a hundred, and a lion, a stag, or a man for a thousand years. The Hebrews, as a rule, admitted expiatory offerings for undesigned sins only, and held intentional transgressions resulting from impious contumacy to lie beyond the sphere of the altar; the majesty of the law inexorably demanded justice, but the holiness of God mercifully received again into His community those who had forfeited that holiness unwittingly.

Therefore, among the heathens, the principal act in the sacrificial ritual was the killing of the animal; among the Hebrews, the sprinkling of the blood had peculiar importance; the former approached the deity mainly with a view of deliverance from punishment, which was borne by the slaughtered animal; the latter chiefly with the hope of

¹ 2 Sam. XXI. 1—9.

² See Sect. XXIII.

internal purification, which was attained by putting the blood upon the parts of the Sanctuary symbolising Divine presence and mercy. And yet, among heathens, the blood was almost synonymous with sacrifice, because it was the chief part devoted to the gods; among the Hebrews, it was no more than a principal feature; it was indeed of paramount importance in expiatory offerings; but in holocausts it was subordinate to the consumption of the body by the flames, in thank-offerings to the burning of the fat and the fat parts; it had in these two classes of sacrifice force and significance chiefly in as much as they shared the expiatory character, which, however, they did but collaterally and indirectly. The blood was not in itself considered divine, as was necessarily the case among pagan nations which supposed the victim to represent the deity; it was holy in so far only as it pointed to the life of the offerer, who sought safety and sanctity by surrendering another life; it was in every respect a symbol, it had no real power, since man was regarded as a creature essentially different from the victim towards which he occupied no close or cosmical relation, the one being merely a living breath, the other a reflex of God Himself. The bloody sacrifices were certainly regarded as most valuable, but the bloodless offerings were in every way deemed as acceptable from those who could afford no more; and on many important occasions, both private and public, they were prescribed not as mere substitutes, but as the regular and ordinary oblations. The Hebrew name for offering means simply *gift*, and includes indifferently the bloody and the bloodless kinds.³

Again, those two classes of sacrifice which manifest the highest degree of self-abnegation and of humility, the holocausts and the expiatory offerings, were particularly frequent and indeed predominated among the Hebrews, while they occupied a very subordinate place among most other nations, and were all but unknown among many. The latter presented offerings more generally either to conciliate the favour of the deity, or to express gratitude and joy for benefits received; they were actuated by worldly considerations; they looked to the promotion of their material welfare only; they followed the dictates of necessity and often the impulses of covetousness. The prayers which accompanied the sacrifices of the Hindoos mostly concerned temporal and selfish boons, such as life, posterity, wealth, annihilation of enemies, especially the destruction of the followers of other creeds, or protection against evil spirits. Not unfrequently they attributed to the sacrifices magical powers which compelled the deity, even against its will, to grant the demanded favours.

³ See Sect. V.

It is indeed highly probable that burnt-offerings formed a very early, if not the earliest class of sacrifice even among the rudest and most untutored nations; they must almost exclusively have prevailed among those who regarded the sacrifices as presents or as food offered to the gods; and they have thus been characterised by ancient and modern writers. Consequently they are indeed occasionally met with in heathen literature; as among the Boeotians, on the festival of the great Daedala celebrated every sixty years; among the tribes in and near Titane, not far from the Asopus, where the entire animals, whether bulls, lambs, or pigs, were burnt to Aesculapius; or in Patrae at the festival of Artemis Laphria, when animals of every kind, as wild boars, stags, and roes, wolves and bears, were thrown alive into the flames, presenting a horrid spectacle of agony; or in Persia, where the elder Cyrus, on occasions of peculiar splendour, is stated to have offered holocausts of bulls to the highest god and holocausts of horses to the Sun; or among the Carthaginians, in whose name Hamilcar, during a fierce battle with the army of Syracuse, burned on a large pyre the entire bodies of the victims; the Athenian citizens seem indeed to have been in the habit of offering holocausts of hogs, especially to Zeus Meilichios, the Atoner; yet they did so merely for personal advantage and in emergencies of special distress; and in a similar spirit they annually in the month of November appeased Jupiter Maimaktes as god of Tempests by a ram burnt entire, to avert the evil effects of the storms. But if we except offerings to the dead or to the deities and shades of the nether world, holocausts were only presented in isolated instances; they are not mentioned at all in Homer; in the historical times we find that some inconsiderable parts of the victim were deemed sufficient for the gods, while the chief portions remained for the use of the worshippers to be consumed in convivial repasts. So the Greeks burnt ordinarily, besides the hair that grows between the horns, only the thigh-bones, on which often but little flesh was left, and certain parts of the intestines enveloped in fat and covered with flour, because, as some ancient authorities assert, the thighs conduce to the power of generation, and are therefore justly burnt to the gods who bestow it, though sometimes small portions of all the limbs were added covered with fat, and in later times the liver, the heart, and some parts not suitable for human consumption. The Romans, following nearly the same sacrificial rites and customs as the Greeks, burnt the intestines (*exta*) if declared favourable by the *haruspex*, and portions of the limbs spread over with the dough of kneaded spelt-flour or strewed with barley-meal; or they dedicated to the deity the skin of the victim suspending it in the temple

or throwing it over the statue of the god. Concerning the Babylonians the apocryphal epistle of Jeremiah remarks, that their priests sold and employed the sacrifices for their own use, or that their wives "laid up a part of them in salt." The Phoenicians, though reported to have primitively burnt the sacrifice entirely, in later times consumed the larger portions of it themselves. The Scythians devoted to the gods "the first-fruits of the flesh and entrails." Among the Persians, who shunned all burnt-offerings as offences against the sacred element of fire, nothing except a little fat was set apart for the deity that was believed to require only the soul of the animal which dwells in its blood.

The Israelites, on the contrary, presented burnt-offerings so constantly and so numerously that strangers might well consider and represent them as their *only* class of sacrifice, which fact is the more significant as their holocausts obviously partook of the character of sin-offerings. And yet so anxious were the framers of the Levitical code not to imperil the fundamental doctrines of the Law that, whilst the heathens generally presented their firstling-sacrifices, wherever they did so systematically, as holocausts, because they offered them in submissive reverence to the productive powers of nature, the Hebrews, lest they should be misled into pagan notions, were commanded to dedicate them to the Deity as thank-offerings in commemoration of a glorious epoch of national redemption.

Again, some instances of expiatory sacrifices among pagans appear indeed to be recorded. It is true that the Egyptians presented sin-offerings rather than thank-offerings, but they were induced to offer them not from an impulse of penitence or a conviction of unworthiness, but from fear and servile awe, to avert a dreaded punishment or to expiate it. Brahmah's "sacrifice of creation", when calling forth the universe, is represented as a sin-offering; but the legend on the subject is too singular and fantastic to be of practical influence or moral value; and that sacrifice, like its anti-type, the horse-offering or Aswamedha, embodies a metaphysical speculation in cosmogony rather than an ordinance to regulate a religious life. The sacrifices offered to Kali, the goddess of destruction and punishment, have indeed an expiatory character, but, "as her revenge consists in being all-devouring time, the expiation is not of an ethical but a cosmic nature, aiming at the conciliation of the finite and transitory with the infinite and eternal." The laws of Manu, sanctioning an older arrangement of the sages, direct the propitiation of the gods for involuntary sins possibly committed, by the daily performance of the five great sacraments; but they leave it indistinct how far this ordinance was prompted by fear or how far

by a yearning after purity of mind. The great bull-sacrifice offered to Mithras, the mediator between Ormuzd and Ahriman, was certainly an expiatory offering; but it was presented to atone for the original sin of Ahriman, who, by killing the world-creating or primeval bull, called forth the evils of nature. Similar results will be apparent from an analysis of other alleged cases of pagan offerings of atonement. Among the Greeks, they were not even, like the other classes of sacrifice, deemed to form a necessary part of divine worship, nor an essential condition of piety. Severed from the higher aspirations of the soul, they were powerless for elevation and ennoblement which might at least result from holocausts and sin-offerings prompted by a sincere conviction of the heart's sinfulness and an anxious desire of confessing it. The heathens held indeed the notion of the *goodness* of the gods to whom they owed all useful gifts, but they were strangers to the notion of the *holiness* of the Deity, which forms the centre of Hebrew theology; they presented therefore indeed thank-offerings, but could not be familiar with true sin-offerings in which the system of the Hebrews culminated. They looked upon moral evil simply as the result of human weakness; whereas the Hebrews viewed it in humble contrast to Divine perfection. They entertained and uttered principles directly opposed to those which give birth to expiatory sacrifices; they encouraged proud self-consciousness, and praised it as virtuous and divine; "as it behoves Zeus", observes Chrysippus, "to know that he is great in himself and in his life, and to speak highly of his own worth, . . . so it behoves all good men to do the like, convinced that Zeus is not superior to them"; and with still higher pride and moral self-sufficiency, Aristotle remarks, "magnanimous is he who estimates his own worth highly; for he who makes too low an estimate of it, is a fool."

Moreover, the sacrifices of the Hebrews were distinguished by greater earnestness and solemnity; the imposition of the hand, the burning of the whole or of a part of the victim on the altar, and above all the sprinkling of the blood so significantly appointed and varied, nay the very meals in the holy place, whether held by the priests "to remove the sin of the people", or by the Israelites with their households and their poorer guests, all these rites, rigidly fixed and enforced, and partly carried out by the suppliant himself, were designed to fill his mind with awe and reverence, and no doubt produced those feelings as perfectly as the gross form of worship by sacrifice in any way permitted. Thus Theophrastus could be misled into the error of asserting that the Jews fasted whenever they sacrificed, and that they used at their oblations much honey, so extensively employed at the heathen offerings for the dead,

Sacrifices were deemed so essential among the Hebrews, that scarcely any holy or solemn act, or any important event or occurrence was left without them; for they were meant not only to satisfy the religious wants of individuals, but to foster an active and healthful communion between God and the whole chosen people — between the Ruler who grants boons and pardon and the nation that looks to Him as the source of all power and holiness.

XXI. ON HUMAN SACRIFICES IN GENERAL.

As sacrifices primitively originated in the desire to conciliate the gods by offerings held dearest and most precious, it cannot be surprising to find that, for a long time, human sacrifices were nearly co-extensive with sacrifices in general. Not content with presenting their choicest property, whether animate or inanimate, untutored nations slaughtered in honour of their deities human beings prized as the noblest work of creation, and in many respects kindred with the gods themselves. It may be that very rude tribes, steeped in ignorance and barbarism, regarded the immolated men actually as food laid before their divinities, since all oblations were commonly looked upon in the same light: thus Bacchus was believed to delight in the raw flesh of human victims, who in Chios and Tenedos were offered to him cut into pieces. Again, several nations may have sacrificed men because they were themselves in the habit of eating human flesh, and people usually shared with their gods their most delicious food. Nor is it quite impossible that some tribes introduced the custom of human sacrifices at first in times of distressing famine or hopeless siege, when necessity and despair led them to taste the flesh of their dead or killed fellow-men; and that then, having acquired for it an unconquerable appetite, they offered it to their gods as the most exquisite dainty. But all these motives can have operated in exceptional cases only. As a rule, men offered up their fellow-beings, because they regarded them as the "finest of all sacrifices" or "the best of all seeds", as the noblest, most acceptable and most perfect means of divine veneration. For human sacrifices prevailed most among communities that had considerably advanced on the path of civilisation and had commenced to speculate on the subtler problems of religion. They were not merely presented on account of their awful grandeur or their heroic self-denial, but because man was conceived as the most superior part of creation, as an epitome of universal life, which he represents in its highest and richest form, or as a "microcosmos." Thus closely connected with the centre of paganism, and expressing, in an intensified manner, the deepest of the current

views on the nature of the gods and on their relation to mankind, they were not at once abolished as refinement advanced; they could in fact vanish only with paganism itself. It is, therefore, a matter of singular interest to survey the extent to which human victims were slain, and to examine the motives which prompted and the emergencies which claimed them: such enquiry, forming an instructive no less than melancholy chapter in the history of human aberrations, strikingly illustrates the fearful enormities to which religious zeal, however earnest and single-minded, is liable, unless guided by enlightened thought. We shall thus have an opportunity not only of completing our sketch on sacrifices, but of examining the question, much debated even in our time, whether and in what degree human sacrifices were practised by the Hebrews.

1. THE OCCASIONS ON WHICH THEY WERE OFFERED.

The paramount sacredness attached to human sacrifices is manifest from the fact that, though presented for nearly every religious purpose, they were chiefly chosen for expiatory offerings. They formed, therefore, in many lands, an essential part of the public or state worship. Based upon the belief that propitiation of the gods is necessary even if individual offences be not manifest, they were repeated at regular intervals, to expiate the guilt that might rest on the nation, and to mark a new phase in the religious life of the community. They are therefore indeed found to be most prevalent among savage and barbarous tribes: the Thracians and Scythians immolated men chiefly to Diana; the Bassari in Thrace who came into contact with the Taurians and imitated their habits, ate the flesh of the men they sacrificed, and are said to have thereby been maddened to such sanguinary rage that they attacked and devoured each other; among the Zulus in Zululand "human victims are, on certain occasions, either killed or buried alive"; and the kings of Dahomey solemnise their "annual customs", to provide the departed monarchs, who are supposed to be present at the ceremonies, with fresh attendants in the lower world — a practice founded on a purely religious basis, designed as a sincere manifestation of the king's filial piety, sanctioned by long usage, upheld by a powerful priesthood, and believed to be closely bound up with the existence of the commonwealth of Dahomey itself. Human offerings were no less frequent among semi-barbarous nations: the Dumatheni in Arabia sacrificed a girl every year and buried her under the altar, and the star-worshippers in the same country adored Mars in a temple of red colour and offered to him, with blood-stained garments, a warrior by throwing him into a pit; the Gauls followed the rite to a very considerable extent, chiefly in honour

of Hestus (Mars) and Tentot (Mercury); the old Teutons, generally sparing in offerings, presented, on certain days, human victims to Wodan (Mercury); the Semnones, the most powerful section of the Suevi, and the Frieses slaughtered a man annually at their chief festival; the Redarii, a Slavonic tribe, worshipped their principal deity Radegast not only with bulls and sheep, but with men: the Pomeranians, at their harvest feast, immolated to their god Swantowit a stranger kidnaped for the purpose; the old Swedes, every nine years, on the great national festival celebrated for nine days, offered nine male animals of every chief species, together with one man daily; the Danes, assembling every nine years in their capital Lederun, sacrificed to their gods 99 horses, 99 dogs, 99 cocks, 99 hawks, and 99 men; and the Mexicans, on the festival of the great Tlaloc, drowned a boy and a girl in a lake, while, on other occasions, they shut up three boys in a cavern and left them there to die of starvation. But the hideous custom took also root among nations capable of a higher civilisation: the Egyptians annually during the dog-days burnt alive in the town of Ilythia (i. e. Lucina) red-haired men, called Typhonic, and scattered their ashes in the air; and in Heliopolis they are reported to have for many generations killed daily three men at the altar of Juno; the Hindoos regularly sacrificed some of their fellow-men to Narayana and to Kali, the awful personification of the destructive and avenging power of Shiva, though the laws of Manu never mention human sacrifices; many Asiatic tribes presented them in the service of Mithra, the god of the Sun; the Phoenicians and most of their colonists, especially the Carthaginians, practised the burning of their children to Saturn (Cronos or Moloch) to a frightful extent, besides killing human sacrifices generally; the Syrians in Laodicea offered every year a virgin to Minerva, the people of Falerii in Etruria one to Juno, the Phocaeans a man to Artemis Tauropolos, the Salaminians to Agraulos the daughter of Cecrops, and later to Diomedes, the Cretans and Rhodians to Saturn, the people of Chios and Tenedos to Dionysos Omadios, the Cyprians from the time of Teucer to Jupiter, the inhabitants of the island of Leucas to Apollo, others to Neptune as a propitiatory offering, the Lacedaemonians to Mars, and the Athenians to Zeus, and after the time of Lykaon to Apollo, in whose honour, on the great expiatory solemnities of the Thargelia, or summer festival, whether annually or only in times of misfortune and danger, two persons usually called healers or purifiers, and fed for the purpose by the state, one on behalf of the men and the other on behalf of the women, the one with a garland of black, and the other of white figs round the neck, were led out of the town to the

sound of flutes and with the recital of penitential hymns, and beaten on the way with rods of fig-wood, and then either hurled down from rocks, or burnt as a lustration-sacrifice, on funeral piles, and their ashes thrown into the sea and scattered to the winds.

But if some great transgression seemed likely to provoke the wrath of the gods, human sacrifices were at any time offered as an extraordinary atonement. They were deemed particularly essential when the offence was public and concerned the whole community. The Athenians, having been afflicted by a plague which they believed to be owing to the pollution contracted in the matter of Cylon, Epimenides purified the town by immolating two young men, Cratinus and Ctesilius, who had offered themselves spontaneously. The Athenians sent every year seven young men and seven virgins to Crete as a tribute, designed to propitiate the gods for the murder of Androgeus the son of Minos. The inhabitants of Potniac in Boeotia, who in the excitement of drunkenness had slain a priest of Dionysus, and were subsequently visited by a pestilence, sacrificed annually a fine youth by command of the Delphic oracle. When the Carthaginians, at the siege of Agrigentum in Sicily, destroyed many graves that obstructed their military operations, and were about the same time visited by a virulent epidemic, the general Hamilcar (or Imilco) appeased the gods by sacrificing "according to the paternal custom" a boy to Cronos. When, at Rome, two Vestal virgins had been convicted of unchastity (in B. C. 217), the books of fate directed that for atonement a Gallic man and woman and a Greek man and woman, be let down alive in the cattle-market, into a place fenced round with stone and already before used for human sacrifices.

Similar offerings were presented when a glaring crime had been committed, especially against a deity, by a family or an individual, because it was believed to expose the whole community to divine punishment. As Athamas, the son of Aeolus, had planned the death of his son Phrixus, the oracle commanded that the eldest of his race should, as an expiation, be invariably immolated to Zeus if he entered the prytaneum of his town Alos in Achaia. When Athamas himself was to be sacrificed as an atonement for his intended crime, Cytissorus, the son of Phrixus, rescued him, for which reason his descendants became liable to the same penalty. The story of Agamemnon and his daughter Iphigenia at once occurs to every reader. At Patrae in Achaia, Komae-the, a priestess of Artemis, and Melanippus impiously disgraced the temple of the goddess; to appease her wrath when the town was smitten with famine and disease, the two offenders, and then annually the finest virgin and the finest youth, were sacrificed to her honour.

At a military sedition, Caesar ordered two of the soldiers to be publicly killed as expiatory offerings by the high-priest and the priest of Mars, and fixed their heads before the Regia Martis.

As calamities were believed to be the consequence of sins committed against the gods, and therefore to require expiation, human sacrifices were offered to ensure the cessation of signal public disasters. They were frequently resorted to in times of war or pestilence. They were, in such emergencies, presented by the Greeks, and also by the old Italic tribes, especially the Sabines, when they celebrated the so-called "holy spring", and all domestic animals and all children that had been born between the beginning of March and the end of April, were devoted to the gods; in Egypt, where persons with red hair, the colour of Typhon, were burnt; among the Phoenicians, the Gauls, and various other nations. So deeply rooted was this custom that even Origen expressed the opinion, that at periods of national misfortune the Deity may be best appeased by the voluntary death of some pious man.

From such conceptions there is but a small step to the belief that *impending* dangers may be *averted* by presenting to the gods the most precious offering which it is in the power of man to bestow. Hence the Greeks, up to the time of the Peloponnesian war, are reported to have sacrificed a man when they marched out upon a military expedition; and though this practice may not have been regularly carried out or universally adopted, an apparently historical account relates that Themistocles was compelled, before the battle of Salamis, both by the advice of the priest and the impetuous demand of the people, to sacrifice three Persians to Dionysos Omados. Menelaus, when detained in Egypt by adverse winds, is said to have seized two children and to have sacrificed them. Phrixus, the son of Athamas and Nephele, was to be killed on the altar of Jupiter to avert the scourge of a dearth. When Erechtheus, the king of Athens, was at war with the Eleusians aided by Eumolpus, the son of Poseidon, the oracle promised him the victory if he devoted one of his four daughters to Persephone, and when he had slaughtered the youngest of them, the three others killed themselves spontaneously as a sacrifice. Similarly Marius, having been defeated by the Cimbrians, received in a dream the assurance of success if he sacrificed his daughter Calpurnia; he did so, and routed his enemies. When Idomeneus, the celebrated Cretan leader before Troy, returned home, and a great storm arose at sea, he vowed to Poseidon to sacrifice to him whatever he should meet first on his landing; he saw his own son first, and he offered him to the god; but the legend — evidently of a later origin — adds that Crete was, in consequence of that sacrifice,

visited by a plague, and that the Cretans expelled Idomeneus from the island. When after the conclusion of the first Punic war, the Gauls and other foreign tribes threatened to deluge Italy with their hosts, the Romans, acting upon the directions of the Sibylline books, buried a Greek man and woman and a Gallic man and woman alive in the cattle-market. In fact, it was laid down as a general rule that the civil or military chief of Rome was permitted to dedicate to the gods before a battle any soldier he might select. Decius declared, "It is the privilege of our family to serve as expiatory offerings for averting public dangers." Nero, to escape the calamities supposed to be foreshadowed by the portentous appearance of a comet, killed as an expiation the most illustrious men of Rome. Whenever the Gauls were troubled by imminent dangers or harassed by anxieties, they sacrificed or vowed to the gods human victims, believing "that the deity would not be satisfied for the life of one man without the death of another;" on such occasions some of their tribes constructed gigantic figures of osiers, and filled them with men, and then set them on fire. When, at the approach of Antigonus, the auguries taken from the entrails of the sacrificial animals, were alarmingly unfavourable, the Gauls, to propitiate the gods, killed their wives and children. The old Saxons, before entering upon an expedition vowed every tenth captive as a sacrifice, and redeemed their promise with great pomp. The Goths thought victory in battle impossible, unless they had before offered a human sacrifice. The Prussians, previous to commencing an engagement, offered through their high-priest (Criwe) an enemy to their gods Pikollos and Potrimpos. And the inhabitants of the Tonga islands immolate a child when there is dangerous illness in the family, while in less serious cases the members of the house cut off a part of their little finger as an atonement to the gods. But the most remarkable instance is that related in the second Book of Kings (II. 26, 27). When Mesha, king of Moab, was severely pressed and besieged in Kir-Haraseth by the Israelites and their allies, he sacrificed publicly on the walls of the town his firstborn-son and heir; and when the Hebrews witnessed this act, they withdrew from the city in dismay; which narrative unmistakably proves the notion of the supreme efficacy of human sacrifices in counteracting dangers to have not only been entertained by the Moabites, but shared by the Hebrews in the ninth century.

If victims generally were considered instrumental in ascertaining the issue of uncertain events, *human* victims were deemed especially fitted to disclose the hidden future. They were, therefore, in extraordinary cases employed for divination. The Gauls took their auguries for

many ages from the fall of a slaughtered man, from the convulsions of his limbs and the flow of his blood, and a similar practice is stated to have been resorted to by many ancient nations.

The same means of worship by which disasters were supposed to have been obviated, were naturally employed for evincing gratitude when deliverance had been effected. Human victims formed, therefore, not unfrequently the thank-offering after happy events and successful wars. Sextus Pompejus, having landed in safety after a violent storm at sea, ordered men to be thrown alive into the waves, together with their horses, as an oblation to Neptune. The people of Argos, after having taken Mycenae, dedicated every tenth inhabitant to the gods. After the victory over L. Antonius and the capture of Perusia, Augustus is related to have sacrificed 300 senators and knights on the altar of Caesar as an offering of atonement. The Carthaginians, having defeated Agathocles, burnt by night the finest prisoners as a eucharistic offering to the gods. At the conclusion of campaigns, the Assyrians offered captive soldiers to their god of war Nergal. After the battle of the Teutoburg forest, the Cherusci sacrificed a large number of prisoners, and suspended their bodies on trees. The Saxons, after their war with Charlemagne, killed on the holy Harz-mountain all the Frankish prisoners in honour of their god Wodan.

Next to expiation and thanks-giving, human sacrifices were most frequently offered in commemoration of the dead; and they are so met with in the most different countries and ages. It may be doubtful, whether the Egyptian kings in early times sacrificed foreigners at the grave of Osiris, since Herodotus distinctly denies it. Nor is it quite certain whether the custom of consigning to the grave of departed persons their best and most attached friends can in all cases be looked upon in the light of a sacrifice, since it seems frequently to have possessed a different meaning. In Dahomey, in former times, the moment the death of the king was reported in the palace, the women began to kill themselves and one another, because the sovereign must enter Dead-land with royal state, accompanied by some of his wives and eunuchs, singers and bards, drummers and soldiers; the greatest number was 500 persons; and this custom prevailed through the African continent to the south-eastern country of the Cazembe, and in many parts, where a much larger number of human victims was demanded; at present, the Dahomans celebrate after the death of the king "the grand customs", distinguished by greater splendour and bloodshed than the "annual customs"; those held in 1791 lasted for three months, from January to March, when no less than 500 men, women and children fell victims to

the detestable superstition. Of many analogous instances we shall only adduce a few more. In Maabar, a province of India, it was usual upon the death of a king and when his body was burnt, for all his devoted servants to throw themselves into the same fire, "intending by this act to bear him company in another life." Similarly the Scythians, at the funeral obsequies of their monarch, buried together with him in one grave his favourite wives after they had been strangled, his cup-bearer, a cook, a groom, a page, a messenger, and horses, besides many valuable objects; and after the lapse of a year, they sacrificed to him, under peculiar ceremonies, 50 of his best servants and 50 of his finest horses. A similar motive must perhaps be attributed to the fearful usage of burning the wives in the funeral pile of their husbands, a usage which obtained among the Wends, the Heruli, among most of the Thracian tribes, where the wife supposed to have been most beloved by her husband, was slain on his tomb by her own nearest relation, having been glorified both by men and women for a distinction eagerly desired by all wives, and especially among the Hindoos. That practice is hardly, as has been maintained, of purely social origin, to prevent the wives from poisoning their husbands, for in some instances the sisters of the husband devoted themselves to the flames; much less was it prompted by the avariciousness of the priests coveting the jewels with which the widow was decked, for she burnt herself with all her ornaments. However, the custom, which is not of very early date among the Hindoos, as it is neither mentioned in the Vedas nor in the code of Manu, was not by far so universal as has frequently been asserted. It was limited by numerous conditions. First the act was to be completely and absolutely spontaneous, not urged even by persuasion either on the part of the relatives or priests. If the widow refused, she was by no means regarded to have disgraced herself, but continued to enjoy general respect provided she carried out certain ascetic exercises, was zealous in piety, charity, and prayer, and remained single and strictly chaste; though, of course, the wife who followed her husband in death, was extolled by fervent praises, and cheered by promises of eternal felicity, for she was believed to purify not only her consort, had he even been guilty of the blackest crimes, but also his and her own paternal and maternal ancestors. Again, the rite was interdicted by most sects, if the widow, at the death of her husband, happened to be in another town, since both were to be burnt on the same pile; or if she was at the time unclean or pregnant, or believed to be so, or had little children who required her care. If all these circumstances be considered, it will be admitted that the usage was not so awful in reality as it is in principle; that,

in fact, the "martyrs of that superstition have never been numerous", as Colebrooke observes, who, writing in 1795, adds, "it is certain that the instances of the widows' sacrifices are now rare; on this it is only necessary to appeal to the recollection of every person residing in India, how few instances have actually occurred within his knowledge." But the idea of an offering of expiation performed for departed relatives or friends, appears distinctly among the Greeks and Romans. Achilles threw into the funeral pile of Patroclus, not only numerous cattle and horses and two dogs, nor only jars with honey and oil, but also twelve Trojans. Polyxena was sacrificed to the manes of Achilles. Alexander the Great killed on his father's tomb the accomplices in his murder, in order to propitiate his shades. And Amestris, the wife of Xerxes, ordered twelve men to be buried during her life-time to render the Hades propitious to herself. At Rome the bowels of slaughtered boys seem occasionally to have been offered to the gods of the lower world. But more frequent, as sacrifices for the dead, were gladiatorial combats, in which, if none of the fighters died on the spot, at least blood was required to flow. So the three sons of Aemilius Lepidus (in B. C. 217) caused 22 pairs of gladiators to fight for three days at the funeral games of their father; and somewhat later Titus Flaminius evinced his filial affection by instituting for three days a combat of 71 men.

But human sacrifices were, besides, offered on any extraordinary occasion to which a paramount importance was attached. The Getae in Thrace were in the habit of despatching every fifth year one of their number as a messenger to Zalmoxis, their teacher and law-giver, with orders to let him know their wants and wishes: the man appointed by lot was thrown into the air and made to fall upon the points of three javelins; if he was transfixcd and died, the deity was supposed to be propitious, if not he was accused of wickedness and considered to have been rejected by the god. Similarly in Dahomey, whenever the monarch deems it desirable to convey to his forefathers an account of his actions or of the events of the day, however trivial and frivolous, he sends a messenger to them by chopping off his head, in which manner at least a thousand victims fall annually; and at times, he sends, as an ocean sacrifice, from Agbome a man carried in a hammock with the dress, the stool, and the umbrella of a cabocceer; a canoe takes him out to sea, where he is thrown to the sharks.

We believe therefore there is no need of additional proofs to show that human sacrifices were among ancient nations very generally deemed the most precious and the most acceptable oblations that could be presented to the deity.

2. THE PERSONS SELECTED.

As human sacrifices, like all other offerings, were prized in proportion to the self-denial which they involved, *self-immolation* was regarded as the highest and most glorious offering, since man cannot manifest his earnestness and religious devotion more strikingly than by delivering up his own life to move the will of the gods. In the war of the seven Argives against Thebes under the leadership of Polyneices, Teiresias or the Delphic oracle prophesied the victory to the Thebans if Menoeceus, the chaste son of Creon, would sacrifice himself for the welfare of the country to Mars incensed on account of the slaughter of the sacred dragon by Cadmus; and Menoeceus accordingly killed himself outside the gates of the town. When the Athenians under king Theseus waged war against the Peloponnesians under Eurystheus because they refused to deliver up the children of Hercules, they received from the oracle the assurance of conquest if one of the hero's offspring devoted himself to Demeter; upon which Macaria the daughter of Hercules and Deianira offered herself spontaneously. The two Greeks, who at the purification of Athens by Epimenides gave themselves up as expiatory offerings, were revered as the rescuers of the city. Even the death of Leonidas at Thermopylae was later conceived as a spontaneous sacrifice for the safety of Greece in consequence of a divine oracle. The Decii and M. Curtius were for their pious heroism glorified as the saviours of their country. When in a battle of the Carthaginians against the Syracusans, the victory seemed to incline to the enemy, Hamilcar threw himself into the flames to propitiate the gods. Antoninus, the page of the emperor Hadrian, has made his memory famous by precipitating himself into the Nile, because he believed that his death would secure the success of his master's schemes. In all parts of India, at the processions of the image of Juggernaut, enthusiasts threw themselves under the colossal chariot which carried the god, to be crushed by the ponderous wheels, either in fulfilment of a vow, or to appease the deity; and though this practice may not be of very early origin, since it is neither mentioned by ancient writers nor later travellers, it obtains to this day, at Orissa, Serampore, and elsewhere, under the very eyes of the British authorities, and it is so difficult to eradicate chiefly on account of the prevailing conviction that the victim, had he even committed the foulest crime, becomes spotless, yea is changed into the god Shiva himself, and through many ages enjoys divine bliss and honour. An eye-witness, giving an account of the festival which took place at Serampore on the 6th of July 1864, describes the chariot as a vast house of wood seventy feet high and twenty square,

rising tier above tier to the idol's throne, and loaded at every stage with Brahmins and gigantic figures. The chariot "crushed out a life with every revolution of its hideous wheels, covered as they were with human flesh and gore...The Brahmins looked down from the car upon the poor wretches with perfect unconcern, and were even signalling the crowd to pull again." The voluntary death of the Hindoo wives on the demise of their husbands, has above been commented upon. Among the old Prussians, the custom prevailed that the high-priest, having attained a certain age, burnt himself for the weal of the people. A different character must be ascribed to the instances of self-destruction sanctioned by the tenets of the stoics, when life seemed to be a burden or a disgrace, or by the doctrines of the Hindoo sages, who, although denouncing suicide as a rule, deem it a most meritorious act to end an ignoble life of disease or decrepitude by the sacred and purifying flames or waves which secure to the sufferer immediate admission into heaven: it suffices to allude to the story of Cabanus (originally Sphinas, the happy), the Indian friend of Alexander the Great, and to that of Zarmanochegas (that is, the holy) of Barygaza, who lived at Athens in the time of Augustus; and, in the year 166 of the present era, the convert Peregrinus followed their example. In fact, pious Christians believed martyrdom to be the noblest form of sacrifice. This was the opinion of Origen; its harmony with the spirit of Christianity is proved by the example of Jesus himself; and a modern theologian writes, "He who, under circumstances, cannot become a martyr, thereby shows that his whole worship has been hollow and empty, and that he was never in earnest with regard to the holocaust so strongly demanded by the Law of God. Whoever has been in earnest, sees in martyrdom nothing but the manifestation of a principle which had ever lived within him."

Next to self-immolation the most valued sacrifice was that of the *dearest relation*. Therefore, the Phoenicians and all those who adopted their religious doctrines and rites, burnt their *children* to Moloch, a custom which prevailed to an almost incredible extent, and which took deep root among the Hebrews also. All children so sacrificed were naturally required to be healthy and well-formed; but the offering was regarded particularly praiseworthy if the child was the *firstborn* or the *only* son of his parents.

Priests and *pious people* were next regarded as highly acceptable victims. "Chariclea", says Heliodorus, "was from the beginning reserved to the gods on account of her unsurpassed excellence." Those who had devoted themselves to certain deities, could at any time be killed

in honour of them, because by death their souls were supposed to be raised at once to the gods, and to be lifted into heaven, their true abodes. In the service of Ashtarte, the immolation of priests was preserved up to the time of the Christian era; and even in the age of Strabo, an attendant of the temple near Iberia, in the Scythian country of Albania, was annually seized by a priest, bound with sacred fetters, and maintained sumptuously, to be sacrificed in honour of the goddess at the expiration of the year. The chief priest of Diana Taurica or Aricina in Latium was commonly slain by his successor's own hands. On important occasions, the Franks cast lots among themselves to decide who was to die as a sacrifice, and the person so marked out was regarded as the special favourite of the gods. — In Meroe it was customary for the *king* to be killed as a sacrifice when the priests deemed it expedient or pretended to have been directed by an oracle; which usage was maintained up to the third century before Christ, when the Ethiopian king Ergamenes, having been summoned for a similar sacrifice, killed the priests and abolished the custom. As chastity was regarded a chief condition of holiness, *virgins* and *unstained youths* were, in many instances, esteemed as victims, especially in honour of maiden goddesses, as Minerva and Diana; the former deity received annually a virgin on her altar at Laodicea. Pelopidas was commanded, by a vision in a dream, to offer a fair virgin; the Ethiopians sacrificed to Helios and Selene none but chaste persons, whose innocence was tested by their being placed on a sacred grate which, if they were not spotless, was supposed to burn off their feet.

Anxious to show that success in great or dangerous enterprises was attributed to the favour of the gods, most nations, both at the commencement of a military expedition and after its happy conclusion, sacrificed *captives of war*, in the one case for supplication, in the other for grateful acknowledgment, which custom was continued up to a very late period. For this purpose the first prisoners captured were deemed most desirable, as among the Ethiopians, whenever they triumphed over foreign enemies, among the Thulitæ or Scandinavians, and occasionally among the Persians. Particularly grateful also were captives of *high rank*, such as *chiefs* and *generals*, who, among the old Prussians and others, were burnt on a funeral pile together with their arms and horses. In other cases, supplication or gratitude was manifested by the *multitude* of victims. The Scythians sacrificed one of every hundred prisoners; the Argivi, after the conquest of Mycenæ, devoted every tenth inhabitant to the gods; the Tarquinians (in B. C. 355) slaughtered 307 captive Romans, and the Mexicans as many of the Spanish in-

vaders as they were able to seize. It is noteworthy that, in most cases, sacrifices of captives were employed as a means of divination and of ascertaining the issue of the war, as is related of the Lusitanians, the Britons, and the inhabitants of Mona (or Anglesey), the Cimbri, the Prussians, and others.

The custom of sacrificing prisoners of war probably gave rise, among many tribes, to the idea of killing in honour of the gods *strangers* rather than natives; for foreigners and enemies were extensively held to be equivalent terms. The sacrifice of shipwrecked strangers by the Scythians in Tauris at the shrine of Diana, has become celebrated by the descriptions of historians and poets. Foreigners were offered by the Hindoos, by the Egyptians in honour of Typhon, by the Ethiopians, who are said to have periodically seized two strangers to slaughter them for the welfare of the community, and frequently by the old Germans. From this point it is not difficult to trace

3. THE GRADUAL ABOLITION OF HUMAN SACRIFICES.

For when men accustomed themselves to consider strangers as oblations pleasing to the gods, they imperceptibly strove to substitute them for their own countrymen and relatives. They thus satisfied their deepest feelings of religion by presenting a human sacrifice, and yet avoided the tormenting conflict into which such sacrifice might bring them with their natural sympathies. But even this first step was not achieved without a severe struggle. It was by men of a fanatic or enthusiastic creed regarded as a cowardly evasion of the most sacred of religious duties. As the Phoenicians and those who adopted their faith believed their eldest sons rightfully to belong to Moloch, the childless among them, to evince their holy zeal, were from early times wont to *buy* the sons of poor persons and to present them to the god; the mother was required to be present at the sacrifice; but if she shed a tear or uttered a sigh, she lost the purchase money, without saving her offspring. Such precedents induced rich parents secretly to purchase boys and to sacrifice them as their own. The detestable practice seems, in later times, to have obtained to a considerable extent. Therefore, when the Carthaginians were defeated by Agathocles, they supposed that the disaster had been sent by Saturn wroth at being deprived of his due honours; they appeased him by a speedy offering of 200 boys of the best families; and 300 adult persons joined in the sacrifice spontaneously.

The next advance towards mitigating the terrors of human sacrifices was to slaughter men who by the laws of the land had forfeited their lives, especially *condemned criminals*. In Maabar, in India, the

culprit sentenced to die usually sacrificed himself in honour of some particular idol, and the readiness evinced in the act was by the people regarded as eminent piety. At Athens, malefactors were kept and fed at the public expense, sometimes for many years, to be offered as expiatory sacrifices at the festival of the Thargelia, at impending or actual public misfortunes, such as pestilence, war, or famine. The same usage prevailed in Rhodus, where primitively a pious man, and afterwards a criminal, was sacrificed at the festival of Saturn; it obtained on the island of Leucas, and in Rome where it was acted upon in the worship of Jupiter Latialis considerably later than the commencement of the Christian era; among the Cimbri, the Frieses, and the Gauls, who went so far as to look upon the sacrifice of delinquents, especially thieves and robbers, as peculiarly agreeable to the gods, and offered innocent men only when convicts were not at hand. In Dahomey, the victims are either foreigners, especially captives of war, or if natives criminals and dressed as such. In fact, a modern traveller received the assurance from king Gelele himself, that "many victims would be released, and that those executed would be only the worst of criminals and malignant war-captives."

Blood, the symbol of life, being generally regarded as the chief and most important element in sacrifices, thoughtful men, urged moreover by considerations of humanity, held it to be unnecessary to kill the human victim, and declared that the gods are effectually propitiated provided some of the man's blood flowed in their honour. Thus another and a very decided step towards a less revolting form of human sacrifices was made. In Sparta, the image of Artemis Orthia, supposed to have been that once taken away by Orestes and Iphigenia from Tauris, was for a long time worshipped by human victims, but this sacrifice was later, it is asserted by Lycurgus, changed into the flagellation of boys, so that the image of the goddess was sprinkled with their blood; and at Alea in Arcadia, Dionysos was similarly honoured at an annual festival by the scourging of women. In Elis, a libation of blood was offered at the grave of the dead as an expiation. The priests of Phoenicia and Syria, especially of Baal, those of Hierapolis, of the Greeks in later periods, and chiefly those of Bramah and Buddha, were in the habit, on certain festivals or serious occasions, of cutting themselves with knives and lancets "till the blood gushed out upon them"; the same practice sprang up in Rome where it was observed by the priests and priestesses of Bellona; and it prevails still among the Dervishes of Turkey and Persia. The Carian settlers in Egypt, when on the great festival of Isis at Busiris the sacrifice had been performed in honour of Osiris, "cut their faces

with their knives." In Rome, the image of Jupiter Latiaris was every year sprinkled with the blood of a gladiator who had been wounded in the public games, and this custom was maintained up to the second and third century after Christ. When the Romans rigorously interdicted human sacrifices among the Gauls, the latter, as a substitute for their ancient rites, scratched the skin of the devoted person, and offered to the deity the blood so obtained. And the Incas in Peru presented cakes sprinkled over with human blood.

A further progress was manifest in the growing belief that the *intention* of offering a human being is as pleasing to the gods as the actual oblation. Not sufficiently enlightened to perceive the abomination of human sacrifices, and yet too merciful to slaughter their fellow-creatures if it could possibly be avoided, some tribes resorted to the most curious devices to overcome the harassing dilemma. They not only connived at but facilitated the escape of the intended victim. In Orchomenos, the maiden appointed to be sacrificed to Dionysos was allowed to save herself by flight from the very altar. The eldest member of the family of Athamas, doomed to die if he entered the Prytaneum of his native town, was permitted to seek refuge in another country. On the island of Leucas, a man was annually, at the festival of Apollo, precipitated into the sea as an expiation for the people; but various kinds of wings were attached to his body, and even birds suspended at his person to lighten by their fluttering the fall or the leap; below, many persons were stationed around in small fishing boats to receive him, to preserve his life if possible, and to carry him beyond the boundary of the country. The Ethiopians placed the two foreigners whom they seized from time to time as a national atonement, in a strong vessel, furnished them with provisions for six months, and ordered them to sail on in a southward direction till they came to a blooming island, where a hospitable reception awaited them: the safe arrival of the men on the island was by the Ethiopians considered as a pledge that the country would, during the period of 600 years, enjoy peace and prosperity. So ancient a work as the Vedas commanded, as a symbolical rite, to tie to posts the persons devoted to death in honour of the goddess Kali, then, after the recital of the hymn on the allegorical immolation of Narayana, to release them unhurt, and finally to make oblations of butter on the sacrificial fire. Later, the multiplied conditions, under which human sacrifices were permitted in India, rendered their frequent occurrence impossible. Gradually, by the softening influence of the Brahmans and the wisdom of Gautama, they ceased entirely, and were in later writings forbidden by the threat of eternal

punishment in hell. In a similar manner, they were rejected and denounced in other countries, as better notions regarding the nature of the deity and of atonement prevailed. From early times, there was, in spite of the cosmic character of paganism, among more civilized tribes a tendency towards that end. Not unfrequently *animals*, considered as legitimate and acceptable representatives, were sacrificed instead of devoted men. It was incompatible with the national character of the Greeks to suffer long the atrocity of human sacrifices utterly abhorrent to the nature of Hellenism. Homer mentions indeed the immolation of men in honour of Patroclus, but not the tradition of Iphigenia's sacrifice. The horrid custom seems to have been brought into Greece by foreign contact and as a foreign element. Though it is true as we have abundantly shown that "we find traces of it throughout almost the whole Hellenic world, in the *cultus* of almost every god, and in all periods of their independent history", it is certain that it was from the fifth century openly denounced as an unholy and godless practice repugnant to the spirit of the national laws. The substitution of animals for men is related in legends reaching back even into pre-historic times; though not alluded to in the Homeric poems, it was primitively sanctioned in several religious systems; it is implied in the story of Iphigenia intended for a sacrifice to Diana but replaced by a stag, and in the narrative of Abraham offering a ram instead of his son Isaac. Phryxus, devoted by the oracle to die in honour of Zeus Laphystios, received from his mother Nephele a ram with a golden fleece, on which he was carried to Colchis, and which he there offered instead of himself. A youth was, at Potniae in Boeotia, to be sacrificed every year to Dionysus, because the inhabitants had slain one of the priests of the god; but "a few years later", the youth was replaced by a kid of the goats. The people of Tenedos, in later times, offered to the same deity, instead of a child, a new-born calf to which they attempted to give a human appearance by providing its feet with cothurni, while they nursed the cow that had thrown the calf like a woman after childbirth, and obliged the man who had sacrificed the calf to flee, probably because in former periods the person who had sacrificed the child was equally persecuted. The human victim periodically offered at Salamis to Minerva and Diomedes, was by Diphilus, king of Cyprus, replaced by a slaughtered ox. Pelopidas, invited in a dream, the night before the battle of Leuctra, by the shades of the "virgins of Leuctra" and their father, to expiate their murder by the sacrifice of a fair-haired virgin, believed he satisfied the request of the vision by slaughtering a light-coloured colt which had strayed from the herd and

ran through the camp; and in a similar manner Agesilaus, when staying over night in Aulis and admonished by a dream to sacrifice a man in commemoration of Agamemnon and Iphigenia, offered a stag. And at Laodicea, in Syria, a virgin was, for some time, offered every year, but later a stag.

However, sometimes not animals but symbolical figures were substituted instead of men, and this must be regarded as another advancement in religious notions. The Egyptian king Amasis offered at Heliopolis wax-images instead of the human beings formerly sacrificed. The Hindoos shaped the form of a man in butter or dough, and burnt it to the destructive goddess Kali. An ancient oracle ordered the old Italic tribes, "Offer heads to Hades, and to his father (Saturn) a man", and this command was for some time acted upon: but when Hercules passed through Italy with the herd of Geryon, he is said to have persuaded the people to offer images of human heads instead of real ones, and torches instead of men. Again, it was customary on the festival of the Compitalia celebrated on the cross-ways, to offer sacrifices in honour of the Lares and their mother the goddess Mania; but Junius Brutus induced the people to present garlic and poppy-heads instead of human heads. Every year, on the ides of May, during the festival of the Lemuralia celebrated for the souls of the departed, 24 or 30 figures of men made of bulrushes were, for the propitiation of Saturn, by the chief priests and the Vestal virgins thrown from the Sublician bridge into the Tiber, as substitutes for the human victims which had once been killed on the same day; and this usage, the origin of which is likewise attributed to Hercules, was maintained at least to the time of Augustus. The vows of the "sacred spring", which the Romans had adopted from the old Italic tribes, were later confined to the cattle alone, or if the children were also included, they were not killed, but in the spring of their twentieth or twenty-first year, they were led out of the boundaries of the land, provided with arms, and directed to establish colonies wherever they might chance to find a resting place; and indeed many settlements, and among them those of the Picentines and the Mamertini in Sicily, owe their origin to the emigration of devoted persons.

But human sacrifices were too deeply rooted in the life of the ancient world to be easily eradicated; they lingered for long periods, even after more rational views had been diffused and adopted; and their suppression required the continuous and zealous efforts of public teachers and reformers. They were kept up in the Roman empire with incredible tenacity. Darius Hystaspis, king of Persia, is said to have forbidden the Carthaginians "to offer human sacrifices and to eat dog-

flesh;" Gelon, the king of Sicily, after his victory over the Carthaginians at Himera (B. C. 480), made the abolition of child-sacrifices in honour of Moloch a condition of peace; a certain Iphicrates devised another attempt at their extinction; but they survived the destruction of Carthage itself; till at last, in the second century after Christ, the proconsul Tiberius, to put an end to the abomination, ordered the priests who performed the rite to be crucified on the trees of their temples. When, in B. C. 116, two Gauls had been sacrificed in one of the streets of Rome, the practice was forbidden, "except when human offerings were ordered by the Sibylline books." The first interdiction for Italy was proclaimed by the senate in B. C. 96, especially in connection with the art of magic. But that law was by no means decisive or effectual. Men were sacrificed by the most prominent, and often the most educated individuals, as by Caesar, at a sedition of his soldiers, by Augustus after the victory over Mark Antony and at the surrender of Perugia, by Vatinius whom Cicero accused of offering the entrails of boys to the gods of the lower world, by Nero at the appearance of a comet, and frequently at his magical incantations, by Commodus (A. C. 180) who at the mysteries of Mithra offered human victims, by Didius Julianus (A. C. 192) and Heliogabalus (A. C. 217) who found satisfaction in sacrificing children to the Sun in connection with magic artifices, by the emperor Valerian (A. C. 253) who on the advice of an Egyptian magician sacrificed boys and disemboweled newborn babes, and by Maxentius (A. C. 306), who cut open pregnant females and examined the bowels of children to invoke the demons or to avert impending war: abominations indulged in at the same period by others also. Indeed, the Fathers of the Church are almost unanimous in testifying to the existence of the horrid practice in their own time. Therefore, the prohibition had to be repeated again and again; it was rigorously enjoined by the emperor Claudius, and renewed by Hadrian for the whole extent of the empire. Still the effect of these edicts was long imperfect and fluctuating. The Gauls sacrificed men publicly at every important crisis in the time of Caesar and Cicero. Some transalpine tribes killed human victims at least up to the time of the elder Pliny. On an elevation in Arcadia, Zeus Lycaeus continued to be honoured with sacrifices of boys in the time of Pausanias, in the second century of the present era. The old Prussians and Goths adhered to the custom for centuries after their open adoption of Christianity. And in India, the burning of the widows was maintained up to the establishment of the British rule. In 1829, Lord William Bentinck abolished it as far as his authority extended, that is among the 37

millions British subjects out of 77 millions souls forming the population. Instances, however, are recorded at Oodypore so late as August 30, 1838, and at Kolah in October 29, 1840. But in 1844, a religious change was wrought. It began in the stronghold of the rite, among the Rajpoots in Rajpootana living in the north-western frontier, a brave race of warriors and hunters, and almost revered by the other tribes. Lieutenant Colonel Ludlow, then the English representative at Jypore, happily availed himself of the movement to carry out his long cherished and philanthropic designs. He forcibly pointed out what indeed had long been known, that the rite of *suttee* was not only unsanctioned but inferentially forbidden by the earliest and most authoritative Hindoo scriptures; that the laws of Manu clearly involve its non-existence; that an obscure passage in Rig-Veda, long the only support of its advocates, has been clearly proved to have no reference to it whatever; and that, in fact, it was an unauthorised innovation and heresy of no earlier date than B. C. 300. Ludlow succeeded first in Jypore (Aug. 1846), next among most of the remaining Rajpoot states, and then in some other free principalities of India occupying about two thirds of the whole territory.

Among the Dahomans also the rite is beginning to lose ground; it is by the chiefs upheld from motives of expediency rather than of religion; king Gelele released, at Captain Burton's intercession, nearly half of the intended victims; this prince, having to perform "a disagreeable duty" over his ancestral graves, takes care that the executions are performed without cruelty; in 1863 and 1864, he allowed no victim to be put to death publicly during day-time; and sometimes he exposes the men without slaying them. "If I were to give up this custom at once", said he, "my head would be taken off to-morrow; by and by, little by little, much may be done."

Thus, then, the slaughter of men to secure the favour of the gods originated indeed in a religious sentiment common to all nations and apparently inherent in the human mind; it was resorted to on occasions of exceptional solemnity when the sacrifice of animals seemed inadequate to express the full depth of religious emotion; it was long regarded as a form of divine worship so praiseworthy and exalted that its neglect was deplored as a symptom of degeneracy and of declining earnestness; it proved compatible with a very considerable degree of civilisation and mental culture; and as it accustomed men to feel supreme satisfaction in seeing their fellow-beings nay their own children massacred, pierced by the sword, burnt to death, hurled from rocks or lofty terraces, drowned in rivers, seas or cess-pools, exposed to starvation or other-

wise cruelly exterminated, it is one of the awful warnings held out by history to prove how narrow-minded enthusiasm, even if exercised for spiritual ends, may lead to the most revolting and most degrading enormities — a warning equalled if not surpassed, in the Christian times, by the burning of witches and the horrors of the inquisition.

We might now enter upon the question how far human sacrifices were practised among the Hebrews; but in order to prepare the way still more completely for the unbiassed treatment of that enquiry, we deem it expedient to premise a sketch of

XXII. THE VARIOUS FORMS OF IDOLATRY ADOPTED BY THE HEBREWS.

A COMPREHENSIVE summary of the variety and extent of heathen worship among the Israelites, as mirrored forth in the works of their historians and prophets, suggests the most momentous and most significant conclusions with regard to the religious development of the chosen nation.

Can a stronger proof of the confusion which long prevailed in the notions of the Deity be conceived than the fact that men who meant to serve Jehovah in earnestness and piety, represented and worshipped Him by images? Even the history of Jeroboam is instructive in this respect. This king, anxious to prevent his newly-acquired subjects from visiting the capital of the sister kingdom, not from worshipping its God, placed two golden calves, the familiar symbols of the Egyptian Apis and Mnevis, in Bethel and Dan, towns probably consecrated by national sanctuaries from remote times,¹ and proclaimed to the people, "Behold these are thy gods, o Israel, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt."² It is not surprising to find that the author of the Books of Kings, living at a time when the worship of Jehovah began to take root in consequence of the promulgation and diffusion of the Pentateuch, severely reprimanded this act of Jeroboam, and described it as the cause and origin of grievous sin,³ which was sure to be followed by fearful visitations,⁴ and which in his zeal he goes so far as unjustly to characterise as rejection of Jehovah and adoption of strange gods.⁵ It is even less surprising to notice that the compiler of the Books of Chronicles, writing at a still later period and with a strongly marked Levitical bias,⁶ did not scruple to call those images "no-gods", and strongly to denounce them as foul paganism.⁷ But an impartial examination of the facts warrants no such conclusion. The arrangement of Jeroboam had a

¹ See Comm. on Genes. p. 213.

⁵ XIV. 9; comp. Jer. XLVIII. 13.

² 1 Ki. XII. 28; comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 16.

⁶ See pp. 24—26.

³ 1 Ki. XII. 30.

⁴ XIII. 1—10.

⁷ 2 Chr. XIII. 8—10.

political rather than a religious object; it was not designed to weaken the people's attachment to the common God of the Hebrews, but to strengthen their fidelity to the new dynasty. The phrase so frequently repeated by the later historian, "the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin",⁸ does not refer to the worship of heathen gods, but merely to the consecration of the two golden statues. This may not only be reasonably inferred from several passages,⁹ but is distinctly stated in that narrative which, after declaring that Jehu killed the worshippers of Baal, burnt his images, and destroyed his temple, continues, "However, as regards the sins of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who caused Israel to sin, Jehu did not depart from them, namely, the golden calves that were in Bethel and in Dan."¹⁰ Jeroboam transgressed therefore not the first but the second commandment; he did not repudiate Jehovah, but fashioned Him in golden images.¹¹ However, the people, uneducated and eagerly bent upon foreign superstitions, could not fail ere long to regard these statues not as impersonations of Jehovah, but actually as the Egyptian Apis or Mnevis, and to worship them as such. Hence the prophets stigmatized them not unfairly as pernicious snares; they called Beth-el, *the house or town of God*, tauntingly Beth-aven, *the town of iniquity*;¹² they castigated the practice among the worst forms of idolatry certain to provoke the wrath of God.¹³ Indeed the worship of the golden calves inevitably caused many deplorable aberrations; and in this sense Hebrew moralists were justified in inveighing against "*all the sins of Jeroboam.*"¹⁴

But we are able to adduce even more striking instances and proofs of the proposition above set forth. The pious priest Ahimelech who, at Nob, conducted a complete and lawful service,¹⁵ had in his possession a gold-plated image or ephod which evidently represented Jehovah.

David appropriated to himself this ephod;¹⁶ and he solemnly consulted it, whenever in critical emergencies he wished to explore the will of God. Having retired to Keilah and being actively pursued by Saul, "he said to Abiathar the priest, Bring hither the ephod; then said David, O Lord God of Israel, Thy servant has heard for certain that Saul seeks to come to Keilah to destroy the city for my sake . . . Will Saul come down as Thy servant has heard? O Lord God

⁸ 2 Ki. III. 3; XIII. 2; XV. 9, 18, 24, 28; etc.

⁹ 1 Ki. XVI. 31—33; 2 Ki. III. 1—3; XIII. 6.

¹⁰ 2 Ki. X. 29; comp. vers. 26—28.

¹¹ Comp. Comm. on Exod. p. 258.

¹² Hos. IV. 15; X. 5; Am. V. 5.

¹³ Hos. VIII. 5, 6; X. 5; XIII. 2; Am. III. 14; IV. 4; V. 6; VII. 9, 13; VIII. 13, 14: in which passages the allusions, though partly veiled, are yet unmistakable. ¹⁴ 2 Ki. XIII. 11; XIV. 24; etc.

¹⁵ 1 Sam. XXI. 2—10.

¹⁶ 1 Sam. XXIII. 6.

of Israel, I beseech Thee, tell Thy servant. And the Lord said, He will come down.”¹ When after the pillage and destruction of the town of Ziklag by the Amalekites, despair overpowered the people, David — so relates the historian — “strengthened himself by the Lord his God”; he ordered Abiathar to bring the ephod; and “he enquired of the Lord, saying, Shall I pursue after this troop? shall I overtake them? And He answered him, Pursue; for thou shalt surely overtake them, and certainly recover all.”² The author of the Books of Samuel utters no word of reproof against David’s use of the ephod; but the Chronist, faithful to his desire of clearing his favourites from all deeds deemed reproachful at *his* time, makes no mention whatever of that figure in the narrative of the events in question.³ David had, besides, in his house an image of the Teraphim, obviously for his legitimate domestic worship;⁴ and the prophet Hosea enumerates the Teraphim, like “statue and ephod”, and like “kings, chiefs and sacrifices”, as an element of national happiness and prosperity, “when the children of Israel again seek the Lord their God and David their king, and when they fear the Lord and His goodness in later days.”⁵

Micah, living in mount Ephraim, had abstracted from his mother and then restored to her a sum of money; when she received it, she declared, “I had wholly dedicated the silver to the Lord from my hand for my son, to make a graven image and a molten image”; and when these figures had been made and placed in the house, together with an ephod and Teraphim, and when the services of an itinerant Levite had been secured, Micah was certain to have obtained the favour of God, and exclaimed with joyful confidence, “Now I know that the Lord will do me good, since I have a Levite to be my priest.”⁶ These facts lead to the most remarkable conclusion that even several and different images, worshipped simultaneously, were by well-disposed people viewed as lawful embodiments of Jehovah; hence a number of Danites who, in search of settled abodes, passed through mount Ephraim, were most eager to secure both those images and the Levite, and when they had accomplished their design by cunning and violence, Micah was overwhelmed by grief and consternation.⁷ The author of the Book of Judges conveyed indeed an implied disapproval of Micah’s images, “In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did

¹ 1 Sam. XXIII. 9—11.

² 1 Sam. XXX. 6—8; comp. 2 Sam. II. 1; V. 19, 23, 24 (XXI. 1), which passages merely state that “David enquired of the Lord”, without mentioning the ephod.

³ Comp. 1 Chr. XIV. 10.

⁴ 1 Sam. XIX. 11—17.

⁵ Hos. III. 4, 5; comp. Comm. on Gen. p. 370.

⁶ Judg. XVII. 3—5, 12, 13.

⁷ Judg. XVIII. 14—26.

that which was right in his own eyes";⁸ but he regarded the matter from his own point of view and by the light of later convictions.

Gideon who had firmly declared, that "the Lord shall rule over the Hebrews", yet placed in Ophrah, his native town, a golden figure, and revered it in common with the whole nation.⁹ The historian's censure, "and this thing became a snare to Gideon and to his house",¹⁰ must be estimated in the same manner as his disparaging comment on Micah's images.

Aaron himself, according to a narrative embodied in the Book of Exodus, made during the absence of Moses a molten calf of gold, and declared, exactly like king Jeroboam, "Behold, these are thy gods, o Israel, that brought thee out of the land of Egypt"; he is then reported to have built an altar before the image and to have proclaimed for the following day "a festival to the Lord".¹¹ It is a matter of course that the compilers of the second and fifth Books of the Pentateuch, writing at a very advanced period, taxed in terms of indignant rebuke the iniquity which, in their opinion, merited and almost caused the complete extirpation of the people, and the expiation of which required the destruction of 30,000 persons;¹² and authors of subsequent ages, imbued with the true spirit of theocracy, depicted Aaron's conduct as a forgetful abandonment of God, and a disgraceful exchange of His glory for the "similitude of an ox that eats grass."¹³ But the historical fact remains undisputed that even men of good intentions, such as David and Aaron, were unaware of a wickedness when they represented Jehovah in a human form or by the figure of a beast. To this may be added the fact, proved and dwelt upon elsewhere, that the "heights" were deemed unobjectionable even by some pious and theocratic kings, and therefore left untouched by them as places of private and public worship;¹⁴ from which it appears that the Temple of Jerusalem was originally not designed by David and Solomon to form an exclusive but only a central or national sanctuary; till gradually other places of worship became to be considered as unlawful because dangerous to the purity and unity of faith.¹⁵

There was, however, in the eastern world scarcely a divinity adored or a religious rite performed which the Hebrews did not adopt, and retain with their own peculiar tenacity. They are, in several passages, summarily stated to have worshipped the gods of Egypt —

⁸ L. c. XVII. 6.

⁹ Judg. VIII. 23, 27.

¹⁰ L. c. ver. 27.

¹¹ Exod. XXXII. 1-6; comp. Neh.

¹² Comp. Exod. XXXII. 7-10, 20-28; Deut. IX. 12-16.

¹³ Ps. CVI. 19, 20; Neh. IX. 18.

¹⁴ See p. 27.

¹⁵ See p. 18.

not only at their early sojourn in that country¹ and in the time of their national existence in Canaan,² but even during their later stay in Egypt as exiles, in the seventh and sixth centuries³ — and the gods of the Phoenicians, of the Aramaeans, the Amorites, and Philistines,⁴ the abominations of Moab, Ammon, and Edom,⁵ of Assyria and Chaldaea.⁶ The permanent establishment of a great portion of these idolatries is distinctly attributed to Solomon acting in deference to the propensities of his foreign wives.⁷ For the tendency of the Hebrews towards heathen worship was strengthened by the matrimonial alliances perpetually contracted with neighbouring tribes⁸ to such an extent that they could hardly be considered as an unmixed race⁹ and the pure descendants of the patriarchs. We are enabled to form an estimate of the astounding multiplicity of their pagan usages by the statements of their prophets and historians, of which we shall attempt to give a brief review. — Above all prevailed the adoration of the heavenly bodies.

The worship of BAAL was not only most extensively cultivated, to the utter neglect of Jehovah, from early times up to so late an age as that of Jeremiah,¹⁰ but was frequently attended with the utmost pomp and splendour;¹¹ the god was honoured with statues¹² and temples,¹³ altars,¹⁴ fumigations,¹⁵ and sacrifices, sometimes even of men;¹⁶ he was adored with genuflexions and kisses,¹⁷ even in the very Temple at Jerusalem,¹⁸ and so universal was the idolatry that at

¹ Josh. XXIV. 14; Ezek. XX. 7, 8; XXIII. 3, 8.

² Ezek. XVI. 26.

³ Jer. XLIV. 5; comp. ver. 1; Ezra IX. 1.

⁴ Judg. VI. 10; X. 6; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 23; Ezra IX. 1.

⁵ 1 Ki. XI. 1, 7, 8.

⁶ Ezek. XVI. 28, 29.

⁷ See 1 Ki. l. c.; though the Chronist suppresses this fact; comp. 2 Chr. IX; see *infra*.

⁸ Comp. Jud. III. 5, 6 ("and the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites; and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods"); XIV. 1, 2; Ruth I. 4; 1 Ki. XI. 1—3; Ezra X. 2 *sqq.*, 10 *sqq.*; Mal. II. 11; Neh. XIII. 23—27.

⁹ Ezra IX. 1, 2 ("they have taken of their daughters for themselves and

for their sons; so that the holy seed have mingled themselves with the people of foreign lands; yea, the hand of the princes and rulers has been chief in this trespass"), 14; Neh. I. c.

¹⁰ Judg. II. 11, 13; III. 7; VI. 25—32; VIII. 33; X. 6, 10; 1 Sam. VII. 4; XII. 10; 1 Ki. XVI. 31, 32; XVIII. 19; 2 Ki. III. 2; X. 18—28; XI. 18; XVII. 16; 2 Chr. XXIV. 7; XXVIII. 2; Hos. II. 15, 19; Jer. VII. 9; IX. 13; XI. 13, 17; XXIII. 27; etc.

¹¹ Hos. II. 10, 15.

¹² 2 Ki. III. 2; X. 26, 27; XI. 18; XVIII. 4; XXIII. 14; 2 Chr. XIV. 2; etc.

¹³ 1 Ki. XVI. 32; 2 Ki. X. 21.

¹⁴ Judg. VI. 25; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 4; etc.

¹⁵ Hos. II. 15; Jer. VII. 9; XI. 13; XXXII. 29.

¹⁶ Jer. XIX. 5; comp. 1 Ki. XVIII. 28.

¹⁷ 1 Ki. XIX. 18; see *infra*.

¹⁸ 2 Ki. XXIII. 4.

the time of Jehu and Elisha not more than 7,000 Israelites were found to be free from it.¹⁹ Unless otherwise qualified, the Baal of the Old Testament is mostly the Tyrian Baal, or Melkarth, the tutelary deity of the town, and the common link of the Phœnician cities and colonies, originally coinciding with the Babylonian *Bel*, and usually identified by the Greeks and Romans with Hercules, though occasionally designated by them Zeus, Saturn, or Mars. He was the god of the heavenly fire or of the sun, or the element of light, and Jupiter as planet, the principle of procreation or the male power in nature, sometimes represented with rays encircling his head, and sometimes with grapes and pomegranates in his hands, as symbols of generation, and not unfrequently drawn by bulls — a being utterly incompatible with the existence of Jehovah, the Author and Lord of the Universe.

ASHERAH or ASHTAROTH, the Phœnician goddess ASHARTE, was, in almost every respect, the counterpart of Baal, with whom she was generally worshipped in conjunction,²⁰ and hence bore also the appellation *Beelthil*, the supreme female divinity in the Assyrian Pantheon, "the mother of the gods", or "the great goddess", or "queen of the lands", sometimes called the wife of Asshur, but more safely to be taken as the wife of Bel-Nimrud, the second member of the governing triad of Assyrian gods; for she was the goddess of the moon, and appears in inscriptions under the name *Tanis*, or the Persian Artemis, and as the goddess of war and the chase. She was therefore called "the queen of heaven"²¹ or Urania, and represented either with a woman's head, or the head of a bull, the emblem of royalty, and with horns, generally three, in the form of the crescent, and later a star between them; for she was Venus as planet, or in the Babylonian mythology *Ishtar*, "queen of the land", the "queen of all the gods", "the beginning or mistress of heaven and earth", and especially "goddess of war, battle, and of the chase", the "queen of victory", the "fortunate or happy"; she was the passive or female principle of conception and birth, or the element of water, and therefore the goddess of fruitfulness termed *Myitta*, and worshipped, especially by women, with cakes, libations, and incense. So universal was her service, that her name was employed to express foreign deities in general; it flourished in Judah especially under Manasseh and in Israel under Ahab; and it was coupled with rites involving the grossest and most sensual forms of natural religion, and probably representing the remains of even ruder notions and more

¹⁹ 1 Ki. XIX. 18; comp. XVIII. 19; 2 Ki. X. 18—28.

cut down the Ashtarte upon it"); X. 6; 1 Sam. VII. 4; XII. 10; 1 Ki. XVIII. 19; etc.

²⁰ Comp. Judg. II. 13; III. 7; VI. 25 ("throw down the altar of Baal, and

²¹ So also by Jeremiah (VII. 18; XLIV. 17—19).

revolting practices. Hence in the Assyrian period, the Hebrews adopted easily the trans-euphratic service of the "Tents of the maidens",¹ kindred to that of Ashtarte, because also requiring the chastity of virgins as an offering to the deity.

Together with Baal and Ashtarte, the Hebrews are, in the later times of the monarchy, usually stated to have adored ALL THE HOST OF HEAVEN,² that is, all the sidereal bodies, comprising Sabaeism in its widest extent, whence Jehovah was also called "the God of hosts";³ and that service was often performed on the flat roofs of houses arranged for the purpose and provided with altars.⁴ The Sun particularly, called in Assyria "the regent of the heavens and earth", "the great mover", or "destroyer of the enemies", received divine honours.⁵ Though sometimes invoked without images, he was revered chiefly by statues or pillars, probably of the form of the cone or of the obelisk, the common symbol of the rising flame, and frequently placed on the altars of Baal, or by carriages and horses, which were kept in the sanctuaries and found access even to the Temple at Jerusalem;⁶ and in imitation of the Mithras worship of the Persians, the Israelites prostrated themselves before the rising orb, turning their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east;⁷ they adopted during these acts even the curious custom of putting "the branch to their nose"; for the Persians held in their hands, during incantations, "bundles of thin sprays of tamarisk", or date-twigs, known as the holy *Barsom*, which has a remarkable analogy in the *Iubar* used by the Jews on the Feast of Tabernacles and consisting of a date-branch coupled with twigs of the myrtle and the willow of the brook.⁸

At the same period, the Hebrews began also to deem sacred the twelve SIGNS OF THE ZODIAC in which the sun was believed to rest or lodge during the twelve months of the year,⁹ and to which Ezekiel alludes in that remarkable passage, "I went (into the Temple) and saw, and behold, every form of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel, pourtrayed upon the wall round about"¹⁰ — that is the Scorpion, Cancer, Bull, and other animals, analogous to the representations of the zodiac at Tentyra.

¹ 2 Ki. XVII. 30; comp. XXIII. 7.

² 2 Ki. XVII. 16; XXI. 3, 5; XXIII. 4, 5, 11; Zeph. I. 5; Jer. VIII. 2; XIX. 13.

³ 1 Sam. I. 3, 11; IV. 4; XV. 2; 2 Sam. V. 10; Ps. LXXXIX. 9; comp. LXXX. 5, 8, 15, 20; etc.

⁴ 2 Ki. XXIII. 12; comp. Zeph. I. 5; Isai. LXV. 3; Jer. XIX. 13; XXXII. 29.

⁵ 2 Ki. XXIII. 5; Jer. VIII. 2; where sun and moon are joined; comp. also Job XXXI. 26, 27; Deut. IV. 19.

⁶ 2 Ki. XXIII. 11.

⁷ Ezek. VIII. 16.

⁸ Comp. Lev. XXIII. 40; see Comm. on Exod. p. 351.

⁹ 2 Ki. XXIII. 5. ¹⁰ Ezek. VIII. 10.

To this cycle of idolatrous worship belongs the adoration of TAMMUZ, the Syrian name of the far-famed ADONIS, the beloved of Ashtarte or Venus, and the god of fruitfulness. When in the autumn the river Adonis assumes a red colour in consequence of the red dust blown into it by the equinoxial gales from the Lebanon, where is its source, the people of Byblus, among whom Adonis was said to be born and buried, supposed that colour to be owing to the blood of this hero shed by a wild boar on the chace, and flowing into the river. Then they mourned his death with weeping and beating of their breasts and every mark of vehement grief, and offered to him funeral sacrifices; but the following day, they believed he had risen from the dead and had ascended into heaven, and then their grief was changed into festive joy and jubilant exultation. This legend is reflected in the cosmic myth, that Tammuz and Ashtarte rule together from the vernal to the autumnal equinox, causing all vegetation to bloom and thrive; while in the winter, when nature stands bare and lifeless, Adonis dies; and then in Jerusalem also, at the northern gate of the Temple, "the women were sitting and weeping for Tammuz";¹¹ while, in the spring, joyful festivals were celebrated, especially by women offering their chastity. This myth recurs, with slight modifications, in many heathen religions; Osiris was mourned in Egypt, Adonis in Phoenicia, Tammuz in Babylon, Attes in Asia Minor, Dionysos and Linos in Greece, and Balder in the countries of the north; and though the rejoicing followed immediately upon the lament, the cosmic meaning of the worship cannot be mistaken.

Baal was, however, worshipped under various special forms and attributes; he was revered as Baal-Berith, Baal-Peor, and Baal-Zebub, and he returns in the shape of the Phoenician Moloch and of other kindred idols.

BAAL-BERITH was "the lord or protector of covenants", probably the patron of the confederacy of the Phoenician towns; his service was in Palestine apparently well established and widely spread;¹² his temples were so richly endowed, that, on particular emergencies, they furnished sums of money to be employed for public purposes;¹³ they were — for instance that in Shechem — surrounded with a stronghold provided with a chief tower, probably intended both for defence in sieges and for astronomical observations.¹⁴

BAAL-PEOR, properly a deity of the tribes of Moab, but worshipped by the Midianites also, deriving his name from mount Peor within

¹¹ Ezek. VIII. 14; comp. Epistle of Jeremy (Baruch VI), vers. 31, 32; see also *Milton*, *Parad. Lost*, l. 446—457.

¹² Comp. Judg. VIII. 33.

¹³ Judg. IX. 4; comp. ver. 27.

¹⁴ Judg. IX. 46—49.

the territory¹ of the former, was probably the principle of generation *par excellence*, and at his festivals, virgins were accustomed to yield themselves in his honour.² To this disgraceful idolatry the Hebrews were addicted from very early times; they are related to have in the desert already been smitten on account of it by a fearful plague which destroyed 21,000 worshippers,³ and they seem to have clung to its shameful practices in later periods.⁴

BAAL-ZEBUB, "the god of the flies", the destroyer of obnoxious insects, and therefore protector against pestilence, was honoured by the Philistines, and had a chief temple in Ekron, to which Ahaziah, the king of Israel, sent for an oracle in a serious illness;⁵ though in later times he was understood as the satan or "the chief of the devils."⁶

MOLECH, the detestable Phœnician deity and "the abomination" of the Ammonites,⁷ to whom children were constantly burnt, was the destructive planet Saturn, whose dreaded power benighted generations sought to appease by surrendering those they loved most fondly; though later speculations conceived him as the impersonation of Time or the revolving Year which produces and destroys all things in a perpetual cycle, and therefore as the Sun himself, and like the Shiva of the Hindoos at once as the bestower and destroyer of life, and hence coinciding with Baal; he was by the Ammonites called MILCOM⁸ or MALCOM,⁹ and it was to this Ammonite form of the idol that Solomon dedicated a special place of worship¹⁰ on the southern side of mount Olivet;¹¹ whereas the service of Molech was performed, at least in later times, in the valley of Hinnom at a spot called Topheth.¹² The hideous idol was represented by a huge bull-headed but hollow statue of metal; when a fire had been kindled in the cavity, the child was laid into the outstretched and lowered hands of the figure, and was then by some mechanical contrivance made to roll into the blazing flames. Caresses, kisses and promises were lavished upon the wretched child, to prevent its crying if this were possible, "lest a tearful victim be immolated"; and in order to drown every sound of agony, the act was accompanied by the din of pipes and drums. The extent to which the rites of Moloch obtained among the Hebrews will be pointed out in the next Section. It is probable that the Moabites and Amorites worshipped a deity akin to

¹ Num. XXIII. 28; Deut. XXXIV. 6.

² Num. XXV. 6.

³ Num XXV. 3—6, 9; Deut. IV. 3; comp. Num. XXXI. 16; Josh. XXII. 17.

⁴ Comp. Hos. IX. 10; Ps. CVI. 28—

31. ⁵ 2 Ki. I. 1—6, 16.

⁶ Matth. XII. 24; Luke XI. 15, 18.

⁷ 1 Ki. XI. 7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 10.

⁸ 1 Ki. XI. 5 33; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13.

⁹ Jer. XLIX. 1, 3.

¹⁰ 1 Ki. XI. 5.

¹¹ 2 Ki. XXIII. 13.

¹² 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Jer. VII. 31; XIX. 6, 14.

the nature of Moloch under the name of CHEMOSH¹³ who, on coins of Areopolis or Ar-Moab, is represented standing on a column of fire, with burning torches at his side. Solomon built a sanctuary for him "on the mountain to the east of Jerusalem", that is, on mount Olivet.¹⁴ And the idols ADRAMMELECH and ANAMMELECH, embodying the male and female power of the sun, were introduced into Canaan, in Shalmanassar's time, by the colonists from the Babylonian town Sepharvaim, that is, Sippara or Sepphoris, sacred to the sun, hence also called Heliopolis, and famous throughout the East; and those gods were honoured by the Hebrews likewise, who appeased them by the sacrifice of burnt children;¹⁵ and they were therefore essentially equal to Moloch.

In addition to these deities connected with Sabæan idolatry, the Bible specially mentions a variety of other heathen gods worshipped by the Hebrews. From Egypt they adopted, besides the *cultus* of APIS noticed above, the adoration of the HE-GOATS¹⁶ held sacred in the Mendesian district, and of the SERPENT regarded by the Egyptians as a symbol of the good demon Kneph, of Isis, and of the power of healing,¹⁷ and revered by the Hebrews in the image of a BRAZEN SERPENT, which was supposed to have been set up by Moses himself, and which was continually honoured by fumigations up to the time of Hezekiah,¹⁸ evidently without calling forth disapprobation or reproof, since the historical Books mention it for the first time in the record of Hezekiah's reign. In imitation of their Philistine neighbours, the Israelites bowed to DAGON, an idol with a human head and human hands, but a fish-stump — "sea-monster, upward man, and downward fish"¹⁹ — worshipped by the Israelites through many centuries;²⁰ and so faithfully did they copy their heathen models that they adhered even to the singular rite of "leaping over the threshold"²¹ of Dagon's temple, without treading upon it, a custom traced by the Hebrew historian to an alleged discomfiture of the idol at Ashdod owing to the presence of the Ark of the Covenant.²²

THE TERAPHIM, idols of human form, though perhaps of smaller size, were probably introduced from the countries of the Euphrates

¹³ 1 Ki. XI. 7, 33; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13; Jer. XLVIII. 7, 13; Judg. XI. 24: the Moabites are hence called "the people of Chemosh", Num. XXI. 29; Jer. XXVIII. 46.

¹⁴ 1 Ki. XI. 7; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 13.

¹⁵ 2 Ki. XVII. 31.

¹⁶ Lev. XVII. 7; 2 Chron. XI. 15.

¹⁷ See Comm. on Genes. pp. 79, 80.

¹⁸ 2 Ki. XVIII. 4, "he broke in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel burnt incense to it, and he called it Nechushtan"; comp. Num. XXI. 8—9.

¹⁹ 1 Sam. V. 4.

²⁰ Comp. Judg. XVI. 23; 1 Sam. V. 1—4; 1 Macc. X. 83, 84.

²¹ Zeph. I. 9. ²² 1 Sam. V. 1—4.

and Tigris; the Hebrews, regarding them as tutelary deities, deemed them long as thoroughly compatible with the true worship of Jehovah, and therefore consulted them as a Divine oracle, like the Ark of the Covenant, the Urim and Tummin, and the prophets. But later, when purer religious notions prevailed, the Teraphim were naturally included in the general interdiction of idolatry; they were even denounced as abominations, perhaps just because they were almost viewed by the people as a legitimate means of religious devotion, and had in the lapse of centuries taken such a powerful hold upon the national mind, that they remained in favour at so late a period as that of the prophet Zechariah.

In the times of the declining monarchy, the Israelites were still more infected with the superstitions of the Assyrians and Babylonians, with whom they were brought into contact not only in the regions of the Euphrates but also in Palestine itself through the Assyrian settlers thither transplanted by Shalmanassar. Besides the service of the "Tents of the maidens" and of Adrammelech and Anammelech, they did homage to NERGAL¹ of the Cuthites, in inscriptions also constantly called the god of Cutha and Tiggaba, the Babylonian divinity presiding over war and the chase, bearing the epithets of powerful ruler, king of battle, champion of the gods, strong parent, tutelary god of Babylonia, ancestral god of the Assyrian kings, and patron of huntsmen; he corresponded on the whole to Mars and was held ominous as a planet; he was represented as a warrior in blood-coloured garments, or on Assyrian sculptures by the Man-lion, as Asshur or Nin, to whom he is kindred in attributes, was figured by the Man-bull; and the Arabians honoured him by sacrifices of captive soldiers. The Hebrews, moreover, humbled themselves before ASHIMA, the god of the people of Hamath or Epiphania,² of whose nature and attributes we possess no reliable information; to NIBHAZ of the Avites,³ who was probably the god of darkness or the evil demon, his feet resting in the lowest depths of the infernal abyss, while his throne reaches to the surface of the upper world; to TARTAK, also revered by the Avites,⁴ probably not differing much from Nibhaz, since he is likewise supposed to be the lord of darkness, and, whether representing Saturn or Mars, to be fatal as a planet; to the god of Fortune GAD, equivalent to Baal or Bel, the planet Jupiter, the bestower of all blessings, and the goddess MENI, corresponding to Venus, next to the preceding deity regarded as the source of every boon and happiness,

¹ 2 Ki. XVII. 30.

³ 2 Ki. I. c. ver. 31.

² 2 Ki. I. c.

⁴ 2 Ki. I. c.

and like him honoured with lectisternia by the Jews who "prepared a table to Gad and filled the goblet for Meni."⁵

Now all these idols, whether expressly mentioned or implied by allusions, were worshipped, under the guidance of a numerous priesthood specially appointed, by images of wood and stone, and later of gold and silver, or by statues or pillars with an emblem of some deity, by sacred stones or *Bartylia* placed on the road and public thoroughfares and poured over with libations of wine and oil, and by Memorial-stones most likely provided with superstitious figures or emblems, on which the worshippers prostrated themselves; till finally the various images themselves, and not the idols they represented, were by the ignorant multitude looked upon as powerful beings able to save or to ruin; they were invoked with sacrifices and incense, libations and cake-offerings, with prostrations and kisses; they were honoured by processions and dances, and in some instances, as at the rites of Baal, by incisions with knives "till the blood gushed forth";⁶ they were appealed to in confirming oaths or consulted for prophecies; adored by the rich and the poor, by men and women, by kings and chiefs, priests and people, throughout the country, not only "in the towns of Judah and the districts of Jerusalem",⁷ but "from Geba to Beer-sheba",⁸ and "in all their towns from the watch-towers to the fenced cities",⁹ "in every street" and "at the corner of every road",¹⁰ so that the altars were countless in number "like the heaps in the furrows of the field",¹¹ or as Jeremiah exclaimed, "The number of thy towns, o Judah, is the number of thy gods, and like the number of the streets of Jerusalem you have set up altars to the abomination, altars to burn incense to Baal";¹² on heights, often artificially constructed in the form of lofty cones, sometimes even in valleys, and provided with their proper altars, or "upon every high hill",¹³ and on the roofs of houses, where permanent temples were built, or tents were fixed and spread over with varied hangings and curtains,¹⁴ in such vast numbers that the God of the Hebrews was described by the Aramaeans as "a god of the mountains and not a god of the valleys",¹⁵ because the celestials were supposed to live on high mountains, and to attend better to prayers addressed to them from an eminence; "under every green tree", in

⁵ Isai. LXV. 11.

⁶ 1 Ki. XVIII. 28, see p. 226.

⁷ 2 Ki. XXIII. 5; comp. ver. 13.

⁸ 2 Ki. XXIII. 5. ⁹ 2 Ki. XVII. 9.

¹⁰ Ezek. XVI. 24, 25, 31, 39.

¹¹ Hos. XII. 12.

¹² Jer. XI. 13; II. 28; comp. Ezek. XVI. 24, 31; see, however, Isai. X. 10.

¹³ Hos. IV. 13; X. 1; Isai. LXV. 7;

Jer. II. 20; III. 6; etc. etc.

¹⁴ 2 Ki. XXIII. 7.

¹⁵ 1 Ki. XX. 23, 28.

groves and in gardens,¹ "because its shadow is pleasant",² or because the mysterious darkness of groves and forests impressed a childlike imagination with awe and marked them as the fit abodes of the deity; on the corn-floors, where at harvest-time homage was paid to the gods of fertility, especially Ashtarte, by abusing her priestesses for money and presents; nay idols were revered in the very Temple of Jerusalem which was defiled by detestable images of every description, by altars erected in both Courts to Baal, Ashera, and all the "host of heaven",³ and by carriages and horses there kept and consecrated to the Sun,⁴ and the sanctity of which was so recklessly despised that within its precincts the Hebrews erected houses of prostitute priests, where the women wove tents for Ashtarte.⁵ Therefore the prophets might justly declare that the whole land was polluted, and that the ground devoted to sanctity had become an abomination.⁶

Nor did the Hebrews remain strangers to the belief in demons and spectres; they professed their faith in the existence of SHEDIM, that is, *lords* or *masters*, implying various kinds of foreign deities or evil spirits, and to them they offered not only sacrifices, but slaughtered their children;⁷ they attributed reality to the LILITH, a night-phantom dwelling in desolate ruins,⁸ and, according to eastern legends, rushing forth in the dead of the night, in the form of a beautiful woman to seize children and to tear them to pieces.

Besides, SOOTH-SAYING of every variety and description prevailed among the people from early ages up to the times of the Roman empire, when Jews wandered through the western provinces in quest of a modest livelihood by the practice of the art. Their wise men or wizzards practised DIVINATION⁹ to predict the future, especially by *rhabdomancy* or by means of *rods* or *wands*,¹⁰ of which two were placed upright, and then allowed to fall on the ground; the direction in which they fell involved the omen; or a rod was on one side stripped of the bark and thrown into the air; if in coming down, first the covered and then the bare side appeared uppermost, the augury was happy; if in the reverse order, unlucky. They were addicted to ENCHANTMENT¹¹

¹ 1 Ki. XIV. 23; 2 Ki. XVI. 4; XVII. 10; Isai. I. 29; etc. ² Hos. IV. 13.

³ 2 Ki. XXI. 5; XXIII. 4, 12.

⁴ 2 Ki. XXX. 11.

⁵ 2 Ki. XXIII. 7, see *supra*; comp. 1 Ki. XV. 12; XXII. 47; Deut. XXIII. 18, 19.

⁶ Jer. II. 7, and the entire chapter, etc.

⁷ Ps. CVI. 37. ⁸ Isai. XXXIV. 14.

⁹ Num. XXII. 7, 23; Deut. XVIII. 10; 2 Ki. XVII. 17; Isai. III. 2; XLIV. 25; Jer. XXIX. 8, XXVII. 9, Ezek. XIII. 6; and still in Zechar. X. 2.

¹⁰ Hos. IV. 12, "My people ask counsel at their wood, and their staff teaches them."

¹¹ Num. XXIII. 23; Deut. XVIII. 10; comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 17.

by spells muttered in a mysterious whisper,¹² to WITCHCRAFT¹³ and to MAGIC, to an extent not inferior to any of the eastern nations;¹⁴ they indulged in INCANTATIONS by which venomous serpents were supposed to be rendered harmless and obedient,¹⁵ and very largely in NECROMANCY often practiced while "sitting on graves",¹⁶ by means of a person who was considered to be prophetically inspired by a daemon;¹⁷ as in the very instructive instance of the "witch of Endor", who first learnt by the rising of Samuel's shade, that her guest was the king,¹⁸ and when asked by the latter what she saw, she replied "I see a god rising out of the earth",¹⁹ whose "appearance" she then described as that of "an old man wrapped in a mantle",²⁰ probably the "hairy garment" ordinarily worn by seers. And their prophets, adopting that distinctive garment of the class "for deception",²¹ misled the multitude by vain and fictitious DREAMS,²² which were often sought by sleeping on tombs, in sacred caves or edifices, generally on the hides of sacrificed animals, and by FALSE PREDICTIONS, whether pronounced in the name of Jehovah or of heathen gods. Most of these frauds and delusions were successfully carried on not only by men but by women, especially witchcraft, prophecy, and necromancy; and they were coupled with all the absurd and superstitious rites associated with them among the heathen nations; as, for instance, the false prophetesses "fastened cushions to all the joints of their hands, and laid pillows on their heads", a sign of the utmost luxury and effeminacy.²³

And all these idolatrous practices flourished from the earliest periods of Israel's history to the latest; during their sojourn in Egypt and during their wanderings in the desert under Moses; in the time of the Judges and the Kings, both in Judah and in Ephraim; even under the latest sovereigns of Judah, under Joahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, who succeeded the pious and ardent reformer Josiah; indeed in the long line of Judah's kings, four only, Asa, Joshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah, were active in promoting the service of Jehovah; a few others adhered to it themselves, but displayed no zeal for its diffusion; while all the rest were sunk in heathen aberrations, which were kept up in the Babylonian exile and after the return to Palestine, so that even when Jeremiah reproved his obstinate brethren who had forced him to

¹² Isai. VIII. 19; XXIX. 4.

¹⁸ 1 Sam. XXVIII. 12.

¹³ 2 Ki. IX. 22; 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6; Mic. V. 11; and even Mal. III. 5.

¹⁹ Ver. 13.

²⁰ Ver. 14.

¹⁴ Isai. II. 6; Mic. V. 11.

²¹ Zech. XIII. 4.

¹⁵ Jer. VIII. 17; Eccl. X. 11.

²² Jer. XXIII. 25, 27, 28, 32; XXIX. 8; Zech. X. 2; etc.; comp., however, Num.

¹⁶ Isai. LXV. 4. ¹⁷ Comp. Lev. XX. 27; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 7, 8.

XII. 6; Joel III. 1; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6.

²³ Ezek. XIII. 17, 18.

accompany them to Egypt, they contumaciously answered, "We will not hearken to thee; but we will...burn incense to the Queen of Heaven, and pour out drink-offerings to her, as we have done, we, and our fathers, our kings, and our princes, in the cities of Judah, and in the streets of Jerusalem; for then had we abundance of food, and were prosperous, and saw no evil: but since we left off to burn incense to the Queen of Heaven, and to pour out drink-offerings to her, we have wanted all things, and have been consumed by the sword and by famine."¹ So deeply were pagan notions ingrained in the minds of the people, and so fatal to a healthful morality were the effects of those perversities! And yet have we reason to believe that the records preserved to us in the Hebrew canon are far from complete with respect to the idolatry of the Israelites. For instance, the worship of the *brazen serpent*, certainly very old and incessantly carried on,² is mentioned for the first time together with the account of its abolition by Hezekiah.³ Again, the author of the Books of Kings states that Josiah "defiled" and thus rendered unfit for the further worship of Moloch "the Topheth in the valley of the children of Hinnom";⁴ yet he had never stated by whom the valley had been consecrated for that purpose. It may, therefore, be safely supposed that paganism prevailed among the Israelites in various other forms besides those described or hinted at in the Scriptures, which of course refer to idolatry but incidentally, without aiming at a systematic and complete account of its multifarious practices.

Let us, then, in a few rapid outlines, survey the history of Hebrew idolatry. Up to Solomon's reign, Baal and Ashtarte only are mentioned as Canaanite divinities; but a large portion of the people were addicted to their service at least from the earlier time of the Judges. By Samuel's influence, their images were indeed removed,⁵ and the religious reform seems to have extended up to the northern boundaries of the land;⁶ but his measures remained without enduring consequences. Then Saul is related to have banished from his dominions the sooth-sayers and wizzards;⁷ but this course would have been impossible without completely extirpating idolatry, which yet immediately afterwards is found in full blossom. Moreover, Solomon, besides consolidating the old, sanctioned or established various new forms of idol worship. Induced by his heathen wives, he built on the heights before Jerusalem temples for the Phœnician Ashtarte, with whose service probably that of Baal

¹ Jer. XLIV. 17, 18.

² Comp. Num. XXI. 4—9.

³ 2 Ki. XVIII. 4. ⁴ 2 Ki. XXIII. 10.

⁵ 1 Sam. VII. 3, 4.

⁶ Judg. XVIII. 31.

⁷ 1 Sam. XXVIII. 3.

was coupled, for Chemosh of Moab, for Moloch or Milcom of Ammon,⁸ for the gods of the Egyptians, the Edomites, and Hittites.⁹ In the empire of Israel, Jehu indeed caused a general slaughter of the priests of Baal;¹⁰ but we find, shortly before its termination, besides the older *cultus* of Baal, Ashtarte, and Moloch, also the adoration of the Sun¹¹ and all the heavenly hosts;¹² and the colonists, who were transplanted from Assyria into Samaria, imported with them numerous native superstitions which tainted the faint remnants of the service of Jehovah.¹³ In the empire of Judah, the pious king Amaziah is related to have brought to Jerusalem Edomite idols, to have adopted their worship, and honoured them with incense on their proper altars.¹⁴ Ahaz, adhering to Baal and Ashtarte, and burning his son to Moloch, removed from its usual place in the Court of the Temple the brazen altar hallowed by age, and set up in its stead another structure,¹⁵ besides encouraging the adoption of eastern rites, especially those of Assyria and Babylon. Hezekiah indeed abolished "the heights", broke the images of idols, even that brazen serpent that had been worshipped from the time of Moses.¹⁶ But his son Manasseh, passionately devoted to foreign superstitions, in which he saw the true source of wisdom and of wealth, not only restored the heights, but practised every variety of sooth-saying, burnt his son to Moloch,¹⁷ placed an image of Ashtarte into the very Temple,¹⁸ and built those small houses for her licentious priestesses, in which they wove curtains for her service,¹⁹ nay he seems to have entirely banished from the Court the old and sacred altar of Jehovah,²⁰ and in its stead he erected in both Courts altars of the stars, made accessible to the whole people,²¹ while at the entrance he placed the chariot with horses dedicated to the Sun:²² the sidereal worship, principally performed on the roofs of houses, took the strongest hold upon the nation, and required the perpetual warnings of subsequent teachers.²³ The well-meant exertions of Josiah were unable to eradicate pagan abominations, which soon returned and were embraced with the old zeal. The image of Ashtarte was probably erected again in the inner Court;²⁴ within the precincts of the Temple women mourned the death of Tammuz;²⁵ the

⁸ 1 Ki. XI. 5—7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13, 14.

⁹ 1 Ki. XI. 1, 8. ¹⁰ 2 Ki. X. 18—28.

¹¹ Isai. XVII. 8. ¹² 2 Ki. XVII. 17.

¹³ 2 Ki. XVII. 29—33.

¹⁴ 2 Chr. XXV. 14.

¹⁵ 2 Ki. XVI. 3, 4, 12—16; see p. 27.

¹⁶ 2 Ki. XVIII. 3, 4. ¹⁷ 2 Ki. XXI. 6.

¹⁸ 2 Ki. XXI. 3, 7; Jer. VII. 30; XV.

4; comp. Ezek. VIII. 3—6.

¹⁹ 2 Ki. XXIII. 7.

²⁰ 2 Chr. XXXIII. 16.

²¹ 2 Ki. XXI. 5; XXIII. 12.

²² 2 Ki. XXIII. 11.

²³ Jer. VIII. 2; XIX. 13; XXXII. 29; Isai. LXV. 3; Zeph. I. 5; comp. Job XXXI. 26—28; Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3.

²⁴ Jer. XXXII. 34; Ezek. VIII. 3—6.

²⁵ Ezek. VIII. 14.

Sun and the signs of the Zodiac were revered, and honoured with fumigations;¹ and most of these idolatries were not only maintained, but deemed indispensable for prosperity, by the exiled Jews in Egypt.²

Thus it is manifest that the history of Hebrew idolatry runs parallel with the growth of the purer religion of Jehovah; and without the former, the development of the latter cannot be rationally understood or appreciated. The cosmical creeds and the ethical faith fought an obstinate struggle for many centuries. Heathen elements of every variety could not be kept aloof; they could still less be repudiated; if they were modified, and it may be refined, so as not to clash with the fundamental truths of a monotheistic system, they were admitted without reluctance even by the better and profounder teachers, well aware that the contrast lived and rooted deep in the consciousness of the nation, that it was manifest even in the worship at the central Temple, but that it was capable of being, in some manner, harmonised, and perhaps gradually removed. In this active and vehement warfare, extended for at least a millenium, between the sensual and spiritual forms of religion lies the chief and most absorbing interest of the Biblical records — an interest of which it is utterly deprived by that mechanical and unhistorical view which assumes a pure and perfect religious system proclaimed at an early age, and, though exposed to heathen inroads, always safe and certain of victory because embodying the highest possible wisdom of man, if not supernaturally communicated by God.

XXIII. HUMAN SACRIFICES AMONG THE HEBREWS.

CAN it after the preceding sketch be surprising to find the custom of human sacrifices prevailing among the Hebrews during protracted epochs? It would indeed be almost unaccountable if just that custom had been singled out by them for rejection among the numerous heathen rites which they eagerly embraced,³ since, from a fatal confusion of religious ideas, human victims were regarded as the most meritorious and most acceptable of all offerings. Now we learn that the Hebrews “burnt their sons and their daughters in the fire”,⁴ or “offered them as burnt-offerings”,⁵ or “made them to pass through the fire.”⁶

But our estimation of the culture of the Hebrews must, in a great mea-

¹ Ezek. VIII. 7—11, 16, 17; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 5.

² Jer. XLIV. 1—29; see the declarations quoted *supra* p. 246.

³ Comp. Deut. XII. 30, 31.

⁴ Jer. VII. 31; comp. ver. 32; XIX. 5; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 3; see also 2 Ki. XVII. 31.

⁵ Jer. XIX. 5; comp. ver. 6; 2 Ki. III. 27.

⁶ Deut. XVIII. 10; 2 Ki. XVI. 3; XVII. 17; XXI. 6; XXIII. 10; 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6; Ezek. XX. 31; etc.; comp. 2 Sam. XII. 31 or simply Jer. XXXII. 35; Ezek. XVI. 21; XX. 26; Lev. XVIII. 21.

sure, depend upon the question *to what deities* they offered human sacrifices. It is indeed true, that, in most cases, they presented them in honour of *Moloch*⁷ and *Baal*,⁸ described as the "idols of Canaan"⁹ or their "abominations",¹⁰ or "evil demons",¹¹ and in the Assyrian period, perhaps imitating the colonists settled in Samaria, in honour of Adrammelech and Anammelech.¹² Yet we have at least two clear and unquestionable instances of human sacrifices offered to *Jehovah*. The first is the immolation of Jephthah's daughter.¹³ A calm examination of the Biblical account proves that the subject is unmistakable and admits of no doubt whatever. After Jephthah had been graced by the "spirit of Jehovah"¹⁴ and had set out on his expedition against the Ammonites, "he vowed a vow to the Lord, and said, If Thou shalt indeed deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, then it shall be, that whoever comes forth of the door of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be Jehovah's and I will offer him up for a burnt-offering";¹⁵ and when he returned victorious, and his daughter, his only child, went out to welcome him, he was indeed overpowered by grief; he rent his garments, and exclaimed, "Thou hast brought me very low and art the cause of my misery"; for he does not seem to have considered the probability of just his daughter coming out to meet him, but to have expected to see first a slave of his household; but with creditable ingenuousness he declared, "I have opened my mouth to Jehovah, and I cannot go back";¹⁶ he neither thought of substitution nor of redemption; and his daughter herself pronounced that view not only as justified but as conclusive and imperative; for she replied, "My father, thou hast opened thy mouth to Jehovah, therefore do to me according to that which has proceeded out of thy mouth";¹⁷ she only asked for a delay of two months, in order to bewail her short and unwedded life, together with her companions; the reprieve was granted; Jephthah's intention of sacrificing his daughter was publicly known for two full months; no priest, no prophet, no elder, no magistrate interfered or even remonstrated, and at the end of the stipulated time, the father "did with her according to the vow which he had vowed";¹⁸ the act of immolation is alluded to rather than described, because a detailed record of the horrid act was shunned by the theocratic historian. The

7 2 Ki. XVI. 3; XVII. 17; XXI. 6; XXIII. 10; Jer. VII. 31; XIX. 5, 6; XXXII. 35; Isai. LVII. 5; Ezek. XVI. 20; XX. 31; Ps. CVI. 37, 38; Wisd. XII. 5, 6; XIV. 23.

8 Jer. XIX. 5.

9 Ps. CVI. 38; comp. Deut. XII. 31.

10 Ezek. XXIII. 37, 39; XVI. 36; XX. 31.

11 Ps. CVI. 37.

12 2 Ki. XVII. 31; see p. 241.

13 Judg. XI. 30, 31, 34—40.

14 L. c. ver. 29.

15 Vers. 30, 31.

16 Ver. 35.

17 Ver. 36.

18 Ver. 39.

event gave rise to a popular custom annually observed by the maidens of Israel:¹ Jephthah's deed evidently met with universal approbation; it was regarded as praiseworthy piety; and indeed he could not have ventured to make his vow, had not human victims offered to Jehovah been deemed particularly meritorious in his time; otherwise he must have apprehended to provoke by it the wrath of God, rather than procure His assistance. Nothing can be clearer or more decided. Therefore Josephus admitted the literal truth of the story, though he naturally added reprovingly that Jephthah "presented an offering neither lawful nor pleasing to God"; in a similar manner the subject was viewed by the Talmud and the Fathers of the Church; and Luther, honest and keen-sighted, but helplessly harassed between his conviction and the tradition of the Church, observed in a marginal note, "It is assumed that he did not sacrifice her; but the text stands clear." It may be that Jephthah, the offspring of an illegitimate connexion, expelled from his father's house, reared in the east of the Jordan where the relations with the Tabernacle and the religious observances of Israel were lax and feeble, and depraved by the society of frivolous and reckless outlaws, though described as a man of sturdy honesty and piety,² might have been induced to believe that a vow common and prized among many nations, was an act of piety among the Israelites also, if made in honour of their national god Jehovah, though such fundamental error is not easily explicable in a man so thoroughly familiar with Hebrew history and Hebrew law as Jephthah is represented to have been:³ but the fact stands indisputable that human sacrifices offered to Jehovah were possible among the Hebrews long after the time of Moses, without meeting a check or censure from the teachers and leaders of the nation — a fact for which the sad political confusion that prevailed in the period of the Judges is insufficient to account.

Very numerous apologetic devices have been propounded in ancient and modern times, but they are, without any exception, repudiated by the plain laws of a sound exegesis. It has been fancifully supposed that, when Jephthah uttered the vow, he had in mind his dog, the animal most likely to await with impatience the return of the absent master — but the dog, an unclean animal, is unfit for sacrifice; or that he thought of a beast of his flocks or herds — but that could hardly be expected to come "out of his house." The Hebrew words in fact absolutely exclude any animal whatever; they admit none but a human being, who alone can be described as going out of the house to meet somebody; for though the restrictive usage of the East binds girls

¹ Ver. 40.² Comp. Hebr. XI. 32.³ Judg. XI. 15—27, 35, 36.

generally to the seclusion of the house, it seems to have been a common custom for Hebrew women to proceed and meet returning conquerors with music and rejoicing;⁴ and the sacrifice of one animal, an extremely poor offering after a most signal and most important success, would certainly not have been promised by a previous vow solemnly pronounced. Again, it has been supposed that Jephthah's daughter, though killed according to the law of "devoted" persons, was not actually sacrificed to God, but dedicated to His service at the Sanctuary, by means of a kind of nazariteship, and under the supervision of the High-priest; or that she was destined to isolation and seclusion, or to perpetual virginity which was considered "a living death." But all these opinions are arbitrary evasions utterly opposed to the tenour of the Hebrew text. Jephthah had distinctly promised "a burnt-offering." Vows of celibacy were entirely unknown among the Hebrews. In Jephthah's time, the Tabernacle was at Shiloh, in the land of the Ephraimites, against whom he was engaged in deadly warfare, and to whose hands, therefore he was not likely to entrust his daughter. Jephthah's grief and despair⁵ are explicable only on the supposition of his daughter's actual death; had she been dedicated to the service of Jehovah, the satisfaction he must have felt at the holiness of her office and of her future life would have almost counter-balanced his pain at her childlessness, especially as her offspring would not have borne his name. Moreover, it is even doubtful, whether dedicated women were obliged to remain single; the example of Samuel proves at least that no such restriction was imposed upon dedicated *men*. The daughter herself laments expressly and strongly "her virginity", because, in harmony with Eastern views on the mission of women, she mourned partly the misfortune and partly the disgrace of her childlessness. But both the misfortune and the disgrace were so fully outweighed by the glory of her obedience to the claims of the paternal vow, that the maidens of Israel praised the fate of the *sacrificed* virgin, and perpetuated its honour and distinction by annual festivals. If she was not to suffer death, why did she demand a delay of two months for bewailing her unmarried state, which she would have been free to do during the rest of her life? The passages that have been adduced to prove the metaphorical use of the words "offering up for a burnt-offering" in the sense of dedicating to the service of God,⁶ are inconclusive, as they occur either in poetical compositions or in writings of a very late date when prayer, good works,

⁴ Comp. 1 Sam. XVIII. 6; see also Exod. XV. 20.

⁵ Ver. 35.

⁶ Hos. XIV. 3; Isai. XXXIV. 6; Ps. XL. 7—9; LI. 19; CXIX. 108; Sir. XXXV. 1, 2; Wisd. III. 6.

and other pious exercises, were figuratively described as substitutes for the sacrificial service then impossible.¹ The words "and she knew no man" (ver. 39), which once more depict the heroic death of the pure virgin with quiet pathos and emphasis, are asserted to form "the subject of the vow", and therefore to mean, she devoted herself to God or to His sanctity — but celibacy and sanctity were in the Hebrew Scriptures nowhere equivalent or correlative terms, and were never understood as such by the Israelites to whose life and notions the idea of the celibacy of women was utterly abhorrent. Again, it has been contended that the narrative is designed to point out the complete contrast that existed between the institutions of the Ammonites and those of the Israelites; therefore, as human sacrifices were sanctioned among the former, they cannot be supposed among the latter — a systematic contrast which no unbiassed reader of the narrative has yet discovered. Or it is averred that the pious Jephthah was not to be punished but to be enlightened; in making the vow he thought of some external possession; he was to learn that man must be ready to surrender his blood, the dearest treasure of his heart: but the plain story, evidently communicated as historical, could not have been employed by the author as the vehicle of an abstruse doctrine, much less as the text of an edifying discourse. Others again have recommended the translation, "whatsoever comes forth of the doors of my house to meet me ... shall surely be the Lord's, or I will offer it up for a burnt-offering"; that is, if a human being, he or she shall be devoted to the Lord's service; if an animal fit for sacrifice, it shall be presented as a burnt-offering. Never has an elliptical expression like this been heard of in any language; it is certainly rejected by the spirit of Hebrew; and yet it does not include or provide for a third contingency — if an *unclean*, or a clean but *faulty* animal were to meet Jephthah: thus another and a strong reason is afforded to prove that he could have had in his mind a human being only. Equally objectionable are the translations, "that shall belong to the Lord, and I will (besides) offer to Him a burnt-offering"; and "or I will offer to *Him* a burnt-offering;" for they are excluded by the grammatical construction of the words. — Of the many other apologetic artifices suggested by a misplaced zeal, and revealing by their singularity the hopelessness of the struggle, it may suffice to quote one more. Jephthah, it is supposed, had indeed vaguely imagined that his only daughter would hasten to welcome him, but he had yet secretly hoped that "God would not demand from him so great a sacrifice, and would so direct things that, what was most improbable in itself, would come to pass, and that

¹ See p. 48.

not she but one of his most devoted slaves would come to meet him" — a subtle casuistry which, in utter dissonance with the character and culture of a Jephthah, covets the merit of heroic piety, but in truth involves hypocrisy and cowardice.

We have dwelt at such length on the history of Jephthah's vow, because the conclusions which it suggests are of the highest importance. From the tenour of the narrative it is manifest that the deed was no isolated case, but that human sacrifices were on emergencies of peculiar moment habitually offered to God, and expected to secure His aid. One instance like that of Jephthah not only justifies but necessitates the inference of a general custom. Pious men slaughtered human victims not to Moloch nor to any other foreign deity, but to the national God Jehovah. The intended sacrifice of Isaac clearly points to the same result, although that story is designed to teach the Hebrews an important lesson on the true spirit of sacrifice.² Again, it is not sufficient to concede that, in the time of the Judges, the "Mosaic Law" was little known and not strictly observed, as is admitted even by orthodox writers; it can, at that period, absolutely not have existed at all; had it existed, a God-fearing leader could not have uttered a vow cursed as an abomination in the Pentateuch; and had he uttered it, he would have been prevented by the appointed guardians of that code from publicly executing the impious and detestable act.

The second recorded instance of human sacrifices killed in honour of Jehovah, forms a remarkable incident in the life of David.³ It has above been proved that this distinguished monarch held images of Jehovah to be entirely inoffensive, and considered them a lawful means of ascertaining the future.⁴ But he advanced another and most serious step in his misconception of the attributes of a Divine being. For when famine distressed the land and he had been informed by an oracle, that God's anger was roused on account of Saul's unjust and cruel slaughter of the Gibeonites, to whom protection had been guaranteed by Joshua,⁵ he delivered up to the men of Gibeon, on their request, seven descendants of Saul — "seven being the holy number suitable at the performance of a godly work" — "to hang them up to Jehovah", or "before Jehovah": and when thus "atonement" had been wrought, Jehovah's wrath was appeased, and the famine ceased. This story gives rise to very grave reflections. We dismiss with a passing allusion a few points not directly connected with the present enquiry. If Saul had committed a misdeed, why did David allow the punishment

² See Com. on Genes. p. 291.

³ 2 Sam. XXI. 1—14.

⁴ See pp. 233, 234.

⁵ Ver. 2; Josh. IX. 15, 19, 20; comp. on the other hand, Deut. VII. 2, 24 (thou shalt utterly destroy them).

of his *descendants*, whereas the Pentateuch plainly teaches, "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nor shall the children be put to death for the fathers; every man shall be put to death for his own sin"?¹ And why had the whole nation to suffer the direst misery for a treachery of which the king alone bore the responsibility? It is here not the place to remark on the deep stain which the transaction casts upon David's character, who readily seized so terrible an expedient for ridding himself of the surviving and dangerous scions of the preceding dynasty, whom he was pledged by the most solemn oaths to spare and to protect,² while he saved none but the lame, harmless, and unwarlike Mephibosheth. Nor is it necessary to examine, whether Saul was really guilty of the alleged attack upon the Gibeonites, or whether he was merely charged with it by the oracle as a pretext for the inhuman retribution; it is not mentioned at all in the Hebrew records; and if it yet took place, it was probably too trifling an affair to deserve the historian's notice. But it particularly concerns us to observe that the whole matter was, in the first instance, referred to Jehovah; that David was plainly informed of the intention of the Gibeonites of "hanging up" the seven persons "before Jehovah" as an "atonement"; that he willingly surrendered them for that atrocity; that he evidently expected from that act a cessation of the famine; and that this calamity is reported to have really disappeared in consequence of the offering. The sacrifice was indeed performed by the Gibeonites, but it was performed with the knowledge and consent of David. Thus human offerings were presented to Jehovah, not, as in the case of Jephthah, in a time of political or religious anarchy, but after the establishment of a strong monarchical government; nor countenanced by an untutored outlaw, but by one of the most cultivated minds that adorned the history and literature of the Israelites. It is of little consequence whether the narrative is literally historical, or whether it has been framed by the author of the second Book of Samuel, who utters no word of reprobation, in accordance with an old tradition; the latter alternative would be more significant still; for as the Books of Samuel were composed at a very late period, they would argue the prevalence of most objectionable notions during many subsequent ages.

No case of a human sacrifice offered to Jehovah is chronicled later than the time of David; but this absence of express testimony does not

¹ Dent. XXIV. 16; ² Ki. XIV. 6; ² 1 Sam. XXIV. 22, 23; comp. XX. 2 Chr. XXV. 4; Num. XXXV. 33; see 15, 42.
p. 297.

prove absence of the practice, since the Hebrew Scriptures are far from complete in their record of public and private worship. The more explicit are the statements of the Bible with regard to human victims slaughtered in honour of Moloch. This idol, probably worshipped by the Hebrews from early times and even in the desert under the eyes of Moses,³ and provided with a formal service by Solomon,⁴ received constant sacrifices by all sections of the nation, both in the empire of Israel and of Judah.⁵

Under one of Solomon's immediate successors a remarkable event took place well calculated to prove the pre-eminent efficacy attributed to human offerings. Mesha, the king of Moab, was besieged in Kir-haraseth, and hopelessly pressed by the joint armies of Israel, Judah, and Edom, the two former being led by the kings Jehoram and Jehoshaphat: in this critical position "he took his eldest son that should have succeeded him on the throne, and offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall", that is, publicly in the sight of the besieging army; after which — so continues the historian — "a great wrath came upon the Israelites, and they departed from him, and returned to their own land."⁶ It is uncertain whether the king of Moab slaughtered the sacrifice to his own national deity Chemosh, or, as is indeed less probable, to Jehovah, who had till then so effectually assisted the Hebrews, and whose favour he might, therefore, have been anxious to secure for himself; it may also be admitted that Jehoshaphat, the pious king of Judah, had no decisive voice in the military councils, since he was only an ally of Jehoram, the idolatrous ruler of Israel and the chief originator of the war; and that he can, therefore, not be made responsible for the hasty and infatuated return of the army; and granted even that the Edomites, confederated with the Hebrews, were particularly affected by the apprehended consequences of the king of Moab's deed: yet it remains an undeniable fact that the Israelites were terrified by the power, supposed to be irresistible, of the human sacrifice to such a degree, that they abandoned the certain prospects of victory, and retreated ignominiously, enraged at the extreme device of the heathen monarch, who had preferred to devote his heir to the deity, rather than lose his land or independence. The words which we have rendered, "a great wrath came upon the Israelites", neither mean, "and there was a great wrath (of God) against Israel", since they had *occasioned* the horror of the human sacrifice, that is, they were smitten by a plague

³ Comp. Am. V. 26; see p. 240.

XXXII. 30, 32; Hos. XIII. 2 see also

⁴ 1 Ki. XI. 5, 7; see p. 240.

Mic. VI. 7.

⁵ 2 Ki. XVII. 17, 19; comp. Jer.

⁶ 2 Ki. III. 27.

or suffered a defeat, which, if brought into causal connection with Mesha's sacrifice, would aggravate the superstitious conception of the historian; nor can they signify "and there was a great indignation (of the enemies) against Israel", which had existed long before the sacrifice in utmost intensity; they can, according to sound exegetical rules, only point to the consternation into which the sacrifice, designedly performed in public, threw the troubled Hebrews; and the efforts that have been lavishly made to avoid this conclusion are necessarily forced and futile.

And as if to remove every doubt on the awful subject, the Hebrew annals mention acts similar to that of the king of Moab as having been performed by several subsequent kings of Judah themselves, perhaps even without that urgency of the occasion which stimulated the pagan monarch. For it is related that Ahaz, the king of Judah (B. C. 743—728), "caused his son to pass through the fire, in accordance with the abominations of the heathens";¹ and the same execrable deed is recorded of Manasseh, the son of the pious Hezekiah.² Indeed Manasseh seems to have established, as a new and special place for the regular and permanent service of Moloch, that Topheth in the valley of Hinnom which, up to the eighteenth year of Josiah's reign (B. C. 642—611), remained untouched.³ And though the detestable worship was then temporarily interrupted, it was soon afterwards resumed in its accustomed form. For Jeremiah again had occasion to break forth in the complaint, "The disgrace (i. e. the disgraceful idols) devoured the labours of our fathers from our youth, their flocks and their herds, their sons and their daughters; we lie down in our shame, and our confusion covers us; for we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers, from our youth *even to this day*."⁴ Nay even Ezekiel, writing during the Babylonian exile, inveighed against his obdurate co-religionists, "Thus says the Lord God, Do you pollute yourselves after the manner of your fathers? . . . for when you offer your gifts, when you make your children to pass through the fire, you pollute yourselves with all your idols *even up to this day*;⁵ and the same prophet reproached the people, that blood was in their hands, for they burnt the very children whom they had born to their abominable idols "for food"; and when they had committed such revolting impiety, they had the hardihood to enter the Temple of Jehovah, and to profane it by their presence.⁶ The hundred and sixth Psalm, composed in

¹ 2 Ki. XVI. 3; 2 Chr. XXVIII. 3.

⁴ Jer. III. 24, 25; comp. VII. 31, 32;

² 2 Ki. XXI. 6, comp. 2 Chr. XXXIII. 6.

XIX. 2—6, 13, 14; XXXII. 35.

³ Comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 10; Jer. VII. 31;

⁵ Ezek. XX. 30, 31; comp. XVI. 20,

XIX. 6, 14; see p. 240.

21, 36.

⁶ Ezek. XXIII. 37, 39.

the captivity during the dispersion of the people,⁷ and offering a brief survey of the people's destinies with reference to their religious career, confesses in general, that the Hebrews "sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the demons, and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and daughters, whom they sacrificed to the idols of Canaan, so that the land was polluted with blood."⁸ And even the second Isaiah, who wrote at Babylon in the latter part of the exile, exclaimed, "Are you not children of iniquity, a seed of falsehood, who are inflamed for the idols under every green tree, who slay the children in the valleys, under the cliffs of the rocks?"⁹

It is, therefore, undoubted that human sacrifices were offered by the Hebrews from the earliest time up to the Babylonian period, both in honour of Jehovah and of heathen deities, not only by depraved idolators but sometimes even by pious servants of God; they probably ceased to be presented to Jehovah not much before they ceased to be presented at all; for being prized as deeds of singular piety, they were efficiently opposed and ultimately abolished only when the notions of piety itself were purified and refined. This was accomplished mainly by the diffusion and growing authority of the Pentateuch and the increased zeal of devoted reformers and leaders. Then at last Jehovah was conceived and taught in a manner more compatible with the attributes of an omnipotent and eternal spirit, the Creator and Ruler of the Universe, and then that religious system was finally developed, which bears the distinctive name of Mosaic or Hebrew, and which is fundamentally different from that of the other ancient nations.

This will be more obvious, if we briefly state

XXIV. THE VIEWS OF THE PENTATEUCH AND THE HEBREW PROPHETS ON IDOLATRY AND HUMAN SACRIFICES.

THE idols were designated by names which alone are almost sufficient to prove in what light they were regarded by the more discerning minds among the Israelites. They received appellations expressive either of scornful contempt or of vehement abhorrence; for they were called, on the one hand, NONENTITIES,¹⁰ that is, *gods that are no-gods*,¹¹ powerless and mute,¹² empty and unreal shadows that cannot help nor save,¹³ while Jehovah is the only One that *is or exists* for ever,¹⁴

⁷ See Ver. 47.

⁸ Vers. 37, 38.

¹¹ Jer. XVI. 20; V. 7; or *no-deity*. Deut. XXXII. 21. where it occurs as a synonym of vanity.

⁹ Isai. LVII. 5.

¹² Hab. II. 18.

¹⁰ Lev. XIX. 4; XXVI. 1; Isai. II. 8, 18, 20; 1 Chr. XVI. 26; Ps. XCVI. 5; XCVII. 7; comp. 1 Cor. VIII. 4; see also X. 19; Isai. XIX. 1; see XXI. 9.

¹³ 1 Sam. XII. 21.

¹⁴ Exod. III. 14.

or VANITIES,¹ lying and deceitful,² because the work of human hands, made of metal or wood,³ or BLOCKS and TRUNKS,⁴ whereas Jehovah is man's "strength and fortress and refuge",⁵ or the "rock of help";⁶ and on the other hand, they were termed ABOMINATIONS,⁷ or DETESTATIONS:⁸ and they were, together with those who manufactured them, derided by the prophets with the bitterest and most taunting sarcasm, in passages which belong to the most exquisite compositions of the whole canon.⁹ Therefore, terms like "Jehovah is the God of gods", or "awful above all gods", or "the highest God", or "none is like Thee among the gods", wherever they occur in later writings, do not involve a recognition of other deities, but mean simply that Jehovah, the acknowledged God of the Hebrews, is mightier than the beings whom other nations consider as gods, and from whom they expect help and deliverance. It is indeed probable that those terms point to a time when the veneration of the Hebrews was divided between Jehovah and other deities as between rival gods, and when the latter were not yet looked upon as "nonentities"; thus Jephthah, in his message to the king of the Ammonites,¹⁰ attributed to their god Chemosh power to procure for them victory and conquest, in the same manner as Jehovah assists the Hebrews;¹¹ for the absolute sovereignty of Jehovah was a notion gradually arrived at by severe intellectual struggles. But when the victory was gained at last, Jehovah was so exclusively worshipped as the Lord of all nature and all mankind, that He was described not only as the source of light but also of darkness, nor only as the author of "peace" but also of "evil",¹² lest a temptation be left of adopting a good and an evil principle in the world, after the manner of the Persian, Egyptian, and other heathen creeds. Then it was that all divinities besides Him were designated as *strange* or simply as *other gods*, though the Hebrew pantheon was constantly enlarged by *new* deities that had not been revered in preceding generations. To express the

¹ Deut. XXXII. 21; 1 Ki. XVI. 13, 26; 2 Ki. XVII. 15; Jer. II. 5; LI. 18.

² Jon. II. 8.

³ Jer. X. 2, 8, 15; LI. 18.

⁴ Lev. XXVI. 30; Deut. XXIX. 16; 2 Ki. XVII. 12; XXI. 21; Ezek. VI. 4, 6; XIV. 6; XVI. 36; XX. 7, 8, 39; XXIII. 39; XXX. 13; etc.

⁵ Jer. XVI. 19; comp. X. 6, 7.

⁶ Deut. XXXII. 15; comp. Acts XIV. 15.

⁷ Deut. XXXII. 16; 2 Ki. XXIII. 13; Ezek. XI. 21; etc.

⁸ Hos. IX. 10; Deut. XXIX. 16; Jer.

IV. 1; Ezek. V. 11; XX. 7, 8; 1 Ki. XI. 5, 7; 2 Ki. XXIII. 24.

⁹ Isai. XLIV. 9—19; XL. 19, 20; XII. 6, 7; XLV. 16, 20; XLVI. 6, 7; Jer. X. 3—5; etc.

¹⁰ Judg. XI. 15 *sqq.*

¹¹ Ver. 24, "Dost thou not take possession of that which Chemosh thy god gives thee to possess? so whomsoever Jehovah our God drives out before us, them will we possess"; comp. also 2 Ki. V. 19.

¹² Isai. XLV. 7; comp. ver. 5.

intimacy and holiness of the relation that was to exist between Jehovah and the Hebrews, it was often represented by the figure of a matrimonial alliance — God as the husband or father, Israel as the wife or the children, as the son or firstborn son; every deviation from His precepts was conjugal faithlessness or “fornication”;¹³ God was supposed to send to His undutiful people “a letter of divorce”;¹⁴ and in many other points that simile was carried out with elaborate minuteness;¹⁵ or Israel was described as God’s people or inheritance, His peculiar nation or treasure, His chosen ones or His flock.¹⁶ Meanwhile the notions of theocracy were developed and practically applied in the organisation of the state. Then Jehovah was conceived not merely as the God, but as the king of the people, and then a leaning towards other deities was not only treachery but treason. A public curse was to be pronounced against those who revered idols in secret.¹⁷ The mere attempt at seducing others to unlawful worship, though the attempt was made with a brother, a son or a daughter, a beloved wife or a friend, was to be visited with lapidation,¹⁸ even if it were supported by dreams and prophecies, by real and undeniable miracles.¹⁹ A town that had been induced to adopt idolatrous rites, was to be destroyed, both men and beasts together with all property; it was to remain “an eternal heap of ruins, never to be rebuilt.”²⁰ Prostration before idols or swearing by their divinity was a heinous crime;²¹ their very names should not be familiarly uttered.²² Idolatry itself became synonymous with “iniquity.”²³ As, therefore, idol-worship in whatever form implied revolt against Jehovah’s absolute supremacy, it was interdicted on penalty of death for individuals,²⁴ and of excision and dispersion for the nation.²⁵ It was menaced with the most fearful woes and troubles, especially in the Books of Deuteronomy and Leviticus, which were completed at a time when public calamities and national disasters could fitly be represented as the Divine retaliation for hardened disobedience: not only were those general terms which had almost become conventional in portraying

¹³ Exod. XXXIV. 15; Lev. XVII. 7; Num. XIV. 33; Judg. VIII. 27; Hos. I. 2; II. 1, 7, 21, 22; IV. 12; V. 7; Isai. I. 21; Jer. II. 2, 25; LII. 5; etc.

¹⁴ Jer. III. 8.

¹⁵ Comp. Ezek. XVI. XXIII.

¹⁶ On these and other metaphors see Comm. on Exod. pp. 217, 248.

¹⁷ Deut. XXVII. 15.

¹⁸ Deut. XIII. 7—12; XVII. 2—7.

¹⁹ Vers. 2—6.

²⁰ Deut. XIII. 13—18.

²¹ Exod. XX. 5; XXIII. 24; Deut. V. 9; Josh. XXIII. 7; etc.

²² Exod. XXIII. 13.

²³ 1 Sam. XV. 23; Isai. LXVI. 3; comp. also Hos. IV. 15.

²⁴ Exod. XXII. 19; Deut. XVII. 2—7; XIII. 2—6; XII. 29—31; see Comm. on Exod. p. 327.

²⁵ Deut. VI. 14, 15; VIII. 19, 20; XXX. 17, 18; XXXI. 16—18; comp. Josh. XXIII. 7, 16; XXIV. 14, 15; 1 Ki. IX. 6—9.

Divine retaliation, employed to pronounce that all nature will be visited by the curse of God — that ample seed would yield scanty produce, and the trees bear no fruit, since the locust, the cricket, and the vermin, blast and mildew would destroy the vintage and the harvest; that the sky would be like brass, and the earth like iron; that sand and dust would descend instead of rain and dew; that man and beast would be afflicted with barrenness; that pestilence would rage with every fearful and incurable disease, and the minds of men be overwhelmed by confusion, anguish and madness —; but it was distinctly declared, that the land of the Hebrews would be deluged by foreign hosts whom “God should bring from afar, from the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flies, and whose tongue they would not understand”; that they would suffer the most terrible sieges, when, in helplessness and despair, they would “eat of the fruit of their own bodies, the flesh of their sons and their daughters”, and refuse to grant a share of the horrid food even to their nearest and most beloved kinsmen; that their corpses would lie unburied and unheeded; and that then the land would be occupied by the relentless enemy, who would seize their houses and vineyards, their flocks and herds, carry away their wives, their sons, and daughters, their kings and chiefs into a strange country, there to suffer distress and want and ignominy, and to be scattered among all nations, from one end of the earth to the other, yea to be sold again into Egypt as bondmen, though despised and rejected even for the meanest services, till their name became a horror and a by-word among all nations:¹ all this was sure to befall them if they swerved from Jehovah and His precepts;² and all transgressors were warned not to indulge in the delusion of being exempted from the awful chastisements of idolatry.³ So faithfully did the authors of the Pentateuch describe, as eye-witnesses, the fearful misfortunes that crushed Israel and Judah in the Assyrian and Babylonian periods.

But it is not enough to acknowledge Jehovah as the only God;⁴ He must be adored under no visible form whatever, not by any image, figure, or likeness, whether of man or woman, of beast or bird, of fish or reptile;⁵ because, according to the writer’s account, the people, when communing with God at mount Horeb, had only

¹ Deut. XXVIII. 15—68; Levit. XXVI. 14—13.

² Comp. vers. 15, 20, 45, 47, 48; comp. also Deut. IV. 25—27; VI. 14, 15; VIII. 19, 20; XI. 16, 17; XXX. 17, 18; 1 Ki. IX. 6—9.

³ Deut. XIX. 16—21.

⁴ Exod. XX. 3; Deut. V. 7; comp. Isai. XLII. 8; etc.

⁵ Deut. IV. 16—18; comp. ver. 25; V. 28; Exod. XX. 4; Isai. XL. 18; XLVI. 5.

heard a voice, but seen no figure.⁶ Moreover, nearly all the manifold forms of idolatry which prevailed among the Hebrews in the author's times, or had been practised by them in former periods, were individually interdicted — the worship of the heavenly bodies, of sun, moon and stars,⁷ of Ashtarte⁸ with her licentious service,⁹ and of the animals held sacred by the Egyptians,¹⁰ the worship on "high places",¹¹ and the erection of altars and images, statues and memorial stones for idolatrous purposes,¹² while their absolute destruction, wherever they should be found,¹³ was commanded with such uncompromising severity that not even the gold or silver with which they were made or adorned, was allowed to be used, but was to be detested like a curse and an abomination;¹⁴ nay the Canaanite tribes themselves were to be extirpated, and all alliances with them scrupulously shunned, lest they should seduce the Hebrews to adopt their gods and their superstitions.¹⁵ The Pentateuch forbids incisions and other mutilations of the body customary among heathens;¹⁶ it brands divination and enchantment, witchcraft and magic, incantation and necromancy,¹⁷ which arts, if practiced secretly, are menaced with excision, if publicly, are to be punished with death by stoning,¹⁸ since they belong to those abominations, on account of which the tribes of Canaan had been doomed to perdition,¹⁹ and which would preclude the Israelite from being "perfect with his God."²⁰ But it denounces the heinousness of human sacrifices with a vehemence of indignation which proves at once how deeply they were detested by the enlightened, and how inveterately they were upheld by the mass of the Israelites. It ordains that any man, whether a stranger or a Hebrew, who offers up his child to Moloch, shall be stoned to death, for "he has defiled the Sanctuary of the Lord and His holy name"; it adds that, if anyone encourages, were it only by his silence, such deeds of horror, God threatens, "I will set My face against that man, and against his

⁶ Deut. IV. 12, 15; comp. Exod. XX. 18—21.

⁷ Deut. IV. 19; XVII. 3; Lev. XXVI. 30; see also Jer. X. 2. ⁸ Deut. XVI. 21.

⁹ Lev. XIX. 29; Deut. XXIII. 18, 19; comp. 1 Ki. XXII. 47; 2 Ki. XXIII. 7.

¹⁰ Lev. XVII. 7; XVIII. 3; Deut. XXXII. 17.

¹¹ Lev. XXVI. 30; comp. Ezek. VI. 3; XX. 29.

¹² Exod. XX. 23; Lev. XIX. 4; XXVI. 1; Deut. XVI. 22.

¹³ Exod. XXIII. 21; XXXIV. 13; Num. XXXIII. 52; Deut. VII. 5; XII. 2, 3;

comp. Isai. XXVII. 9; 2 Ki. XVIII. 4; XXIII. 24.

¹⁴ Deut. VII. 25, 26; comp. Isai. XXX. 22.

¹⁵ Exod. XXIII. 32, 33; Deuter. VII. 2—4, 24; XX. 16—18; comp. Exod. XVII. 14; 1 Sam. XV. 2, 3.

¹⁶ Lev. XIX. 28; XXI. 5; Deut. XIV. 4.

¹⁷ Exod. XXII. 17; Lev. XIX. 31; Num. XXIII. 23; Deut. XVIII. 10, 11.

¹⁸ Lev. XX. 6, 27; 1 Sam. XXVIII. 3, 9; 2 Ki. XXIII. 24.

¹⁹ Deut. XVIII. 10, 11; comp. 2 Ki. XXIII. 24. ²⁰ Deut. XVIII. 13.

family, and will cut him off and all that go astray after him, from among their people" ¹ — an addition which renders it evident that, on the part of the people, an indulgent connivance at the rites of Moloch was to be apprehended; and it repeats the same injunction with sustained emphasis; while the prophets inveigh against the revolting practice with implacable bitterness, and predict, as an inevitable punishment, death and pestilence, affliction and mourning, and general desolation, ³ famine in sieges and disaster in battles, ⁴ subjection and ignominy. ⁵

Thus, in spite of the perpetual and decided prevalence of idolatry, there always existed among the Hebrews a small band of clear-sighted men, who by a fine intuition were capable of forming purer notions, and often proclaimed them at the peril of their lives; they were the "holy seed" that was to grow into a towering tree; they were the spark that was to light the torch of progress; for long epochs their voice was heard in isolated accents only, in prophetic speech, such as the requirements of the moment called forth; till at last their doctrines were laid down in a collected code, if not systematically, at least comprehensively, enjoined with earnestness and authority, and, if necessary, shielded by the arm of worldly power. Therefore, while other nations remained sunk in superstition and disappeared tracelessly as soon as they had lost their national independence, the Hebrews, from the beginning endowed with the germ of intellectual advancement, flourished and developed their true strength in exile and persecution. By adopting the canon of the Scriptures, compiled and sanctioned by their spiritual leaders, they were familiarised with the ideas that had so long been preached in vain, and which found a welcome support in the influence of the almost Puritanical spirit of the Persian religion suffering no image or representation of its deities. Then the task could be undertaken, so consistently accomplished in the Books of Chronicles three or four generations after Zerubbabel, ⁶ of composing the anterior history of the Israelites from a Levitical point of view, of treating it in accordance with the principles set forth in the Pentateuch, and of colouring, nay of modifying the narrative of the events by a constant regard to the observance or neglect of the "Mosaic Law." A later work, the Book of Daniel, written in the second century before the present era, and carrying the thread down to the last years of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, represents the complete triumph of the worship of Jehovah over that of all idols, and describes how even heathen kings,

¹ Lev. XX. 2—5.

² Lev. XXVIII. 21; Deut. XII. 31; XVIII.

10.

³ Jer. VII. 31—34.

⁴ Jer. XIX. 1—13; XXXII. 35.

⁵ Ezek. XVI. 36 *sqq.*

⁶ See 1 Chr. III. 19—24.

lost in the grossest superstitions, are forced to acknowledge the grandeur and the supremacy of the God of Israel, and to command His service within their dominions.⁷ And this glorious and fondly cherished hope is finally realised in the Books of the Maccabees, especially the first, which record the exploits of the champions of Israel's faith, and the persecution and partial annihilation of idolatry, and which disclose the firm hold which the Pentateuch, hallowed by the authority of the name of Moses, had then already gained upon the thoughts and the lives of the Jews.⁸

XXV. CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL REMARKS ON THE THEOLOGY OF THE PAST AND THE FUTURE.

It would be a matter of regret to us if the preceding observations, misleading attentive and impartial readers, were understood by them to imply an unqualified vindication of the doctrines of the Hebrew prophets and the Pentateuch. Such an inference would be equally opposed to the tenour of our deductions and to truth. It has been our object fairly to contrast the purer views and precepts of a more enlightened class among the Hebrews with the idolatrous habits preserved by the bulk of the nation from the earliest to the latest time. But though we could not but represent the former as immeasurably superior, we have as yet found no occasion for pronouncing an opinion on their absolute truth. We now propose to enter upon this enquiry, which we regard as the chief object of this treatise, and to which all anterior sections were meant to be preparatory. We shall, at present, not enlarge upon the question of the date and age of the Pentateuch, though it might be almost conclusively settled from the facts already adduced;⁹ but leaving this momentous point for future and special discussion, we shall confine ourselves to an examination of the theology of the Pentateuch and of those historians and prophets, whose writings embody the conceptions of the most advanced of the nation. It has too long been customary, even for liberal and acute critics, merely to comment on the *facts* contained in the Bible, and to weigh the degree of reliability they merit, while the *ideas* and the *teaching* have either been declared final for all times, or have at least been tacitly assumed as unimpeachable. The time, however, has arrived for abandoning this questionable course, for determining by a searching and calm enquiry the positive value of the notions current in the Scriptures, and for

⁷ Compare, among other passages, Dan. II. 47; III. 28—30; IV. 31—34; V. 23; VI. 11, 26—28.

⁸ Comp. 1 Macc. II. 17—25; IV. 43; V. 68; X. 83, 84; XIII. 47, 48.

⁹ Comp. Sectt. III, XV, XXIII.

ascertaining by a candid estimate, how far they satisfy the modern mind and correspond with the philosophical and scientific results of the last centuries. This task will either show the entire sufficiency of the Bible for all our spiritual needs; or, if it lead to a different conclusion, it will prove an essential preliminary to constructing a system of theology that shall be in harmony with our general modes and habits of thought, accord with the achievements of science and with the ordinary tenour of modern life, and which shall thus beneficently influence our conduct and progress.

In our age, we are accustomed to look upon every occurrence as the natural and inevitable consequence of human action, or of some other circumstance with which it is connected. We attempt to trace effects to adequate causes. Unchangeable laws regulate the life of individuals and nations, and prescribe the course to universal history. The gradual development of mankind is the necessary result of the abilities, energies, and passions inherent in men. The happiness of the individual depends, in a great measure, on his mental and physical organisation; it is the ordinary concomitant of healthful vigour of body and mind, as wretchedness is the usual fate of weakness and morbidness. Prosperity is the combined product of personal exertion and favourable opportunity. Man is, therefore, in some respects, a free agent, but in a much higher degree, he is a creature of necessity. The works which he produces result from the talents he possesses, and from the activity he is able or willing to display. They are prompted by that internal impulse which is inseparable from his idiosyncrasy. He is capable of improvement and advancement, as he is liable to retrogression and decline. He labours as his powers bid him; he succeeds according to the measure of his gifts or of his usefulness; and he finds his chief reward in the consciousness of having zealously cultivated and honestly employed his faculties.

If, with these notions which underlie our whole life, we turn to the Scriptures, we are at once struck by a different sphere of thought, a strange and unfamiliar spirit. Forced away from the circle of ideas which guide us in our daily pursuits and reflections, we are abruptly transferred to conceptions and views, which indeed occasionally touch a sympathetic chord, whether from their poetical and imaginative beauty or from the ineffaceable impressions of childhood, but which our maturer manhood finds it impossible to acknowledge and to adopt. The affection for a venerable tradition that may linger in our hearts, at last yields to the severer truths dictated by our intellects.

1. THE CREATION.

The Scriptures teach that the universe and all it contains, were called into existence in six days, by God's direct command. This Biblical cosmogony¹ is grand and sublime, but it is erroneous and unscientific; it disregards those attributes of matter which, by their own inherent power, of necessity produce the changes and combinations that constitute the cosmos; therefore, it arbitrarily compresses within the compass of a few days what was effected by the gradual operation of myriads of milleniums, and it transforms into acts of personal agency what we are wont to regard as the result of clear, constant, and unchangeable laws.²

2. MIRACLES.

The same personal interference continues in Biblical *history*. For special ends, the eternal course of nature is altered, and *miracles* are performed. Yet the idea of miracles is absolutely opposed to our notions of the universe, as derived from a patient cultivation of the natural and historical sciences. It gains ground whenever men, unable to understand their position as a subordinate though organic part of mankind, consider themselves or their community as the chief end of creation and general government. For it rests virtually on the assumption that nature pays special regard to the deeds and destinies of individuals or single nations, and bestows aid and sympathy, or displays resistance and enmity, according to the pleasure of a ruling power, whereas her whole economy is one and indivisible, embracing the universe, and working in majestic impartiality for all worlds alike. Thus Spinoza might justly use *miracles* and *ignorance* as convertible terms, and he adds the weighty words fraught with significant meaning, "I believe the principal difference between religion and superstition to be this that the former is founded upon wisdom, the latter upon ignorance; and I am convinced that herein lies the reason why the Christians are distinguished from other men not by an honourable life nor by love nor the other fruits of the holy ghost, but merely by an opinion; because, like all the rest, they fortify themselves only by miracles, that is by ignorance, which is the fountain of all wickedness, and thus convert faith, however true, into superstition."¹ How few are ready to admit the truth of these words even nearly two centuries after they were written! Ancient nations felt strongly the influence of the divine in nature; but as they had explored the latter but imperfectly, all re-

¹ Gen. I. 1—II. 4; compare also the second account, Gen. II. 5—24.

Genes. pp. 1—41; on the imperfect astronomical notions of the Bible, see

² See the Treatise in Comm. on

ibid. pp. 11—22.

markable or unusual phenomena appeared to them as direct manifestations of the deity, or as miracles, which inspired them alike with terrifying awe and sublime veneration; and these feelings were the more powerful, the more vividly and freshly their minds were affected by all impressions and the more consistently they were accustomed to develop and to apply every new and great idea. The assumption to which we have alluded gave rise to the Roman fictions of *prodigia* or *portenta*, by which the gods were believed to announce impending calamities or important events — the sky appearing in a blaze of fire or flaming torches seen in the air; spears or hands burning but not consumed; men of fire attacking and fighting with each other; flesh or worms, earth, stones or blood raining from heaven; rivers flowing in blood; human monstrosities born; animals speaking, mules bringing forth young, or wonderful animals, as a snake with the mane of a horse, starting up; trees springing from the soil full-grown, or cut stems suddenly rising to an unusual height; rocks moving of themselves; birds in anguish seeking refuge in private or public buildings; marvellous or alarming sights and sounds produced by delusion of the senses; or images of gods speaking, or shedding tears continuously. The Biblical miracles are founded on similar notions. Heavenly bodies are said to have been arrested in their course by the behest of God;¹ yet we know that such contingency would be inevitably followed by a complete derangement of the sidereal systems, and by incalculable ruin of thousands of worlds. Occasionally even the Bible shows a gleam of the conviction of nature's immutable stability. "He has established the heavens for ever and ever; He gave a law and they trespass it not";² "He said to the sea, Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed";³ "I have placed the sand for the boundary of the sea by an eternal law, that it cannot pass it; and though its waves rage, they cannot prevail";⁴ but such incidental admissions do not materially influence the spirit and tenour of the narratives. According to Biblical accounts, the Divine will constantly changed the intrinsic properties of things which constitute their very character and essence. But if we read that the water of the Nile was converted into blood,⁵ and ordinary water was changed into wine, as at the marriage of Cana;⁶ that the waves of the Red Sea were divided and stood upright like a wall, and the floods of the Jordan, struck by Elijah's mantle, opened a dry

¹ Josh. X. 12—14; comp. Isai. XXXVIII. 5.

² Ps. CXLVIII. 6.

³ Job. XXXVIII. 11.

⁴ Jer. VI. 22; comp. Eccl. I. 10; III. 14.

⁵ Ex. IV. 9; VII. 17—20.

⁶ John II. 1—11; IV. 46.

path;⁷ that an axe, which had sunk to the bottom of the Jordan, rose to its surface by Elijah's will and swam there,⁸ and that Christ walked on the water of the lake Genesareth;⁹ that the men of Sodom or Bar-Jesus (Elymas) turned suddenly blind,¹⁰ and blind men recovered their sight as suddenly;¹¹ that a staff became a serpent and a serpent a staff, a healthy hand was at once made leprous, and a leprous hand healthy;¹² that the earth opened its womb to engulf alive a number of offenders,¹³ or the dead were revived or raised alive from the grave;¹⁴ that Moses was forty days on Mount Sinai without requiring any food whatever,¹⁵ or that a limited supply of flour and wine was practically unlimited and sufficed for the household of the widow of Zarephath a considerable time;¹⁶ that every vessel which a prophet's wife could possibly procure, filled itself by Elisha's command with oil;¹⁷ that twenty loaves of barley proved more than abundant for a hundred men,¹⁸ or 4,000 men, beside women and children, were satisfied by seven loaves and a few little fishes, and left over seven baskets full of broken pieces;¹⁹ that a fig-tree, covered with leaves and expected to bear fruit, instantaneously withered away;²⁰ that the ass of Balaam spoke, a raven provided Elijah regularly with bread and meat,²¹ and a whale preserved Jonah in its womb three days and three nights, and then threw him unhurt on the dry land;²² if we read all this, we might be led to the perplexing belief that there is nothing stable and fixed in nature, were we not taught by science to regard undeviating uniformity as nature's first principle. All reality is destroyed, and the things, deprived of their clearly defined character, lose their intrinsic value and absolute existence. "The miracle changes the serious code of nature into a merry book of fairy-tales; but for this reason, miracle itself deserves to be ranked no higher than a fairy-tale." Disdaining, like fancy to

7 2 Ki. II. 8, 14.

8 2 Ki. VI. 6. 9 Mark VI. 48, 49.

10 Genes. XIX. 11; Acts XIII. 6—11.

11 Matth. IX. 28—30; XX. 32—34.

12 Exod. IV. 2, 7; comp. 2 Ki. V. 27; Luke XVII. 12—14; Matth. VIII. 2, 3; see also IX. 20—22 (the woman who had an issue of blood for twelve years was instantly healed by touching the garment of Christ).

13 Num. XVI. 30—33.

14 John XI. 1—11 (on the resurrection of Lazarus); Matth. X. 18, 24, 25; comp. 1 Ki. XVII. 17—22; Acts IX. 40; see esp. Matth. XI. 5 (the blind receive

their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up).

15 Exod. XXXIV. 28; comp. Matth. IV. 1, 2; Luke IV. 2.

16 1 Ki. XVII. 14—16.

17 2 Ki. IV. 3—6. 18 2 Ki. IV. 42—44.

19 Matth. XV. 32—38; comp. Mark VI. 38—44, where the numbers are 5000 men, 5 loaves, 2 fishes, and 12 baskets. 20 Matth. XXI. 19.

21 1 Ki. XVII. 4, 6; comp. the legend in XIX. 5—7.

22 Jon. II. 1, 11; comp. also Judg. VI. 36—40.

which it is largely indebted, the fetters of necessity, it capriciously confounds the qualities of matter, combines what is naturally incompatible and disjoins what is inseparable. Every miracle "paralyses reason"; for it checks the specific work of the latter, which consists in searching for laws and causes, and, by depriving it of the safe support of experience, renders it valueless even for pointing out the path of practical duty. The miracle attempts to sway nature, but not, like reason, by penetrating into its organism, but by misusing it for arbitrary ends; unrestrained by any limit and unshackled by any condition, it appears infinite and inexhaustible in power; exercising an absolute rule over matter, and reminding man of his own inborn yearning, it is by unreflecting generations easily mistaken as divine. Hence the East is the home of miracles; because the East is most apt to confound fancy and reflection: these two faculties have indeed abstraction as a common element; but fancy sets at naught or renounces reality, while reflection judiciously preserves but spiritualizes it.

It is not only useless but objectionable to reduce the miracles by ingenious and strained interpretations, to the least possible number, or to explain them away altogether, by representing them merely as ordinary occurrences told in a marvellous or imaginative form.

This observation has a wider scope still. It must create the utmost perplexity, if the results of philosophical thought are by strained expositions grafted upon the Scriptures, in the vain hope thereby to save the authority of the latter.

It is equally unavailing to confine miracles to certain periods; Catholicism, in this respect more in accordance with the spirit of the Bible than Protestantism, which attempts an unsuccessful compromise between belief and reason, extends their operation beyond the limits of tradition and supposes their constant and living manifestation. For the Biblical narrative contains not simply miracles, but is throughout framed in a miraculous spirit. It is entirely compiled on the assumption of a perpetual and immediate intervention of God in the natural course of events. That extraordinary "offering of jealousy", on which we have commented above,¹ and which is manifestly an ordeal involving the regular and miraculous interference of God, is alone sufficient to point out the wide chasm which separates the Biblical from the scientific notions beyond all possibility of agreement. Wonders are freely employed to remove difficulties, even where these might have been overcome by natural agencies. Whether Noah and his family are alone rescued amidst the universal destruction of all living creatures, or

¹ Sect. XVI.

Lot is by special messengers of God saved from the calamities which overthrow his entire district; whether Pharaoh is, by unparalleled afflictions, forced to release the Hebrews, or the persons and the property of the latter remain untouched when appalling misfortunes befall the land; whether God personally guides and protects the patriarchs, or at once afflicts the women of Abimelech's household with barrenness because that king takes Sarah into his house;² whether He gives to the myriads of Israelites wandering in the desert food and water in abundance for forty years, or makes the Syrian army hear a noise of vast numbers of horses and chariots to delude them into the belief of large hosts approaching, in consequence of which they flee panic-stricken, leaving their whole camp behind them³ — these and all the numerous traits of a similar kind defy all laws both of reason and experience, and substitute phantasmagoric playfulness for sober historiography to such a degree that even the attempt at harmonizing them with scientific results bespeaks the slothfulness of a mind equally unable to form an independent estimate of the antiquated past, and to keep pace with the growth of modern inquiry. "By the direction of God", observes Spinoza, "I understand the fixed and immutable order of nature or the concatenation of natural things. The general laws of nature, by which everything happens and is determined, are nothing but the eternal decrees of God, which ever involve eternal truth and necessity. Therefore, whether we say that everything happens according to the laws of nature, or that everything is ordained by the will and direction of God, we say the same thing." These views, whether they be avowed or not, rule our lives and our thoughts. They must form the starting point of all future theories of philosophy or theology. Sometimes indeed the Bible records natural facts in connection with miracles; for instance, Moses threw a certain wood which God had shown him into the bitter waters of Marah, which then became drinkable,⁴ and similarly Elisha rendered salubrious for ever a deleterious spring of water while casting into it a quantity of salt;⁵ Elisha leaned repeatedly over the dead boy, till the latter grew warm and returned to life;⁶ the Syrian general Naaman was healed from leprosy after bathing seven times in the Jordan;⁷ and the ten plagues of Egypt are all based on natural phenomena of almost regular occurrence in that country;⁸ but these facts, though affording *to us* valuable hints and explanations, were by the Biblical

² Gen. XX. 17, 18.

³ 2 Ki. VII. 6, 7; comp. vers. 1, 16.

⁴ Exod. XV. 25.

⁵ 2 Ki. II. 21, 22; comp. IV. 38—41.

⁶ 2 Ki. IV. 34, 35; comp. also VI. 6;

II. 11; IV. 14—17; VI. 12.

⁷ 2 Ki. V. 1—14.

⁸ See Comm. on Exod. pp. 87 *sqq.* and the notes on the plagues.

narrators not meant to remove the miraculous character of the events; they prove, on the contrary, that even where a natural explanation offered itself, and was suggested by tradition, it was rejected by miracle-loving generations, and set aside in favour of the assumption of extraordinary agencies. Yet, what natural basis can be discovered for the legends that Miriam became suddenly "leprous like snow" because she had spoken slightly of Moses,¹ that a corpse which touched the bones of Elisha, became alive and rose from the grave,² or that diseases were cured, physical defects removed, and evil spirits expelled by touching the hand or the garment of Christ, or "an handkerchief or apron" of the apostle Paul?³ that a large number of fiery horses and chariots appeared to rescue Elisha from his pursuers?⁴ that fire came out of a rock by striking it with a staff, and consumed the meat and the cakes placed thereon by Gideon as an offering?⁵ that the sea raged because it bore the guilty Jonah, and became tranquil as soon as the latter was removed from the ship?⁶

And yet the Bible itself lowers considerably the force and effect of miracles by attributing the power of performing them not only to Hebrews worshipping foreign gods,⁷ and to heathens controlled by the might of Jehovah, as in the instance of Balaam, but to idolators who work in opposition to Jehovah himself, as the magicians of Egypt.⁸ The New Testament goes even farther; it supposes miracles to be performed by "false Christs and false prophets"⁹ to such a degree "that if it were possible they might deceive the very elect";¹⁰ the enemy of the Church, represented under the form of a beast rising out of the earth, "did great wonders, made fire come down from heaven, and thereby deceived many men";¹¹ and "the spirits of the devils", which betray the kings of the earth and of the whole world, work miracles.¹² Wonders, therefore, neither testify to the greatness of God, nor to the purity or truth of doctrines. It is, moreover, extremely difficult to distinguish between a true and a false miracle; all criteria that have been fixed, are either indefinite or fallacious.

The inference to be drawn from these facts is as decisive as it is significant. Can a gift that an idol is able to bestow, have any value or

¹ Num. XII. 10. ² 2 Ki. XIII. 21.

³ Matth. VIII. 13, 15; IX. 20—22; Mark VI. 55, 56; VII. 32—35; Acts XIX. 12.

⁴ 2 Ki. VI. 17; comp. II. 11.

⁵ Judg. VI. 20, 21.

⁶ Jon. I. 12—15.

⁷ Deut. XII. 2—6.

⁸ Exod. VII. 9—12, 22; VIII. 3; see, however, ver. 14.

⁹ Matth. XXIV. 24; comp. 2 Thess. II. 9.

¹⁰ Comp. Revel. XIX. 20.

¹¹ Revel. XIII. 13, 14.

¹² Revel. XVI. 14; comp., however, John III. 2 (no man can do these miracles except God be with him).

reality? Can those powers be supernatural which a Hebrew prophet shares with a priest of Baal?

Miracles are both impossible and incredible — impossible because against the established laws of the universe, and incredible because those set forth by tradition, are palpable inventions of unhistoric ages.

The belief in miracles may, in certain periods, not be without advantage and importance; it emanates from a spiritual elevation, perhaps from a moral impulse; it may serve to strengthen the religion of the heart and to sanction those doctrines which the mind recognises as true and eternal; it may thus prove a material aid to a genuine faith; but it can, at best, only be a means to that end; it loses its usefulness, when it loses the connection with the mind; it becomes injurious and dangerous and leads to mechanical ritualism or fanatic vehemence when it is isolated from the moral faculties; and engenders hypocrisy and falsehood when it ceases to be conceived in simplicity and childlike ingenuousness. According to the current and traditional view, miracles were wrought exclusively in the early times of deficient education and imperfect knowledge; they are no longer reported in the more enlightened epochs of progress and research. Why should they have so suddenly and so completely ceased? It is futile to reply that they were performed only as long as they were necessary for the training of the human race; for miracles, by confounding and often insulting reason, and hence fostering superstition, especially magic, witchcraft and sorcery, to which they are akin, far from promoting, tend to retard the education of mankind. They are valueless for our advancement, whether in religion or philosophy; for neither the one nor the other can be improved by phenomena which the human mind is unable to understand; those facts and ideas only can influence us which lie within the sphere of our common nature; "from an effect which surpasses the capacity of man, he cannot deduce intelligible truths, and those are silly who, if unable to understand a thing, have recourse to God; forsooth, a ridiculous mode of displaying ignorance."

The notion of "rational wonders" which has been proposed, is preposterous; for all wonders are irrational; they realise their character the more completely, the more irrational they are; for reason penetrates into the depth and essence of things, while the miracles play lightly on their surface. The *love of the miraculous*, innate in human nature, and strongest in imaginative or enthusiastic minds and in the early stages of development, is the parent of miracles: they germinate not in the quality of things but in the propensity of men; "believe you that I am able to do this?" Jesus asked the blind men who came to

him to be cured, and "they said to him, Yea, Lord";¹ a leper appealed to him saying, "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean", and Jesus said, "I will", and the leprosy was immediately removed;² miracles are desired and demanded when they are believed in; their origin lies neither in the sphere of metaphysics nor of theology; they can be truly explained only as psychological phenomena. Mohammed was pressed on all sides to perform miracles in vindication of his alleged mission; the incessant requests of both friends and foes, justified by the precedents of the Old and New Testament, almost brought him to despair, and in vain he insisted, that the greatest miracles are the creation, the animal and vegetable kingdom, or heaven and sea.

The untutored or youthful mind delights in uncommon and astounding mysteries, the manly intellect endeavours to reduce all uncommon and astounding mysteries to ordinary and intelligible laws. The one is, therefore, prepared to witness miracles before an occasion arises, the other refuses to acknowledge them even after they are supposed to have happened. The childlike believer feels his yearnings unsatisfied by the severe, impartial, and uniform rule of ever-balancing and all-embracing reason; the thoughtful philosopher disdains the insinuating flatteries of aspiring enthusiasm, of exceptional or providential protection, because he divines eternal harmony and order in the stern sameness of nature's working. The former, therefore, requires extraordinary marvels to be awed, since "the miracle is the dearest child of faith", while the latter is impressed with a sense of sublimity by examining the common and daily operations of nature. Confiding apathy beholds in the affairs of life the inscrutable and desultory play of preternatural influences; energetic reason is restless to discover the connecting thread of cause and effect. Hence the former either disregards or reads to no purpose the book of the past, while the latter derives from it the most fruitful lessons for his guidance and training. The feeble-minded, conscious of his own helplessness, constantly tries to support it by some unexpected and unaccountable aid; the resolute man of action glories in his ability of maintaining his due place in the system of creation by his own energy and the legitimate exercise of his strength. And while the one is eager to be lifted, on the wings of fancy and of faith, immeasurably beyond his natural sphere, the other prefers laboriously to conquer, by the sword of thought and science, his proper domain as a rational being, and to desire no more, convinced that he is great only in the same degree as he is independent, and that his conquests are sure and inalienable when he obtains them by his own

¹ Matth. IX. 28.

² Matth. VIII. 2, 3; comp. IX. 22.

efforts and the unrestrained power of his nature. The contrast, therefore, between the miracle-loving Scriptures and the productions of pragmatic history, is nothing less than the contrast between poetry and truth, between the hazy beauty of the morning-dawn and the clearness of the midday-sun, between the first creditable efforts of reflecting infancy and the safe conclusions of experienced manhood.

History rests on proofs and the internal evidence of facts; the Biblical narrative introduces elements lying beyond the test of ordinary examination, and often directly opposed to all experience, reason, and possibility. While, therefore, the one possesses objective truth, the other may be accepted or rejected according to the general principles adopted by individual readers.

The Scriptures habitually represent drought and famine, pestilence and earthquake, floods and every disaster of the elements, as the results of idolatry and wickedness; they make the cessation of these inflictions dependent on the people's return to God and virtue,³ and hence speak, for instance, of "the ignominy of famine":⁴ but the scourges of nature result from physical laws which, though they should never be explored entirely, certainly repudiate the notion of a direct influence of the moral upon the physical world. And with respect to the living creation, the conception of the Bible is so childlike, that it assumes the possibility of moral degeneracy in animals, generally supposes a simultaneous corruption of men and beasts, and includes both in the same exercises of penitence, fasting, and humiliation;⁵ nay even the earth, the abode of man, and the material from which his body was framed, may share in the general depravity; and hence the destruction of man, as was the case in the deluge, includes the destruction of the beasts, and at least the temporary devastation of the earth, if not, as in the visitation of Sodom and Gomorrah, its utter annihilation⁶ — all which notions are to us like strange and fanciful echoes of a remote past.

The veil which once covered and hid nature, has in a great measure been withdrawn. The awe which man felt at her grandeur, has thereby not been diminished; on the contrary, it has gained in intensity and reality. But the enquirer has become conscious that he must renounce the hope of fathoming a power that rules her working; that she does not enable him to understand the distinction between "a primary cause" and "secondary causes", since, throughout her dominion, she reveals

³ Comp. Exod. XXIII. 25; Lev. XXVI. 6, 7, 10, 19, 20, 26; Deut. XXVIII. 3—5, 11, 12, 16—18, 23, 24; Deut. XI. 13—17; etc.

⁴ Ezek. XXXVI. 30; comp. XXXIV. 26—29.

⁵ Jon. III. 7, 8; comp. IV. 11; Jer. XII. 4; Hos. II. 20; IV. 3; Zeph. I. 3; and other passages.

⁶ Comp. Gen. VI. 12, 13, 17; Comm. on Gen. pp. 119, 121.

causes that he must consider as primary, and beyond which he cannot pass if he desires to penetrate into the genesis of things; and that, therefore, man's dignity and his happiness depend on the earnestness with which he explores nature's laws and obeys her suggestions and behests.

2. PRAYER AND OTHER DEVOTIONS.

From the principles laid down with regard to miracles, it will not be difficult to estimate the value of several other fundamental notions which pervade the Bible. If every effect produced in the material world is the consequence of a commensurate physical cause to which it is intrinsically related, human supplication, sacrifices, fasting, or any other form of devotion or asceticism, cannot possibly exercise an influence on the course of events or on the destiny of men. There exists no conceivable connection between the one and the other. The spiritual aspiration of prayer lies in a sphere totally different from that which causes the changes or the progress of the external world. If we read that Elijah's prayer suddenly called down from heaven a fire to consume his sacrifice,¹ we are startled by a complete overthrow of all the truths to which we are accustomed with regard to the permanent order of things, and we find it impossible to abandon the undisputed results of science in favour of a doubtful tradition, even if the latter did not form part of a narrative coloured throughout by fanciful legends. If the entreaty of Abraham at once removed the barrenness which had afflicted the women in Abimelech's household,² if prayers are supposed to effect or to accelerate the recovery of the sick,³ and even to restore the dead to life,⁴ or to cause sudden blindness,⁵ we fail to see, how words, however fervent, can affect a physiological process resulting from the complicated operation of the human organism. And yet the New Testament plainly teaches, "Is anyone sick among you? let him call for the elders of the Church, and let them pray over him . . . and the prayer of faith shall save the sick";⁶ nay it contends, "If you shall say unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea, it shall be done; and all things whatever you shall ask in prayer, believing, you

¹ 1 Ki. XVIII. 36—38.

² Gen. XX. 17, 18; comp. XXV. 21; 1 Sam. I. 10 *sqq.* ³ Comp. Num. XII. 13, 14; 2 Chr. XXX. 18—20; 2 Ki. XX. 3, 5, 6; 1 Ki. XIII. 6.

⁴ 1 Ki. XVII. 17—22 (on the son of the widow of Zarephath); Acts IX. 40 (on Tabitha or Dorcas); comp. also 1 Ki.

IV. 33 (on the son of the Shunamite woman).

⁵ 2 Ki. VI. 18; comp. vers. 17—20.

⁶ James V. 14—16; comp. 2 Ki. XX. 1—6; Wisd. XVI. 12; the Chronist remarks even, with censure, that king Asa in his illness "did not consult God but the physicians" (2 Chr. XVI. 12).

shall receive";⁷ and thus it consistently asserts, "all things are possible to him that believes."⁸ By what inherent force is prayer able to stay a pestilence⁹ or a locust-plague,¹⁰ or to procure the victory in war?¹¹ If people pray for rain to secure a plentiful harvest,¹² they cannot be aware of their irrational proceeding; or else they would not cherish the impossible hope, that for the sake of the limited district in which they happen to live, the meteorological laws which fix the distribution of rain over the whole globe, should be capriciously upset, a contingency which, were it feasible, would utterly derange the atmospheric relations of our planetary system. In short, the efficacy attributed to prayer lies entirely in the unreal region of the miraculous. When, in 1865, public prayers were appointed to be offered up throughout Great Britain, for the cessation of the cholera, the objections entertained by many of the most educated men were well expressed by Prof. Tyndall. "The great majority of sane persons", he observed, "at the present day believe in the necessary character of natural laws, and it is only where the antecedents of a calamity are vague and disguised that they think of resorting to prayer to avert it"; he calls this a "pagan method of meeting the scourge"; and he adds "the ideas of prayer and of a change in the course of natural phaenomena refuse to be connected in thought."¹³

If the heart of man is filled with humiliation and shame on account of moral transgressions or deficient zeal in the exercise of virtue or of duty, let him, in contrition, confess to himself his weakness or apathy, and atone his guilt by increased energy and diligence in every noble pursuit. If his soul rejoices in the possession of boons and benefits, let him evince his worthiness by an unselfish use of these blessings, by banishing pride, by lending his indefatigable assistance to the less fortunate, and by unostentatiously aiding every excellent scheme. And if his mind is lost in amazement at the grandeur of nature and the admirable fitness of all her parts, let him prove his appreciation of her magnificence by an eager study of her marvellous mechanism and by an ungrudging obedience to the lessons she teaches. But it is

⁷ Matth. XXI. 21, 22; comp. XVII. 20, 21; Mark XI. 24; Luke XVIII. 1; XXI. 36; Ephes. VI. 18; Rom. XV. 30, 31; 2 Thess. III. 1, 2; Hebr. XIII. 18, 19; etc.

⁸ Mark IX. 23.

⁹ Ps. CVI. 30; Num. XXI. 7; XI. 2; 1 Ki. VIII. 37.

¹⁰ Joel II. 11—14.

¹¹ 1 Ki. VIII. 33, 34, 44—50; 2 Ki. XIX. 15; Jer. XXXVII. 3; 2 Macc. XII.

36, 37; X. 27—30; comp. Jer. XLII. 20; Deut. IX. 20, 26; Prov. XV. 8, 29.

¹² Comp. 1 Ki. VIII. 35; XVIII. 41—45; James V. 13—18.

¹³ See the *Pall Mall Gazette* of October 12 and 19, 1865, and the discussion carried on in that journal on the same subject during the greater part of the month of October, and evidently rousing much public interest.

vain and irrational to utter supplications for such objects as health, long life or posterity, riches, success or distinction; for they either lie entirely beyond the control of man, or depend on the measure of his abilities and his vigour, or they follow, as an inevitable sequence, from the organisation of society or the order of the physical world. Ancient writers already saw the difficulty that different men of equal earnestness and piety often pray for opposite things, which the deity cannot possibly grant simultaneously. "Some sailors", observes Lucian, "pray for north-wind, others for south-wind; a farmer desires rain, a cloth-worker sunshine, and often Jupiter is uncertain and hesitates in his decision." Nay Plato classes the belief in the possibility of moving the gods by sacrifices or prayers among the worst forms of impiety and the unfailling causes of wicked deeds.

Hence we may estimate the value of the prayers sanctioned by the different creeds and sects; and we take as a specimen the chief Christian prayer attributed to Christ himself and partially borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish sources, a prayer which is allowed by common consent to be one of the finest forms of supplication. "Our father that art in heaven." Is that Being which is adored as Divine enthroned in one special abode? does it not pervade the universe and fill all that surrounds us, all nature with her wonders and her wealth? And what is "heaven" in the scientific language of our time? Nothing distinct from sky or air, atmosphere or ether. — "Hallowed be Thy name." What does this traditional phrase and the following one, "Thy kingdom come", express which cannot be conveyed with much greater clearness by terms derived from the sphere of practical ethics — by the terms self-sacrificing devotedness and unswerving rectitude, universal diffusion of peace and virtue, of knowledge and truth? — "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." This absolute power of decision in all things utterly contradicts our well-established views of the general course of events regulated by unchangeable conditions. — "Give us this day our daily bread." Even the most pious sees in these words hardly anything beyond the *wish* that the efforts of his intelligence or activity may be successful, or that the operation of the elements which constitute our social organism, may be favourable for securing his sustenance or establishing his worldly prosperity. — "And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors." Only the latter part of this invocation depends upon ourselves, and if carried out in a free and generous spirit, forms our highest moral glory; but the former part is in many cases unfeasible; for a guilt can only be condoned by those against whom it was committed; and very often the commonwealth

does not and cannot pardon guilt, but exacts the most rigid retribution, which, however, involves the atonement of the offender. — “And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.” It is against the well-known order of things that circumstances and events should be guided with the special view of keeping individuals away from temptation; they take their necessary course, and trials can only be avoided and misfortunes overcome by prudence and moral strength. — “For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever.” These words can have a distinct meaning only by depriving both the world of matter of all independence, and human society of all responsibility.

Devotion, in the spirit above indicated, is not only beneficial, but indispensable as a requirement of every moral mind; but prayer in the vulgar sense is at variance with reason and intelligence. “Praying, observes Kant, “taken as a formal act of worship and a means of grace, is a superstitious illusion; a sincere wish to please God in all our ways, that is, the frame of mind accompanying all our actions and making them appear to be performed in the service of God, is the spirit of prayer, which can and ought to work within us incessantly.”

Before beginning difficult or uncertain and dangerous enterprises, men feel disposed to pray and to invoke higher assistance. What is the motive and impulse of such prayer? It expresses the wish, that all external circumstances also might be propitious which, no less than man's own strength and ability, his prudence and perseverance, are required for the successful issue; it is, in a word, an appeal to fortune, or if it be preferred, to chance, which consists in an auspicious concatenation of extraneous conditions.

It may be that in many cases prayer, by producing a calm confidence, enhances the energy of man, and contributes to his success; but it does not exercise that influence because it is in reality efficacious, but because he who prays *believes* it to be so; therefore, the strong-minded will prefer earnest reflection, or any other means of rousing his activity, to a fictitious help founded upon delusion and prompted by weakness. Men have indeed at all times wavered on this point. Intelligence and a sense of independence urged them to expect their happiness from their own exertions, but inertness and indolence led them to rely, at least partially, on prayer. This fluctuation gave rise to utterances like “Trust in the Lord and do good”,¹ or the time-honoured injunction *ora et labora* and many similar adages. In the Bible we meet, on the one hand, the principle, “Whatsoever thy hand finds to do, do it with all thy might”,² and on the other hand, “Cast

¹ Ps. XXXVII. 3.

² Eccl. IX. 10.

thy destiny upon the Lord, and He will sustain thee";¹ or "Unless the Lord build the house they labour in vain that build it; unless the Lord guard the city the watchman wakes in vain";² and progressing almost to the verge of paradox, the same text continues, "It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late . . . for He (God) gives it to His beloved in his sleep."³ The Bible indeed attaches prominent weight to *reliance* and *faith*, as might be expected from its eastern origin and from the childlike stage of intellectual development which it represents; and it is, on this account, especially foreign to our present modes of viewing life and the government of the world.

Kindred with prayers are the *blessings* and *curses* pronounced upon others: the blessing of Isaac, even supposed it were not written *post eventum*, was powerless to secure the prosperity of Jacob's descendants, who had to depend on their own conduct and the force of circumstances; nor would the curses of Balaam have exercised any influence upon the career of the Israelites. The belief in the efficacy of blessings and curses, though often emanating from the laudable desire of securing the good wishes of the pious, or from the well-founded fears of a guilty conscience, is, in fact, based on that fatal confusion of the moral and the material world, which is the prolific parent of despicable and often dangerous superstitions.

That which is true of prayer, the purest and most spiritual form of devotion, applies with increased force to all other pious exercises, to *sacrifice* or *fasting*. There is no connection between these practices and the ordinary affairs of human life. No degree of self-castigation can avert a calamity which is the inevitable result of a chain of events or of physical conditions. We must repeat once more — to expect an effect without a corresponding cause, is superstition. Yet the Biblical narrative constantly introduces prayer, sacrifice, and the like, and attaches to them a profound and mysterious reality. Who will deny, that any ceremony, however unmeaning in itself, if performed in a spirit of earnestness and humility, may serve the best and holiest ends of religion, by rousing the soul and directing it to its highest duties? But here again, it is not the ceremonies which work so beneficially, but the frame of mind which they happen to call forth; however, this frame of mind, very different in different worshippers, might be produced in many other ways, and is, in fact, more surely engendered by means better consistent with the true nature of man and his place in creation. Even the so-called *good works*,

¹ Ps. LV. 23; comp. XXXVII. 5.

² Ps. CXXVII. 1.

³ Ver. 2; the English Version ren-

ders the last words incorrectly and unintelligibly, "for so He giveth His beloved sleep".

as charity and alms-giving, truly ennobling and beatifying if exercised from a consciousness of the obligations which man owes to man, and from a feeling of single-minded self-denial, are a noxious perversity, if performed in the selfish hope of obtaining the favour of the Deity and thereby securing temporal or eternal happiness; not only do the good works thus lose their chief merit and grace, not only do they cease to be the brightest glory and most precious gem of man's life, they contribute to foster both egotism and superstition. We must advance even a step farther and weigh the value and force of *penitence*. If the destruction of a town as Nineveh is all but impending, and is yet averted by the repentance of its inhabitants, we are justified in asking, how such an effect can be wrought by such a cause? We are very far from undervaluing the transcendent merit and wonderful power of repentance, to be prized as the chief means of purification and peace of mind, because it is alone able to counterbalance our inherent weakness, or at least to mitigate its baneful operation: but we cannot attribute to it any other direct or outward influence; for the confession of sinful or wicked acts cannot make them undone; a deed cannot be effaced by a thought, but only by another deed, or by uncontrollable circumstances; on the contrary, experience and reflection teach us alike that no penitence, however sincere and unremitting, can wipe out a transgression; sin must be expiated by suffering; but the sufferer is upheld by the consolation that, as his vice, his indolence, or his imprudence has plunged him into distress and sorrow, so his virtue, his energy, or his thoughtfulness can restore him to happiness and harmony of mind.

4. REVELATION.

The principles above laid down enable us to assign its due place to another group of notions affecting the very groundwork of the Scriptures — revelation, inspiration, and prophecy.

The main precepts of the Pentateuch claim to be directly communicated by God to Moses; and both the earlier patriarchs and distinguished men of later times are represented as enjoying God's personal intercourse at decisive epochs of their lives. Let us examine the dogmatic foundations upon which such conceptions were built up. It is true that God's incorporeality is theoretically taught in the Pentateuch; yet He appears in human form,⁴ and is seen in the visions of the prophets;⁵ He speaks distinctly and intelligibly, and imparts His thoughts and designs to His elected mediators.⁶ From these views to the doctrine of incarnation there is but a natural step; and

⁴ Gen. XVIII, 2, 17. ⁵ Isai. VI, 1sq.; see *infra*. ⁶ See also Exod. XXXIII, 15—23.

thus theology almost returns, as if by a circular movement, to the very point from which it started — the notion of personal gods with human attributes. But how can a Spirit that pervades the universe, and which is accessible to our intellects by the works exclusively that fill the world, and by the laws that govern it, commune bodily or personally with man, and reveal to him commands or truths for the guidance of his life? The most Divine power of which we have knowledge and consciousness, is human reason, and it suffices to secure man's dignity and his happiness. Wise and good men intended to convey to their fellow-beings what they regarded as irrefutable truth; and they clothed their teaching in the form of a revelation, because this is the most impressive, and was therefore, for such purposes, the most usual and familiar mode of communication. Let us analyse a clear instance of revelation or *theophany*; we choose one distinguished by simplicity and grandeur, composed by Isaiah who is unquestionably to be counted among the noblest and most gifted of the ancient Hebrews. "In the year that king Uzziah died", he writes,¹ "I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lofty, and His train filled the Temple. Above Him stood seraphs; each one had six wings; with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he did fly. And one cried to another and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of His glory . . . Then said I, Woe to me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips; for my eyes have seen the king, the Lord of hosts" — after which a seraph lays a live coal upon the prophet's lips, and God charges him with the mission of preaching to the Israelites. Has this narrative literal truth? Can it have reality? Isaiah sees God. Can God be seen? Would the prophet in sober earnestness admit the possibility? Can he then fear instantaneous death on that account? He sees God *sitting on a throne*. Can a spirit be so conceived, and is it tied to the conditions of space? The *train* of God is specially noticed. How is this to be understood? And has He any form that admits of the contrast between *above* and *below*? The prophet observes that the train filled the Temple. Is God enclosed within the walls of an edifice? And in what manner can the garment of a spiritual being fill a circumscribed space? He sees, moreover, seraphs with six wings. What are seraphs? Are they not, like all angels, demons, and spirits, both good and evil, pure and impure, which are so prominent in all parts of the Bible and most so in the latest, are they not beings of eastern mythology, creatures of fancy, without possible reality? Yet he sees

¹ Isai. VI. 1—13.

them "standing above God". What, it must be asked, does it mean "above God"? What can there be above Him who fills the heaven and the heaven of heavens, and the whole universe? Then the seraphs speak, and God speaks, and Isaiah answers, and the angels perform a symbolical act. How is a communion between God and man possible by means of language? Does an incorporeal being utter articulate speech intelligible to man? Can an enlightened person expect a verbal reply in addressing God? — Now in what light are we to look upon this vision of Isaiah? The idea of deception or imposition must be utterly discarded; the loftiness and purity of Isaiah's character at once banish such suspicion. Is it, then, the result of wild self-illusion and religious ecstasy? The usual calmness and clear-sighted penetration of the prophet would fairly make us abandon this alternative. Is it, therefore, purely and simply a poetical invention, a form of composition designed to describe interestingly his vocation as a teacher and his initiation as a prophet? The earnestness and depth of the writer forbid us to suppose frivolous playfulness in relating the holiest and most important event of his life. What view, then, remains? Though the narrative evinces prominently neither the fervour of religious enthusiasm, nor the design of beauty and effectiveness of diction, it appears to be a combination of both. Isaiah, in common with his time and people, believed the possibility of a direct revelation; and he had ardour enough to persuade himself that the powerful impulse which stimulated him to his great career, might be hallowed or confirmed by a solemn theophany. On the other hand, he could scarcely deceive himself so far as to imagine that he had actually received such revelation through the personal appearance and address of God; yet he might well *describe* his initiation under that form, which was familiar to his contemporaries, and which he was able to employ with clearness and impressiveness. The form of visions, generally adopted in eastern theology, and naturally varying according to the disposition and talent of the writers and the taste of their times, grew more and more in favour among the Hebrews; it is found with increased frequency in the later writings, especially in the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of St. John, till it was overloaded with an exuberant, if not extravagant, admixture of symbolism or allegorical play.² Narratives like that under examination, have, therefore, a very high psychological interest, but they can be fully understood and appreciated only, if viewed in relation to the age in which they were written, or to which they point. This applies pre-eminently to the most important of all revelations, those of the Pentateuch. The authors of

² Comp. Ezek. i; IV.

these tales, living many centuries after the events they narrate, and imbued with the idea that God personally appears to His messengers to charge them with His commands, must needs have believed that Moses was above all other men deemed worthy of receiving Divine revelations; and that as his legation was more momentous than that of all his successors, so the personal manifestations of God were, in his case, more direct, more palpable, and more grandly communicated, than on any previous or later occasion. Eager to exalt this mission, they enlarged and, it may be, exaggerated the notions of their own time with regard to theophanies; and their narratives are, therefore, the combined result of conviction and of logical inference.

The Books that are called revealed have, in fact, disclosed nothing that reason and experience are unable to suggest; they contain manifold truths which reflecting minds of all nations have concurrently discovered; they abound in errors which, in many instances, almost destroy the beneficial effects of their truths, and which the continued exercise of reason and of observation has alone been able to discover and to correct. But even if their human origin were not abundantly disclosed by internal evidence, if they did not, by innumerable features, betray themselves as the compositions of fallible, imperfectly informed, though mostly noble-minded and gifted men, we should not be able to accept them as anything else. The writers indeed considered as reality and fact what they supposed to be possible or what appeared to them desirable, because it was a necessity of their age, and was therefore not likely to be questioned by their contemporaries. But they could not be aware of the incredible mischief which their pretended "revelations" have produced. For they professed to proclaim *final* truths, "to which nothing was to be added, and from which nothing was to be taken off"; and thus they fettered thought and research, and retarded human progress in its most important spheres. Moreover, as their words were considered as the utterances of *Divine wisdom* itself, every opposition or even deviation was looked upon as blasphemy and crime punishable by human authorities; heresy was no more an error, but open rebellion against the authority of heaven; and thus were caused those unspeakable miseries and appalling persecutions, which the mind shudders to recall, which will for ever remain a dark stain in the history of the human race, and which are unparalleled even in the annals of pagan superstition. Instead of directing man to exert his own faculties, the Bible dictates to him what he is to consider as the end of all research and knowledge; it makes him a passive recipient of truth, whereas he feels the unconquerable impulse of searching for it himself;

and instead of leaving to him the triumphs of well-employed reason, it claims them entirely for a Being immeasurably above him. Revelation, therefore, in so far as it coincides with reason, might work beneficially, and has fortunately worked so in a considerable degree; but it derogates materially from the *moral* value of the actions which it prompts; for actions, not performed from spontaneity and choice, but in obedience to an authoritative command from a higher power, not only lose the noblest attribute of virtue, but are liable to thousandfold evasions and perversions; which double danger is effectually avoided by leaving the sovereignty to reason itself, instead of delegating it to revelation, its temporary and imperfect embodiment. Morality does not deserve its name, unless it flows from pure and free motives. Works of charity, benevolence and good-will, performed because they are commanded with the promise of reward and the threat of punishment, cease to be meritorious. In short, revelation, based upon a defective notion of the Deity, enslaving human reason and slighting its strength and nobleness, teaching the dangerous surrender of human enquiry in favour of a supernatural code, unjustifiably converting cosmic or anthropological truths into theological dogmas, and boldly pronouncing, in the name of an invisible spirit, as eternal law what is no more than the emanation of human thought, and what, therefore, is exposed to error and capable of improvement, depending on the intellect of man for all it utters, and then presumptuously demanding the mastery over him, and hence fostering sophistry and casuistic perversion, which are required to harmonise the later advancements of truth with its own immovable dicta — the idea of revelation combines whatever is objectionable and preposterous in positive religion, and manifests at a glance its weakness and its fallacy. The term revelation which, in its essence, precisely coincides with human knowledge and wisdom, can therefore fitly be dispensed with altogether, and ought only to be employed conventionally for describing the traditional view of orthodoxy.

5. INSPIRATION.

It would be needless, after the preceding remarks, to characterise minutely the term inspiration. Those who, in our age, persist in regarding it as a suggestion from some superhuman source, thereby forfeit the right of speaking in matters of historical research. Inspiration is in reality nothing but intellectual or moral elevation of man himself striving to rise to the utmost greatness and purity of his nature; therefore the word, if employed at all, may with equal propriety be applied to the earnest and noble effusion of any gifted mind. The point has

indeed been virtually surrendered even by orthodox divines. "A doctrine of inspiration", observes Tholuck, at the conclusion of his exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews, "which assumes uniform correctness of the words of Scripture cannot be accepted in accordance with the results here obtained." "The treatment of the Bible according to the theory of literal inspiration", says Döllinger, "would render every theology impossible"; and Stanley writes, "this doctrine of literal inspiration can henceforth no more be imposed on the English Church." If there is a difference between the so-called "inspired" books of the Bible and "profane" works, it arises from the circumstance that the Scriptural canon includes, on the whole, such writings only as are either directly designed to elucidate religious doctrines, or are at least composed from a spiritual or theocratic point of view, and therefore may be considered in the light of religious text-books. But the Hebrew canon represents very imperfectly the wealth of the literature of the ancient Hebrews; for its compilers, pursuing a special object, narrowed the scope of the collection to one particular class of writings, though they were not quite consistent in their plan, for they admitted several portions entirely "profane" in tendency, as the erotic "Song of Solomon" and the worldly forty-fifth Psalm. Hence it follows, on the one hand, that Hebrew literature was at once more varied and less severe as would appear from the Hebrew canon; and on the other hand, that the works allowed to form a part of the collection possess, even in doctrinal matters, no higher authority than they deserve on a critical examination of their contents. But in this respect we observe two different stages. Some admit historical errors and internal discrepancies in the Bible, and hence refuse to accept the *facts* and *narratives* which it contains, yet they maintain the immutable and eternal truth of the Biblical *doctrines* and *dogmas*, and look upon them as indispensable and all-sufficient for happiness, wisdom, and salvation; they attribute, therefore, to the Bible still a Divine or supernatural origin, and declare that the doctrines, and not the facts, were the end of revelation. Others again believe that the manifest historical errors of the Bible indeed compel us to ascribe to it an ordinary human authorship; but they nevertheless hold or would seem to hold that the spiritual and religious views laid down in the Scriptures, are the highest and purest at which human reason is able to arrive in its search after truth, and that they must, therefore, be for ever adhered to as the standard of faith. We do not know which of the two views deserves the palm of inconsistency. If one part of a book, however subordinate that part is supposed to be, abounds with errors, the book is not in-

fallible, and cannot, therefore, be considered Divine; but it is an unfounded assumption that the portions of the Bible which contain narratives are unessential; it is a misconception of the spirit of the Scriptures, to regard, for instance, the account of the Creation, of the Flood, or the wanderings of the Israelites in the desert, as collateral or indifferent; the Bible itself makes no distinction between important and unimportant parts; it insists, on the contrary, that no single word ought to be added or taken away; either the whole of the Bible is Divine or the whole is not Divine; any intermediate opinion is a feeble and unavailing compromise, whether arising from insincerity or from a conviction too timid to follow out its own consequences. On the other hand, if the Scriptures are the work of human reason, it is difficult to understand, why human reason should never be able to pass beyond them, and write something more perfect; it is against all historical evidence to assume that man reached some thousands of years ago the utmost degree of enlightenment of which he is capable, and that ever afterwards his only task consists in preserving and protecting the intellectual treasures then discovered; this we repeat is untrue; for we know that man has, since those times, immeasurably advanced in every valuable acquirement; that he has in particular made marvellous progress in those branches of knowledge which disclose the depths of the human mind and the mechanism of the universe, in *philosophy* and *the natural sciences*; and that even now he feels he has scarcely mastered more than the rudiments of either; as men wrote the books of the Bible, so men can, at subsequent periods, write books that surpass the Bible; and later again, works superior to the books that surpass the Bible; and till the genius of mankind is degenerated or exhausted, every following generation will attempt to outstep the efforts of anterior ages.

6. PROPHECY.

The gift of prophecy which all ancient nations attributed to elected favourites of the deity, is again nothing else but the gift of human reason and judgment, striving to penetrate through the veil of the future, and hence naturally liable to error. We are far from denying the peculiar importance and the most blissful influence of the Hebrew "prophets"; they were the ever movable element of Israel's religious training; they counteracted, and for a long time successfully, that stagnation which the growth of the Levitical spirit threatened to produce; they fought with undaunted courage against the narrowness of the priesthood, and often against the presumption of kings; they vindicated the rights of the spirit against the rigid lifelessness of for-

mulas, and of morality and virtue against the encroachments of ritualism and the dogma: they appealed with fervour and glowing eloquence to the hearts and consciences, not to the fears and prejudices of their hearers; they loved their country with almost enthusiastic patriotism; uplifted by the feeling of a higher impulse and assistance, they were enlightened teachers in religion, and clear-sighted counsellors in politics; these objects — the purification of faith, the improvement of morals, and the advancement of national prosperity — constituted their chief mission; prediction of the future was only their subordinate function; the erroneous translation of the Hebrew word *navi* by *prophet*, while it means “overflowing speaker”, has frequently caused its innermost import to be misunderstood and distorted; for it raises the accessory activity to almost exclusive importance. The prophets of the Hebrews, high-minded and unselfish, unequalled as a class in singleness of motive and purity of enthusiasm, in intrepidity and perseverance, practical experience and literary ability, deserve indeed the superiority over those of any other nation; they showed, moreover, greater sagacity in the delineation of future occurrences, since they were mostly political characters, moving in the very current of public life; but they were not the less fallible; their activity was absolutely tied to the ordinary limits of the human mind; and therefore, they occasionally predicted events which either were not fulfilled at all, or happened in a different manner and form. Thus Amos¹ foretold, “Jeroboam shall die by the sword and Israel shall surely be led away captive out of their own land” whereas the historical account relates, “that he slept with his fathers, and Nadab his son reigned in his stead.”² Jeremiah³ prophesied of king Jehoiakim, that “he shall be buried in the burial of an ass, and drawn and cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem”;⁴ but history tells us that “he slept with his fathers.”⁵ Again, Jeremiah⁶ foretold concerning the Edomites, that all their towns would be given up to eternal desolation,⁷ that in fact their whole territory would be converted into a dreary, uninhabited desert, the horror and mockery of all strangers, like Sodom and Gomorrah,⁸ and that they themselves would be carried away by Nebuchadnezzar like helpless lambs;⁹ and gloomy predictions of a similar nature, likewise suggested by deep and implacable hatred,¹⁰ were pronounced by Ezekiel,¹¹ Obadiah,¹² and other

¹ VII. 11.² 1 Ki. XIV. 20.⁹ Ver. 20; comp. Lam. IV. 21.³ XXII. 18, 19. ⁴ Comp. XXXVI. 30.¹⁰ Comp. Ps. CXXXVII. 7; Ezek. XXXV. 5.⁵ 2 Ki. XXIV. 6; comp. 2 Chron. XXXVI. 6.⁶ XLIX. 7—22.¹¹ XXXV. 3, 4, 6—9, 14, 15; XXV.⁷ Ver. 13.⁸ Vers. 17, 18.

12—14.

¹² Vers. 5, 9, 10, 18.

writers.¹³ Now the Edomites were indeed subjugated by the Babylonians,¹⁴ and suffered considerable injuries;¹⁵ but they remained in their land; they succeeded even in appropriating to themselves a part of southern Judea including Hebron,¹⁶ which was, therefore, frequently called Idumea; they took an active part in the Maccabean wars,¹⁷ in the course of which they were compelled by John Hyrcanus (about B. C. 130) to adopt the rite of circumcision, and were incorporated in the Jewish commonwealth. Ezekiel promised the political re-union of the empires of Israel and Judah,¹⁸ which has never been realised. The total destruction of Gaza is repeatedly predicted in distinct terms;¹⁹ yet the town exists to the present day. The coincidences are certainly much more numerous than the failures; but the prophecies were commonly pronounced in general, and often in vague terms; the poetical elevation and the rhetorical emphasis with which they were set forth, were even unfavourable to nice accuracy; precise details were avoided, names of persons never mentioned,²⁰ and dates usually stated in round numbers, or altogether omitted. Moreover, many professed prophecies are in reality nothing but history in the form of prophecies; they were composed after the events to which they relate; for ancient writers, especially if wishing to furnish a comprehensive survey of the past, or to endow national institutions with a higher authority, were accustomed to make pious and renowned men of earlier ages pronounce the *facts* as *prophecies*, which, however, were desired by the authors to be regarded as real predictions of the men to whom they ascribed them — a style of writing which recommends itself by impressive solemnity, and to which Hebrew literature owes some of its finest and choicest compositions. Besides, the Bible teaches that false prophets may utter predictions which God allows to be realised in order to try the Hebrews whether they love Him with all their hearts;²¹ and to crown the confusion, the truthful or fraudulent nature of prophecies given in the name of Jehovah, was according to the Law to be tested by their realisation; predictions proclaimed in the name of Jehovah but not justified by the event, were regarded as criminal deceptions to be punished by the death of the impostor:²² thus the

¹³ Joel IV. 9; Am. I. 11; Isai. XXXIV. 5—15; LXIII. 1—6.

¹⁴ Jer. XXXVII. 3, 6.

¹⁵ Mal. I. 3, 4; Ezek. XXXII. 29.

¹⁶ 1 Macc. V. 65; comp. Ezek. XXXVI. 5.

¹⁷ 1 Macc. V. 3, 65; 2 Macc. X. 15—18; XII. 32—36.

¹⁸ Ezek. XXXVII. 22.

¹⁹ Am. I. 6, 7; Jerem. XLVII. 1 *sqq.*; Zeph. II. 4; comp. Zech. IX. 5.

²⁰ The mention of Cyrus by the second Isaiah at once betrays and proves the real time in which this author lived and wrote.

²¹ Deut. XIII. 1; comp. Ezek. XIV. 9.

²² Deut. XVIII. 20—22.

practical value of prophecies as such was extremely precarious and almost nugatory. In short, the belief in prophecy has the same origin as the doctrines of revelation and inspiration — namely, the impossible supposition that the deity enters into a direct and personal intercourse with some men specially chosen.

But these notions are, moreover, the source of other errors, widely diffused in ancient times, and also shared and recognised by the authors of the Scriptures — the faith in *oracles* and *dreams*. Minds unaccustomed to independence and self-reliance, and untrained in tracing cause and effect, were led to suppose that, in perplexing situations, they might be enlightened and guided by an immediate communication from the deity, whether this were conveyed through the medium of a person, or through the instrumentality of a consecrated object. Who can contemplate, without grief and pity, the fraud and the mischief necessarily caused by so irrational a belief? The most important private and public enterprises were made dependent on the heart or liver of a sacrificial animal, on the smoke or flame of the fire on the altar, on the flight or cry of birds, the movement of serpents, or the neighing of horses, on the figures formed in the water of a goblet, on lightning or an eclipse of the sun or moon, on comets and meteors, on the position of rods or arrows thrown on the ground, the decision of lots, the persons first seen or met in the morning or just after deliberating on some enterprise, and on thousand similar chances which possessed no conceivable connection with the matter at issue, and the interpretation of which was left to the shrewdness or cunning of the official expositors. Soothsaying became a trade, and the soothsayers were used as tools of the powerful, if they did not serve their own avarice or ambition. Auguries often checked the most promising, and encouraged the most pernicious schemes. Oracles were consulted for private and for public purposes; and they not seldom helped to produce the effects which they predicted. Now, the Bible forbids indeed to consult on the future the *heathen* gods or their ministers, or to indulge in divination, magic, or necromancy, but it unreservedly sanctions oracles requested of the God of the Hebrews through the prophets or by the Urim and Thummim, or granted by dreams or by lot.

Let us now try to sum up the result of the preceding remarks. It is not sufficient to appeal from the letter of the Bible to its spirit; indeed the one "kills", but even the other is no longer life and truth to us. The spirit of the Bible is not the spirit of our time; it is not the light that illumines our path or points to our goal.

Many suppose they have removed all difficulties by urging that religion is to be separated from philosophy; that "there exists between both neither community nor relationship", because, as they contend, one aims at obedience and piety, the other at truth, and the foundations of the former are Scripture and revelation, of the latter nature and general notions; that the Bible is not intended to teach science, and condemns disobedience but not ignorance; that therefore all speculation which does not directly make men obey God, whether it relates to the knowledge of God or the knowledge of natural things, does not concern Scripture, and is to be kept apart from revealed religion. But we adjure those who adopt this view of Bacon, Spinoza, and others, to weigh its true scope and tendency. What, in the name of truth, is left for religion to achieve, if it renounces to teach the knowledge of God and the knowledge of natural things? How can it satisfy man's nature, and be to him all in all, if it disregards and leaves untouched his most essential interests? how can it claim to direct vigorous and intelligent minds, if it excludes *truth* from its sphere, overlooks *nature*, and banishes from its doctrines *general notions*? If it is declared that it is not the business of religion to enquire what is God, "whether Fire, Mind, Light, Thought, or anything else, or to examine in what sense God is the prototype of true life, whether because He has a just and merciful heart, or because all things exist and act through Him, and man therefore also thinks through Him and discerns through Him what is right and good, for it is indifferent what everyone sets forth on these matters"; if, more questionably still, it is asserted, that faith is in no way concerned whether people believe "that God is omnipotent by virtue of His essence or of His power, whether He governs all things by liberty or the necessity of nature, whether He prescribes laws as ruler or teaches them as eternal truths, whether man obeys God from liberty of will or from the compulsion of a Divine decree, and whether the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked is natural or supernatural in its mode": if, we repeat, religion admits such principles, it works its own destruction; it can have no importance for man, if it eschews his deepest and most sacred problems. Viewed in this manner, religion and philosophy are not sisters, but are forced to become deadly rivals. The separation of both does not involve their conciliation but their hostile opposition. That fatal division bears the guilt of the unhappy confusion which convulsed many centuries. Safety and peace do not lie in the contrast but in the union, or rather in the identity of both. Truth is one and indivisible. It is a paradox to assume a religious truth in contradistinction to a philosophical truth. Faith has no power and

no reality, unless it flows from our rational conviction and is at one with it; and our philosophy is imperfect, sterile, and unprofitable, unless it leads to a "religious" life, that is, a life of love and justice, of gladness and active benevolence. Philosophy and religion must henceforth not mark out two different provinces, but two chief divisions of the same province; the joint aim of both is truth and moral excellence; and while philosophy strenuously searches for principles and first causes, religion applies and carries them out in practical life. And in as much as virtuous action is the ultimate aim of all human efforts, it matters little if we call philosophy the "handmaid" of religion, provided we remember that it is also its "torchbearer."

Head and heart, reflection and life, are identical; true philosophy is by its nature and tendency practical; it does not only imply religious elements, but is itself religion.

Again, it is not enough to admit that there is in Scripture "a Divine and a human element", a phrase which recurs a thousand times in recent works of speculative theology; the "human element" is a concession reluctantly wrung from reflecting minds by the implacable force of facts; but the concession is rendered illusory and worthless by the supposition of a Divine element, the conception and nature of which are above the capacity of man, and which is compatible with assertions like these, "the Holy Scriptures differ from every other book because they alone contain a guaranteed revelation, which lifts the veil, so far as needed, from both the earliest past and the remotest future, to disclose the motive, the sanction, and the law of man's labours, and because the Holy Spirit, which watched over the delivery of that revelation, filled the spirits of the writers with a more complete and pervading presence, than ever presided over the execution of a merely human work." This passage contains as many errors as it does enunciations; the revelation embodied in Scripture is no more "guaranteed" than any other alleged supernatural communication; it is philosophically impossible and historically undemonstrable; it has taught men nothing reliable whether with regard to the history of his race, the origin of the universe, or the development of our planet; it can teach him nothing reliable with regard to his future; for prophecy is subject to error like every other human speculation; it "discloses the motive, the sanction, and the law of man's labours" from points of view which have been essentially modified by later convictions; and there is no "Holy Spirit" distinct from the intellect of man; the books which compose the Bible must, therefore, be measured by the ordinary standard of human faculties; and the result of an impartial survey

will be that they possess indeed those peculiar merits which fitted them for religious guides during many generations, but that they are eclipsed by other works in historical value, in comprehensiveness of facts, in depth of philosophy, and accuracy of science.

It is true, in a certain sense, that "opinions taken absolutely without regard to actions involve neither piety nor wickedness, but that a man has a pious or an impious belief, only in so far as his opinions move him to obedience, or afford him a pretext for sin and contumacy"; but, in the first place, the great question of our time does not simply relate to the practical results of faith, but at least as decidedly to its truth and intrinsic credibility; for else we should arrive at the paradox that in itself the darkest superstition is not objectionable; and in the second place, dearly bought experience teaches, that the only safe guarantee of practical virtue lies in the enlightenment of reason and the clearness of general notions; nay, that a mistaken obedience to a Law ostensibly Divine has led to the most execrable enormities which will for ever remain a stain and disgrace of mankind, to those excesses of horror and frenzy of which even Christianity was capable, such as the criminal burning of witches, the fiendish tortures of the inquisition, the bootless enthusiasm of the crusades, the sanguinary persecution of the Jews, and the insatiable cruelty of religious wars, because Christianity ventured to despise the majesty of reason, and cast it into the ignominious fetters of unintelligible dogmas. Hatred worked while love was professed. Hence there is an internal impossibility in the proposition, "whosoever, while believing the truth, becomes disobedient (that is, depraved), has in reality an impious faith, but whosoever, while believing falsehood, becomes obedient (that is, virtuous), has a pious faith"; or in the maxim, "not he shows the best faith who shows the best arguments of reason, but he who shows the best works of justice and charity": up to a certain degree and under certain circumstances, simplicity of heart may indeed exercise virtue and self-denial, but it is only the "true faith", that is, enlightened conviction or obedience to reason, which *ensures* the practice of excellence and goodness in all relations of life; and, as a rule, those will show the best works of justice and charity, who can show the best arguments of reason. It is, therefore, not only an erroneous but also a most dangerous opinion, "faith requires pious doctrines rather than true ones, and though there be among them many which have not even a shadow of truth, they are harmless, provided that he who adopts them is not aware that they are false." For without truth genuine piety is impossible. The root of error and falsehood cannot bring forth fruits of

righteousness and benevolence. Error, though believed to be truth, necessarily manifests its fatal traces in acts and thoughts. Indeed, our faith will be more perfect, and our life more righteous, more honourable and more useful, the farther we advance in true knowledge.

Religion must become a reality in life; it can become one only if it is *understood*: if it buds forth from our own reflection and feeling; if it is neither above nor below our nature; if it is neither founded upon mystic speculation, nor stained by the low impulses of selfishness and pride. It must, therefore, on the one hand, repudiate all unintelligible and sterile notions, like revelation, inspiration, and prophecy, and renounce uncertain traditions, imaginary narratives, and lifeless ceremonies; but it must, on the other hand, foster the purest and highest virtues of the human heart, and must lead to an active life of devotion, love, self-control, and cheerful sacrifice; and this blissful feeling of abnegation and useful work must be regarded as the only precious reward to be coveted. The writers of the Bible not unfrequently express this aim with force and beauty; it may suffice to insert a few of these utterances, as it is impossible to adduce all. "God has shown thee, o man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of thee, but to act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God"?¹ — "Let not the wise man glory in his wisdom, neither let the mighty man glory in his might, let not the rich man glory in his riches; but let him that glories glory in this, that he understands and knows Me, that I am the Lord who exercises lovingkindness, judgment, and righteousness on the earth; for in these things I delight."² — "But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law."³ — "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them; for this is the Law and the prophets."⁴ — "All the Law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."⁵ — "Love is the fulfilling of the Law."⁶ — "Let us love one another; for love is of God, and every one that loves is born of God and knows God; he that loves not knows not God, for God is love . . . If we love one another God dwells in us and His love is perfected in us . . . he that dwells in love dwells in God and God in him."⁷ These and similar principles form the eternal and indestructible kernel of the Bible; they are the secret of its intellectual conquests

¹ Mic. VI. 8.

² Jer. IX. 22, 23.

³ 1 John IV. 7, 8, 12, 16; comp.

⁴ Gal. V. 22, 23.

⁵ Matth. VII. 12.

also Psalm. XV. 1—5; XXIV. 3—6;

⁶ Galat. V. 14; comp. Mark XII. 29—34; see Deut. IV. 5; Lev. XIX. 18.

Isai. LVIII. 6—8; Jer. XXII. 16; Galat. V. 6 ("faith which works by love" alone

⁷ Rom. XIII. 8, 10.

avails), 13; etc.; see especially See t. IV

and its civilising power; they contain indeed the germs of the universal faith, and every progress in religion must be marked by their zealous realisation in life. If they are taken as guides, the complaint will cease, that "men who boast to profess the Christian religion, that is, love, joy, peacefulness, moderation, and fidelity against all, wrangle with reckless harshness, and daily vent against each other the bitterest hatred, so that from these contentions rather than from those virtues the creed of each is discernible." For "what does it profit, though a man say he has faith, and have not works? can faith save him?... Faith if it has not works, is dead, being alone... You see then, that by works a man is justified and not by faith only."⁸ Yet all these beautiful fruits of religion are safe and reliable only, if that faith is derived from the light of man's own mind; to be practically efficient, it must be the result of his own reflection, experience, and individuality; it will help to extend the empire of charity and morals on earth, not if it is handed down to him from the distant past and from different ages, but if it is the creation of his own nature, of his own wants, and his own ideals.

The views here propounded may create, in some minds, a twofold apprehension — first, of a confounding diversity of religious creeds, and secondly, of intellectual intolerance and persecution. But in every essential point, the religious convictions of all will be identical or kindred; for they follow from the essence of human nature, which is virtually the same under all zones and all conditions of existence — everywhere the like aspirations, hopes, and endeavours, the like spiritual needs and efforts; and however varied the speculations, practical morality tends invariably to the same end. And as regards intellectual toleration, nothing is so certain to lead to modesty, humility, and forbearance, than honest research; for every step manifests the limits of our knowledge; and if the wisest has finished his labours, he knows only that he "knows nothing", and — to use a well-known simile of one of England's greatest philosophers — he feels that he resembles the child that gathers pebbles on the seashore, while the ocean of truth lies all unexplored before him.

Henceforth, therefore, we do not desire a religion of fear which is the fruit of delusion, but of love which flows from intelligence, not a religion of rigour which breeds servitude, but of joy which bears witness of the freedom of the mind and heart, not a religion of contention which persecutes others by the haughty presumption of infallibility, but of peace which respects all honest convictions if they can but

⁸ James II. 14, 17, 20, 24; comp. 28; comp. 1 John II. 3—5. Galat. V. 6; see, however, Rom. III. 27.

show works of charity and unselfish devotion. Above all, reason, instead of being slighted and denounced as feeble, fallacious, perverse, and corrupted, must be restored to its right and functions as the supreme tribunal; its light alone can dispel the darkness of folly, illusion, and pernicious superstition; without it, religion is barely more than "credulity and wretchedness." Occasionally even the Bible expresses a similar view;¹ yet it insists that the revealed Law alone is true wisdom and understanding.² For it avails little to proclaim reason as the highest judge in matters of religion, unless it is consistently treated and respected as such. Besides, the severe contradistinction between intellect and soul must be decidedly rejected, a contrast which produces the utmost confusion in the whole sphere of moral philosophy. The two notions do not exclude each other; for the true intellect includes soul; the intellect that does not include soul is defective and unsound; a well-balanced intellect cannot possibly act coldly, selfishly, or cruelly; it is noble, elevated, and gentle; it is conscious of its own boundaries, and, therefore, modest and humble; it knows too well what it owes to others to be otherwise than indulgent and charitable; an intellect which does not possess these attributes, hardly deserves the name, for it lacks its most essential characteristics. The apparent exceptions which are occasionally found, will, on close scrutiny, reveal some radical defect in the organisation of the mind or in the philosophical system it has worked out or adopted.

Not obedience to doctrines imposed by extraneous commands must be the rule of our actions, but freedom of will and choice, or obedience to our reason and our conscience. Not a number of books traditionally handed down, and singled out by fallible judgment from a large multitude of works, is the true source of religion, but the spirit of man which thirsts after truth, and the heart of man which yearns for love; the "word of God" was not heard merely during a limited period of human history; it has not been mute for thousands of years; it was proclaimed at all times when intelligence and moral excellence uttered their thoughts and aspirations; and it will be heard as long as the instinct to great and noble deeds lives in mankind. There is therefore great force and propriety in the following remark: "History is neither *likely* to be the source of our religious knowledge, nor actually *capable* of being satisfactorily established as such. Let us face this truth candidly. Let us renounce the false ground at once and for ever, and build as well as we may on what remains. True that with the claims of history we

¹ Comp. Prov. II. 3—5; III. 13 *sqq.*;

² Deut. IV. 5, 6; Prov. IX. 10; Job XVI. 22; 1 Cor. XIV. 20. XXVIII. 28; etc.

renounce the hope of obtaining an infallible creed. True that the Consciousness which remains for basis is often obscure and variable . . . Still, still we say, let it be done! It is worse and more dangerous to stand still than to go forward. If an historical Religion be built on the sand, the sooner we learn it, ere the storms beat it down and overwhelm us in its fall, the safer shall we be."³ When the law is engraven on the tablets of the mind, it cannot be lost, it cannot be destroyed, it is living and working, and streams forth incessantly in deeds of charity and good-will.⁴ If the voice of reason is hushed, man is certain to sink into idolatry; it matters little whether the idol is a figure of stone or a Book that petrifies the mind. That Book was sacred and Divine as long as it represented man's innermost emotions, and was honestly acknowledged by him as the chief guide of his life; it ceased to be sacred and Divine when it began to fall upon our minds with a strange accent, and reflected a world which we felt had passed away. We may still study it for understanding a most remarkable phase of human civilisation; we may cull from its pages many a practical and spiritual truth conveyed in language of unsurpassed sublimity; but, as a whole, it cannot edify us; it cannot fully uplift us to the height of our nature. It will always be cherished with gratitude and reverence as the educator of many generations and centuries; but it must yield the precedence to the new light, which the exploration of the forces of nature and the powers of the human mind have thrown upon the general economy of the world. Its blessing is changed into a bane if it presumptuously claims to be the sole legislator for all times; it has, in a great measure, at present fulfilled its mission; it can henceforth only be an individual element among numerous means of human culture.

Yet many have argued, that the Bible with all its deficiencies ought to be maintained in authority for ever, because it offers great consolation to the less strong-minded, is useful to the state, and can in no way be injurious to the believer; its truth can indeed not be proved, but this matters little, as most human actions are uncertain and full of fluctuations — an opinion which necessarily involves the most serious errors, and leads to the obnoxious distinction between a creed for philosophers and a creed for the vulgar mass, as if that


³ *Colbe*, Broken Lights, p. 149. Comp. also *Arnold*, Sermons, pp. 485—492, "If ever they (discrepancies in the Bible) are brought before us, let us not try to put them down unfairly . . . Let us not do evil that evil may be escaped from; and it is an evil, and the fruitful parent

of evils innumerable, to do violence to our understanding or to our reason in their own appointed fields, to maintain falsehood in the despite, and reject the truth which they sanction."

⁴ Comp. Deut. XXX. 6; Jer. XXXI. 33; 2 Cor. III. 3.

which is illusion and falsehood for the former could be truth and light for the latter. A belief which does not satisfy the most acute enquirer, can by honest men never be deemed sufficient for the simple-minded. Many pretend that the distinction is demanded by policy and expediency; but it is generally prompted by pride and arrogance, and always engenders hollowness and hypocrisy. And these characteristics are almost glaringly manifest in the singular observation, "the Law was given to those only who are devoid of reason and the supports of natural intelligence": the pride lies in the assumed superiority over the great majority of men, and the hypocrisy in the ostensible profession of "revelation"; for if revealed truths were sincerely believed in, they would not, with evident contempt, be described as important for the silly only, but would be held to be valuable even for the most gifted.

Every man is, by his nature, subject to superstition, because he is by his nature subject to fear; but by knowledge he must subdue fear and superstition; he must, on the one hand, rise to the consciousness of his dignity and power, and he must, on the other hand, modestly subordinate himself as a serving link of the universe, convinced that no evil can happen to him whatever happens to him as a member of universal creation. But how does he rise to his dignity? If his mind strives to penetrate into the first causes and the essence of things; if his heart conquers every passion and all base emotions; if his actions, guided by love, aim at promoting the welfare of mankind, or of that part of it with which his destiny is connected. Therefore, TRUTH, VIRTUE, and ACTIVE LOVE — these three form the creed of the Future, but the greatest of these is TRUTH; for enlightenment leads to self-control and to self-denying deeds; knowledge alone is able to keep man on the path of moderation and thoughtfulness, and thus to secure, through virtue, his inward peace and happiness.



A. FIRST CODE.

CHAPTERS I TO V.

1. THE BURNT-OFFERING.

CHAPTER I.

SUMMARY.—God speaks to Moses from the Tabernacle, and communicates to him the laws of the *Burnt-offering* which is to consist of male cattle, whether bullocks, sheep, or goats (vers. 1—13), or of fowls, whether turtle-doves or young pigeons (vers. 14—17). If the victim is a quadruped, it is to be burnt entirely on the altar, with the exception of the hide (VII. 8), while the blood is sprinkled on the altar round about; if it is a bird, the head and then the rest of the body are to be burnt, except the crop and its contents, while the blood is pressed out along the side of the altar.

1. And the Lord called to Moses, and spoke to him out of the Tent of Meeting, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them, If anyone of you

1—9. All the Israelites, both men and women, had, with readiness and zeal, co-operated in the completion of the holy Tabernacle; the skilful rejoiced in being permitted to bestow upon it their talents, and the wealthy contributed the costly and multifarious materials till at last the offerings were far too abundant even for that magnificent structure, and their discontinuance was enjoined by a public proclamation. Every detail was so scrupulously executed in accordance with the Divine command, that Moses felt induced to pronounce a blessing upon the pious people. The time had arrived for arranging the component parts and erecting the edifice. The first day of Nisan, in the year after the Israelites' departure from Egypt, was appointed for the task. In systematic order, and under the direct supervision of Moses, the labour was performed. First the external framework of the Tabernacle was

joined together; the boards of acacia wood, twenty on the northern, as many on the southern, and eight on the western side, were fixed in the ground by means of tenons and silver sockets, two for each board; the poles of acacia wood covered with gold were fitted in five golden rings fastened at the outside of the boards, to render the structure conveniently portable during journeys; the four pillars of acacia wood overlaid with gold, at the eastern side of the Holy of Holies, and the five at the entrance of the Holy, were duly fastened by hooks and sockets; and the beautiful hanging of twined byssus, and blue, red, and crimson, with figures of the Cherubim woven upon it, was suspended by small hooks within the Tent, forming the ceiling, and falling down on the sides; while the three other coverings of goats' hair, of rams' skins, and of badgers' skins, were spread over it from with-

bring an offering to the Lord, you shall bring your offering of the cattle, *whether* of the herd or of the flock. 3. If his offering *be* a burnt-sacrifice of the herd, let him offer a male without blemish: he shall offer it at the door of the Tent of Meeting for his acceptance before the Lord. 4. And he shall put his hand upon the head

out, partially reaching down to the ground to protect the gold-coated acacia boards against the injury of the weather. The exterior having thus been reared, Moses put the holy implements in their prescribed places within. Beginning at the western extremity, he furnished the Holy of Holies with *the Ark of the Covenant*, not, however, before he had deposited therein the two tablets of the Law or "the Testimony", had also, for the purpose of transportation, drawn the two gilded staves of acacia wood, never again to be removed, through the four rings at its four feet, and had put the golden mercy-seat with the sacred figures of the Cherubim on its upper side. Then he closed the Holy of Holies by the splendid curtain which was suspended immediately under the loops and hooks of the first covering. He next removed into the Sanctuary or Holy its three chief utensils — to the northern side, *the Shew-bread Table* of acacia wood overlaid with gold, with its enclosure and wreath, its golden rings and staves, and the golden vessels belonging to it, the dishes and bowls, the cans and cups, arranging upon it the shew-bread, twelve cakes in two rows, and probably adding the first frank-incense to be burnt upon them; to the southern side, opposite the Table, the magnificent *Candlestick*, weighing with its appendages one talent of gold, consisting of seven branches and seven lamps, beautifully ornamented with calyxes of almond flowers, apples or pomegranates, and blossoms; and between the Table and

the Candlestick, just before the curtain of the Holy of Holies, the *Altar of Incense*, of acacia wood overlaid with gold, with its rings and staves. Then he fastened the vail which formed the entrance of the Sanctuary. Lastly he placed in the Court the *Altar of Burnt-offering*, of hollow boards of acacia wood covered with brass, and probably filled with earth, adding its vessels, the pots and shovels, the bowls and forks; and the *Laver* to the left of the altar, nearer the Sanctuary, made of brass, like the base on which it rested. And having fixed, by hooks and sockets, the fifty-six columns which marked the area of the Court round the Tabernacle, and fastened the hangings to the columns, and having, at the eastern side, suspended the curtain to serve as the entrance door, he could well consider the noble work as entirely completed and declare it ready for the sacred purposes which it was thenceforth destined to serve. In order to mark these purposes symbolically, he anointed both the whole structure and all principal utensils with the holy oil, and thus consecrated them; and as a sign and confirmation that the task had in every respect been accomplished in conformity with the Divine will, a heaven-sent cloud covered the edifice, and the glory of God filled it. Moses, unable to enter, remained before the Tabernacle, while God communicated to him His commands from within (vers. 34, 35; Lev. I. 1; and in general Exod. XXXV. 1 *sqq.*; see also notes on VIII. 1—5).

This is the connection intended

of the burnt-offering; and it shall be accepted for him to make atonement for him. 5. And he shall kill the young bullock before the Lord: and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the altar that is by the door of the Tent of Meeting. 6. And one shall flay the burnt-offering, and cut it into its pieces. 7. And the sons of Aaron

between the second and third Book of the Pentateuch; it is plain and unforced, and its continuity is only once interrupted, at the conclusion of Exodus, by the insertion of a general notice, in harmony with the pragmatism of Biblical history. The narrative is indeed perfectly consistent with itself, and the *general* arrangement of the sections is logical and judicious; for as the second Book concludes with the erection of the Tabernacle, the third fitly begins with commands concerning sacrifices and priestly functions, succeeded by civil and moral laws; and whereas previously the ordinances were issued from Mount Sinai, they were now, since Moses had descended from the mountain, proclaimed from the Tabernacle; and the "Tent of Meeting", from where God promised to commune with Moses and the priests, was indeed appropriately made the scene of the proclamation, as it was to be the scene of the execution, of the sacerdotal precepts. God had visibly manifested His love of Israel by filling the Sanctuary with His glory, and Israel was thenceforth to receive, from the same place, the injunctions by the observance of which they might preserve that love for ever; and these laws were addressed to all the children of Israel because they immediately concerned every member of the holy community.

But it is needless to point out the legendary character of the whole account. It contains many essential elements of religious fiction: God holds direct and personal intercourse with

His servant Moses; He reveals to him orally all the details of a complicated sacrificial and sacerdotal service; He fills the Tabernacle with His glory so visibly that Moses is unable to enter. It is throughout pervaded by anthropomorphic notions utterly incompatible with the spiritual and incorporeal nature of the Deity. Therefore, the manner in which the sacrificial ordinances are set forth, deprives them necessarily of that higher authority, with which the author of Leviticus deemed it desirable to invest them. The stamp of Divine origin, claimed for all the laws and institutions, was considered pre-eminently important for those regulations which concerned the innermost centre of religious life, formed the chief national bond, and were designed to exhibit man in his most essential relations to God and his fellow-men, and to secure peace and purity of mind. Yet these laws, though not possessing the fictitious support of an alleged supernatural suggestion, deserve the most careful investigation; for they are the combined result of tradition and thought: they reflect, on the one hand, the sacrificial practice current among the Israelites in the compiler's time, or deemed by him possible and expedient; and they embody, on the other hand, a complete system of statutes thoughtfully deduced from the leading doctrines of Hebrew theology by earnest and cultivated minds; they have, therefore, at once a positive or historical, and a speculative or dogmatical importance; and though, in

the priest shall put fire upon the altar, and lay wood in order upon the fire: 8. And the priests, Aaron's sons, shall lay the parts, *and* the head, and the fat in order upon the wood that *is* on the fire upon the altar. 9. And its bowels and its legs shall he wash with water: and the priest shall burn all on the altar, *as* a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.

the former respect, their value can, of course, but vaguely and approximately be estimated, since our limited information does not permit us to determine the extent to which the author borrowed from the observances of his time, they are, in the latter respect, of singular interest, since they are connected with the very essence of the Hebrew creed, and allow us, by an impartial analysis, to compare the religious views of the Israelites with those of the other nations of antiquity. We have endeavoured in the preceding treatise, to examine the text under these various aspects.

The burnt-offerings aptly commence the sacrificial laws. First, they were probably the oldest form of sacrifice. In the next place, they had the very widest application, and could be presented by any person without distinction, a point which is the more significant as the offerer, sharing the sacred functions with the priests, had to perform several important parts of the ceremony himself. And lastly, though originally designed to convey merely the worshipper's awe and his unconditional submission to the Divine supremacy, they were, in the Levitical code, invested with the character of *atonement* (ver. 4), and were not only commanded on specified occasions, but left to the spontaneous impulse of the heart that yearns for peace and for the expiation of sins known to the transgressor alone. They were, therefore, meant to serve the highest ends of an inward religion. Thus modified, they

marked a decided progress in the path of spiritual faith; they were, in fact, the fore-runners of the expiatory offerings, which form the very crowning point of the sacrificial system, and beyond which, even at the very next step, the mind leaves the fetters of the ceremonial law and enters the purer regions of freedom and elevation. Hence the Levitical holocausts lead us to a time when the deep-rooted tendencies towards pagan idolatry had been conquered, and the intellectual efforts of the more thoughtful and more gifted among the Hebrews had been rewarded by the establishment of a religious creed, which, however far removed from absolute truth, and however repugnant to the true attributes of the Deity and the requirements of philosophy and reason, at least permitted the exercise of noble and exalted humanity, and even facilitated, more than any of the preceding and most of the later systems of theology, an insight into the moral government of the world, and the higher aims of human existence. Thus the very beginning of the Book reveals unmistakeably the time and purposes of its composition, and forms the first link in that great chain of evidence which leads to the most pregnant and most interesting historical results (pp. 35—37).

The nature and the development of the burnt-offering, as well as the occasions and ceremonies of its presentation, have been fully discussed in the previous treatise, to which we must

10. And if his offering *be* of the flocks, *whether* of the sheep or of the goats, for a burnt-sacrifice, he shall bring it a male without blemish. 11. And he shall kill it on the side of the altar northward before the Lord; and the priests, Aaron's sons, shall sprinkle its blood round about upon the altar. 12. And he shall cut it into its pieces, and its head, and its fat; and the priest shall lay them in order on the wood that *is* on the fire upon the altar: 13. And he shall wash the bowels and the legs with water; and the priest shall bring *it* all, and burn *it* upon the altar: it *is* a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.

14. And if his offering to the Lord *be* a burnt-sacrifice of fowls, then he shall bring his offering of the turtle-doves or of the young pigeons. 15. And the priest shall bring it to the altar, and wring off its head, and burn *it* on the altar; and its blood shall be pressed out on the side of the altar: 16. And he shall remove its crop with the excrements thereof and cast it beside the altar eastward, to the place of the ashes: 17. And he shall cleave it at its wings, *but* shall not take *them* off, and the priest shall burn it upon the altar, upon the wood that *is* upon the fire: it *is* a burnt-sacrifice, an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.

refer on this and on every similar point of detail connected with Hebrew sacrifices (see pp. 157—162).

14—17. Possibly in order to enhance the value of offerings of birds, very small in itself, the whole ceremonial was performed by the priest; the worshipper

renounced even his prerogative of killing the animal, and this was the more desirable as the sprinkling of the scanty blood of those birds could be well performed by him only who killed them, and the sprinkling was exclusively a priestly act (comp. pp. 130, 162).

2. THE BLOODLESS OFFERING.

CHAPTER II.

SUMMARY. — God reveals to Moses precepts concerning the *Bloodless offerings*, whether they consist simply of fine flour (vers. 1—3), or are baked in the oven (ver. 4), prepared in a pan (ver. 5), or boiled in a cauldron; in all which cases a handful is to be burnt as "a memorial" on the altar, while the rest belongs, as most holy, to the priests. Salt is never to be omitted in any sacrifice, while honey and leaven are to be rigidly avoided, though they may be employed for first-fruit-oblations (vers. 11—13), regarding which an ordinance is appended (vers. 14—16).

1. And if anyone will offer a bloodless offering to

1—13. Animal and bloodless sacrifices were probably co-eval in origin (see pp. 8—11). The code of law which treated of the one, necessarily

the Lord, his offering shall be *of* fine flour; and he shall pour oil upon it, and put frank-incense thereon. 2. And he shall bring it to Aaron's sons, the priests; and the priest shall take thereof a handful of its flour and of its oil with all its frank-incense; and he shall burn *this as* a memorial upon the altar, *as* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord: 3. And the remainder of the bloodless offering *shall belong* to Aaron and his sons; *it is* a most holy *part* of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.

4. And if thou bring an oblation of a bloodless offering baked in the oven, *it shall be* unleavened cakes of fine flour mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil.

5. And if thy oblation *be* a bloodless offering *prepared* in a pan, it shall be *of* fine flour, mingled with

included the other. Hence both are here introduced in close connection (ver. 1). However, since the former were regarded as more valuable and more meritorious, they fitly occupy the first place in these ordinances. Bloodless oblations were doubtless presented alone and independently of animal offerings. This is manifest from a rational survey of the nature and history of sacrifices; and it is confirmed by the tenour of this chapter: the "offering of the *minchah*" is placed in juxtaposition to the "offering of the burnt-sacrifice", and forms, therefore, like the latter, a distinct class; and the ceremonials are so complete in themselves that it would be difficult to make them a subservient appendage to another ritual. Moreover, it can scarcely be questioned that the *minchah* was primitively burnt to the Deity entire, like the holocaust; not only is this implied in the notion of *sacrifice*, but it is expressed in the very name which means *gift* (comp. p. 148). But when the right of performing sacrifices was transferred from the whole people to one family or tribe, it was deemed sufficient

to burn to the Deity a small portion of the oblation, as a symbol of the whole, while the rest was left for the maintenance of the members of that tribe, who acted as mediators between God and the nation, and were in many respects regarded as the representatives of the former. In this altered and indirect and — it must be added — artificial sense, the bloodless offering might even then have been called a *gift* (the meaning of *minchah*). However, in one incidental point, the ordinances of Leviticus manifest a certain fluctuation. For it appears that, at first, all the bloodless offerings alike, with the exception of the "memorial", were given over to the priests as a common stock to be divided among them (vers. 3, 10); but later, when the organisation of the Levitical order advanced, it became law that those bloodless oblations only which consisted merely of flour unprepared, should thenceforth be distributed among all the Aaronites indifferently, while those prepared in an oven, a pan, or cauldron, should belong to the individual priests who performed the sacrifice (Lev. VII. 9, 10). For when

oil, unleavened: 6. Thou shalt divide it in pieces, and pour oil thereon: it is a bloodless offering.

7. And if thy oblation *be* a bloodless offering *boiled* in a cauldron, it shall be made *of* fine flour with oil. 8. And thou shalt bring the bloodless offering that is made of these things to the Lord; and when it is presented to the priest, he shall bring it to the altar. 9. And the priest shall take from the bloodless offering its memorial, and shall burn *it* upon the altar; *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord. 10. And the remainder of the bloodless offering *shall belong* to Aaron and his sons; *it is* a most holy *part* of the offerings of the Lord made by fire.

11. No bloodless offering which you shall bring to the Lord, shall be made fermented; for you shall burn no leaven nor any honey in any offering of the Lord made by fire. 12. For a firstfruit oblation you may offer them to the Lord; but they shall not come upon

the sacerdotal functions were, as much as was feasible, equally divided among the body of the priests (whether this object was really ever carried out, or remained a legislative idea), each of them could, as a rule, be supposed to subsist upon the income attached to his own functions; while a comparatively small amount of dues sufficed as a provision for those who, for any reason, did not or could not officiate (comp. p. 143, and notes on VII. 8—10). — Of the more carefully prepared cereal offerings three classes are specified — those baked in the oven, or in the pan, or cooked in a pot or cauldron (comp. pp. 152, 153). The term oven denotes not only the baker's oven or stove, heated for a considerable time, but also a large or portable pot, generally of earthenware, liable to be broken (Lev. XI. 35), such as is still extensively used in the East for making bread and cakes readily. The different forms of ovens and the contrivances to replace them have been described elsewhere (see our Com-

mentary on Exodus pp. 97, 98, 148, 161). — The pan, a flat metal vessel, generally of iron, was employed for baking hard and crisp cakes, which were generally mixed with oil, after which they were not unfrequently broken into small pieces, and then again thoroughly kneaded into a thick paste with butter, honey or milk, to be finally divided into larger portions; the same utensil is still so used among the Arabs and other Asiatic tribes, especially of Syria and Armenia, and among the Kabyles in Africa. — The "pot" or "cauldron" is a deep vessel suitable for boiling flour and other substances thoroughly. — Now in all these cases, the sacred character of the offering was conveyed not only by the admixture of oil, the type of holiness and sanctification (p. 83), the addition of frank-incense, the emblem of devotion (p. 85), and the use of salt, the agent of preservation, and therefore called "the salt of the covenant" (p. 80); but more decidedly still by the rigid prohibition of honey

the altar for a sweet odour. 13. And every oblation of thy bloodless offering shalt thou season with salt; nor shalt thou allow the salt of the covenant of thy God to be lacking from thy bloodless offering: with all thy offerings thou shalt offer salt.

14. And when thou offerest the oblation of firstfruits to the Lord, thou shalt offer for the oblation of thy firstfruits green ears of corn roasted by the fire, *namely, the grains* rubbed out of the early corn. 15. And thou shalt put oil upon it, and lay frank-incense thereon: *it is* a bloodless offering. 16. And the priest shall burn its memorial, *some* of its rubbed out *grains* and *some* of its oil, with all its frank-incense; *it is* an offering made by fire to the Lord.

and leaven, representing fermentation and corruption (pp. 94 *sqq.*), by the portion devoted to God and burnt in His honour as a "memorial" to bring the worshipper to His gracious remembrance, and lastly by the injunction to leave to the priests the remainder as most holy. Honey might, indeed, as a product of nature, be dedicated, in its natural state, as a firstfruit-gift and as a part of the offerer's income, and it could be employed for the leavened firstfruit loaves presented on Pentecost; however, in both cases, the oblation was not placed *on* the altar, but *before* it (Deut. XXVI. 4), and it belonged to the priests who consumed it (Lev. XXIII. 20); but honey and leaven could never form parts of offerings destined to be burnt on the altar; they could never be a sweet odour to the Lord.

14—16. Roasted grains of corn whether simply prepared by the fire, or baked in a pan or on a plate of iron, were, as they still are, a favourite food in many parts of the East. They were, therefore, naturally and habitually presented on the

altar, from a spontaneous impulse, by an agricultural people; and the legislator had no other task but to prescribe their presentation accompanied with rites calculated clearly to stamp them as a *minchah*, that is, to ordain the addition of oil and frank-incense, and the burning of "the memorial." Hence it cannot be doubted that the precept, "When thou offerest the oblation of firstfruits to the Lord", refers to private, and not to public offerings; this is clearly implied by the tenour of the law which makes no allusion whatever to the people; the public firstfruit *minchah*, consisting of ears of barley, was, according to a distinct ordinance, to be offered on the second day of Passover with a prescribed ritual (pp. 153, 154); whereas our passage fixes no time, mentions none beyond the ordinary ceremonies of the *minchah*, and limits the offering to no particular class of grain, which, if such restriction were designed, would be wheat rather than the less valuable barley.—On the bloodless offerings in general see pp. 148—154.

3. THE THANK-OFFERING.

CHAPTER III.

SUMMARY.—Now follow the precepts concerning the *Thank-offering*, which may be presented, male or female, either from the herd (vers. 1—5) or from the flock, whether a lamb (vers. 6—11) or a goat (vers. 12—16): the fat and the fat parts are to be burnt on the altar; the breast and the right shoulder belong to the priest, and the remainder of the victim to the offerer. Appended is a prohibition, enjoined for all time, against eating blood and fat.

1. And if his oblation *be* a thank-offering, if he offer *it* of the herd, whether *it be* a male or female, he shall offer it without blemish before the Lord. 2. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it at the door of the Tent of Meeting, and Aaron's sons, the priests, shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar round about. 3. And he shall offer of the thank-offering, *as* an offering made by fire to the Lord, the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the

1—17. As the feeling of awe precedes that of joyful gratitude in man's relation to God, so undoubtedly the holocausts preceded the thank-offerings. And as the latter sentiment implies a religious progress, so does the latter class of sacrifices. This is especially evident from the degree of participation permitted to the offerer in either case. The holocaust was totally burnt to God, and even the hide was claimed by His ministers (VII. 8); the thank-offering was but very partially delivered up to the flames, indeed no more than was necessary to mark the animal as a sacrifice; the fat and the fat parts dedicated to God were hardly more than emblems to point to the sacredness of the act; the rest was retained mainly by the offerer himself. This indicates an important advance in religious development; it involves, in some sense, a more spiritual conception of the sacrificial practice; it aptly expresses the conviction that God, the Bestower of every blessing,

though all-powerful, does not disdain graciously to commune with man; and that man, the recipient of unceasing bounties, though dependent and ever needy, may in joyous confidence rely upon God's paternal protection (comp. pp. 1, 2). But the Levitical organisation, as devised in the Pentateuch, demanded slight modifications from the original ordinances regarding thank-offerings. Some portions — the breast and the right shoulder — were set apart for the priests, if the eucharistic sacrifice was private; while the ministers received all that remained after the burning of the fat and fat parts, if the offering was public; in the former case, the deviation had a practical, in the latter a theocratic or hierarchical reason; for in the one, it was devised as a provision for clerical functionaries; in the other, as an acknowledgment of God's sovereignty through His representatives; and, in neither case, the measure materially affected the fundamental idea of the

bowels, 4. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys. 5. And Aaron's sons shall burn it on the altar upon the burnt-sacrifice, which *is* upon the wood on the fire; *it is* an offering made by fire, of a sweet odour to the Lord.

6. And if his offering for a thank-offering to the Lord *be* of the flock, he shall offer it, male or female, without blemish. 7. If he offers a lamb for his offering, then shall he offer it before the Lord. 8. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it before the Tent of Meeting; and Aaron's sons shall sprinkle its blood round about upon the altar. 9. And

thank-offering. It is also noteworthy that the rigour in the precepts of the burnt-offering is markedly relaxed compared with those of the eucharistic sacrifice; for while male animals exclusively were commanded for the former, male and female victims were indifferently permitted for the latter — a change arguing a more liberal spirit and a greater freedom of religious feeling.

The bloodless oblations might, of course, also be either holocausts or thank-offerings; but it appears that they were holocausts only in the early stages of sacrificial usage (see p. 302); in the Pentateuch they share with the thank-offerings this important characteristic, that a comparatively small portion only was burnt on the altar; but they differ from the thank-offerings in this remarkable point, that the remainder belonged entirely to the priests, whether they were offered for private individuals or for the whole nation; so that no part of them was, in any case, left to the worshippers themselves. The reason is obvious; they were probably, as a rule, presented by poorer people, and were of such small value, that they could hardly have been regarded as sacrifices un-

less they were entirely dedicated to sacred purposes; whereas, in animal thank-offerings, the surrender of "the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that is on the bowels, and the two kidneys, and the fat that is upon them, which is by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver", and in certain classes of sheep the valuable tail also, together with the breast and right shoulder, was an act of sufficient self-denial on the part of the offerers, who were, moreover, bidden to invite the poor and helpless to share the sacrificial repast that followed the offering. Thus the three first classes of sacrifice — the holocaust, the bloodless, and the eucharistic — are allied by various and natural analogies; their very distinctions reveal their affinity; and they were, therefore, justly connected in an early attempt at sacrificial legislation (comp. II. 1; III. 1).

The tail of the sheep above referred to is "extremely broad and large, terminating in a small appendix that turns back upon it. It is of a substance between fat and marrow, is not eaten separately but mixed with the lean meat, and is also often used instead of butter." (*Harmer, Observat.* III. 329). It is "not less than three

he shall offer of the thank-offering, *as* an offering made by fire to the Lord, its fat — the whole fat tail which he shall take off close by the backbone, and the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 10. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys. 11. And the priest shall burn it upon the altar; *it* *is* the food of the offering made by fire to the Lord.

12. And if his offering *be* a goat, then he shall offer it before the Lord. 13. And he shall lay his hand upon its head, and kill it before the Tent of Meeting; and the sons of Aaron shall sprinkle its blood upon the altar

cubits in length, so that if it were allowed to trail on the ground, it would be bruised and fall into sores; but every shepherd . . . makes little carts and fastens them on the tails, binding the tail of each separate sheep to a separate cart" (*Herod.* III. 113). It weighs usually about fifteen pounds, but sometimes much more, up to fifty, while Leo Africanus contends to have seen one in Egypt weighing eighty pounds. That species of sheep (*ovis laticaudata*) is found extensively in Syria and Palestine, in southern Arabia and Egypt, northern Africa and other parts of the East; it is in Africa called "sheep of Barbary"; it is kindred to that now known under the name of Cape sheep because found especially at the Cape of Good Hope, "having a kind of apron tail, entirely of rich marrowy fat, extending to the width of their hind quarters, and frequently trailing on the ground; the weight of the tail is often more than six or eight pounds" (*Fellows*, Asia Minor, p. 10, quoted in Rawlinson's Edit. of *Herod.* II. p. 500); and Robinson observes, "The sheep of Palestine are all of the broad-tailed species; the broad part being a mere excrescence of fat, with the proper tail hanging out of it" (*Biblical Researches*, I. 477).

Now this first sketch embodies, besides, the most important of the general principles of Hebrew sacrifices — that every fermenting substance, such as leaven and honey, ought to be avoided, while, on the other hand, salt was never to be omitted, in any offering (II. 11, 13); that the blood was to be sprinkled round the altar, and the fat to be burnt upon it; and that, therefore, neither blood nor fat was to be eaten in any age or in any clime (III. 17). For this latter injunction, the compiler found no more appropriate place than at the end of this first code, where it is introduced with some abruptness. But he mentions it as a simple and absolute command, without assigning to it a deeper reason (comp. also VII. 22—27). Now, primitively, both fat and blood were evidently shunned because they were supposed to involve the principle of animal life which it was deemed godless to consume. On this ground chiefly, and as forming the most sacred parts of the animal, they were ordered to be devoted to God upon the altar. As regards the fat, no more distinct statement occurs throughout the Pentateuch (see pp. 92—94). But a very peculiar significance was gradually attached to the blood. After the first

round about. 14. And he shall offer thereof *as* his oblation, *as* an offering made by fire to the Lord, the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 15. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys. 16. And the priest shall burn them upon the altar *as* the food of the offering made by fire for a sweet odour: all the fat *belongs* to the Lord. 17. *It shall be* an eternal statute for your generations throughout all your dwellings, You shall eat neither any fat nor blood.

and ruder notions of sacrifice had been conquered, the victim was currently regarded as a substitute for the offerer, and to suffer, as his representative, the death which he himself was held to have deserved for his transgressions. And since the blood was viewed as the element of life, it was the victim's blood which ensured the worshipper's atonement, and, in fact, wrought one of the chief ends of all sacrifice. These ideas were naturally developed in the course of time only; they are not alluded to in our text, but they are distinctly, and even emphatically set forth in a subsequent collection of

sacrificial laws, "The life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul" (XVII. 11; see p. 89). And if we read the injunction in its strict and categorical decision, "It shall be a perpetual statute for your generations, throughout all your dwellings", it is difficult to see how those who acknowledge the Divine origin of the Pentateuch, can ever deem themselves justified in eating the fat or blood of animals.

On the Thank-offering in general see pp. 162—166.

4. EXPIATORY OFFERINGS.

α. SIN-OFFERING, IV. 1—V. 13.

CHAPTER IV.

SUMMARY.—The laws regarding expiatory sacrifices, whether sin-offerings (IV. 1—V. 13) or trespass-offerings (V. 14—26). The sin-offering presented by the High-priest (IV. 3—12) or in the name of the whole people (IV. 13—21) was more solemn than that presented for a "ruler" (IV. 22—26), and this again more solemn than that of a common Israelite (V. 27—35): the difference lay both in the choice of the victim and the significance of the ritual, especially the modes of sprinkling the blood (comp. vers. 6, 7, 17, 18, 25, 30, 34). In all four cases, the fat and fat parts were to be burnt on the altar; but in the two former, the remainder of the victim was to be burnt without the camp, in the two latter, it was to be consumed by the priests in a clean place. Then follow some special instances of sin-offerings (V. 1—13), namely, for neglecting to give infor-

mation as witness, for all kinds of impurity, and for heedless oaths or vows (vers. 1—4); in all which cases the offender was required to present a female lamb or goat as a sin-offering (vers. 5, 6), or if he was poor, two turtle-doves or pigeons, one to be sacrificed as a sin-offering, the other as a holocaust (vers. 7, 10), or even merely the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour, unaccompanied by oil and incense (vers. 11—13). Then only are stated the precepts concerning the trespass-offering, which was prescribed for unlawful appropriation of property, whether unintentional (vers. 14—19) or designed (vers. 20—26), and whether the property was sacred (vers. 14—16) or secular (vers. 17—19): the trespass-offering consisted of a superior and faultless ram, together with full restitution of the unjustly acquired property increased by one fifth of its value.

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, If a soul sins unawares

1, 2. Submission and gratitude are indeed the emanations of a religious frame of mind; but their source is mainly in a feeling of *dependence*; they bespeak, therefore, only an outward or material relation of man to God; and even gratitude for benefits received is, from this point of view, not essentially distinct from submission on account of dangers to be averted. Hence burnt-offerings and thank-offerings are among the earliest manifestations of religious feeling; and they are found even among nations rude and untutored. They are based on the conception of the deity as the lord of nature and the dispenser of human destinies. They require, as their foundation, merely the general and elementary cosmic notions. But the Hebrews were among the few races that passed beyond this narrow circle of ideas. They conceived God as the Holy one, distinct from the world and elevated above it. Thus they were enabled to create and to adopt a Divine Law, or a moral code, reflecting the sacredness of God, and designed to form the very centre of human existence. Thus again they were enabled truly to define sin as the opposition to the holy will of God, and to trace the evil not merely in its outward effects, but to follow it to its source, the wan-

ton deviation from the goodness and perfection of the Deity. These views were steadily developed among the Hebrews; they were understood and expressed with growing distinctness by the profounder minds; and they ultimately gave rise to a new kind of sacrifices — the *expiatory offerings* — intended to keep alive the desire and the hope of godlike purity, whenever the heart is pained and oppressed by a conviction of guilt and a saddening consciousness of its estrangement from the Divine holiness. A class of sacrifices resulting from ideas so refined and spiritual, was most probably adopted at a late period in the history of the nation; it was, perhaps, at the time when the ordinances regarding it were compiled (ch. IV, V), little known and understood in its full import. While the two previous kinds of offering are mentioned as a recognized and ordinary usage and treated as such, the third is introduced, with a certain circumstantial minuteness, as a matter little familiar to the people, and, in fact, detailed for their information. On the one hand we read, "If any one of you bring an offering to the Lord, you shall bring your offering of the cattle . . . If his offering be a burnt-sacrifice of the herd, etc." (1. 2, 3); or, "And if his oblation be a

against any of the prohibitions of the Lord, which ought not to be done, and acts against anything of any one of them: 3. If the anointed *High*-priest sins to the guilt of the people; then let him bring for his sin which he has committed, a young bullock without blemish to the

thank-offering, if he offer it of the herd, whether it be a male or female, etc." (III. 1). But on the other hand, our text states, "If a soul sins unawares against any of the prohibitions of the Lord, which ought not to be done, and acts against anything of any one of them . . . then let him bring for his sin which he has committed, a young bullock . . . for a sin-offering." The stress which is here laid on some words, permits another inference. There is evidence to prove that a certain sort of expiatory sacrifice — the trespass-offering — was indeed known and practised among the Israelites from a comparatively early time. But it was limited to a few offences mostly connected with the rights of property or the laws of purification, and to those offences only if intentionally committed (see pp. 177, 180, 181). As religious education advanced, and the notion of a "holy people", the children of a "holy God", was unfolded and took root, the expiatory sacrifice was, on the one hand, indeed extended to *all* the Divine commandments, but was, on the other hand, restricted to those that were inadvertently transgressed, while those designedly contravened could not be expiated at all by a sacrifice, but were amenable to the rigour of legal punishments. For the holy community was defiled by the guilt of one of its members; that guilt, if unintentional, could, consistently with the character of the theocracy, be expiated by an offering, but it could not, without danger to the state, be remitted, if intentional; "The soul that does ought presumptuously . . . blasphemes the Lord, and

that soul shall be cut off from among his people; because he has despised the word of the Lord, and has broken His commandment; that soul shall utterly be cut off; his iniquity shall be upon him" (Num. XV. 30, 31). These conceptions which underlie the expiatory offerings of the Pentateuch, are pure and eternal; they lose nothing if divested of their accidental or Levitical form, or the peculiarities of the monotheistic system; the ideal of moral excellence and of the happiness that arises from the fear of sin, lives in the human race; and the depth of contrition and the blessed feeling of restored harmony after offences remain realities, whether they are shadowed forth in some ceremonial, or brought into connection with a personal and perfect Being whom man invests with every attribute of greatness and perfection.

3—12. A gradation established with regard to no other class of sacrifices was, in the course of time, appointed in reference to the sin-offering. The solemnity of the latter varied in accordance with the position or importance occupied by the offerer in the theocratic state. The individual and the community were, by this peculiar organisation, inseparably joined in a bond of mutual relationship. The righteousness of the one enhanced the holiness of the other; and the impiety of the former endangered the very existence of the latter. The Hebrew theocracy resembled the Spartan and Roman polity in so far, as, in either, the man was merged in the citizen; but the Spartan or Roman citizen was exclusively a political

Lord for a sin-offering. 4. And he shall bring the bullock to the door of the Tent of Meeting before the Lord, and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before the Lord. 5. And the anointed High-priest shall take *some* of the bullock's blood, and bring it to the Tent of Meeting: 6. And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before the Lord against the vail of the Sanctuary. 7. And the priest shall put *some* of the blood upon the horns of the altar of sweet incense before the Lord, which *is* in the Tent of Meeting; and shall pour all the *other* blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering, which *is* at the door of the Tent of Meeting. 8. And he

being; the Hebrew citizen — as ideally conceived in the Pentateuch — was stunted in none of his human faculties, but, raised into a sphere of holiness, he retained full scope for all domestic and social virtues, which he was indeed expected to bring into harmony with a system that acknowledged God, the holy and the perfect, as king and as ruler. Now, from these points of view, the supreme requirement was the sanctity of the nation in its totality. If the whole people had been defiled by some involuntary transgression, the theocracy was most directly profaned, and the sacred relation between God and Israel disturbed or interrupted. Therefore, the expiatory offering presented on such occasions was surrounded by a ceremonial of the utmost impressiveness: the blood of a bullock dedicated to God by the imposition of hands on the part of the elders of the people, was by the High-priest sprinkled seven times against the vail before the Holy of Holies and put upon the horns of the golden altar in the Holy. But the people was, theocratically, represented by the High-priest; the sin of the latter was, therefore, a breach of the holy covenant as flagrant as the sin of the former; and it happened that hence, "if the High-

priest sinned to the guilt of the people", his sin-offering was exactly identical with that presented for a transgression of the whole people, except that, naturally, he himself performed the imposition of hand. Nay, Jewish tradition teaches, "If the bullock of the High-priest and the bullock of the congregation stand together ready for sin-offerings, the former has the precedence in every way." This law was not suggested merely by the supreme honour in which the High-priest was held as the chief spiritual instructor; nor by the consideration that the influence of his example was all-powerful for good or for evil, and especially in those matters which formed the life and centre of the commonwealth; it was not even dictated by such maxims as, "A sin is small or great according to the dignity of the sinner", or, "The imprudence of a leader is equivalent to recklessness"; but it was required by the very nature of the organisation which demanded a holy mediator between a holy God and an erring people. This train of ideas almost-spontaneously led to the notion and the desire of a sinless intercessor or High-priest; therefore, Philo already speaks of a "true High-priest who has no participation

shall take off from the bullock of the sin-offering all the fat — the fat that covers the bowels, and all the fat that *is* upon the bowels, 9. And the two kidneys, and the fat that *is* upon them, which *is* by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys, 10. As it is taken off from the bullock of the thank-offering; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar of the burnt-offering. 11. And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his bowels, and his dung, 12. Even the whole bullock shall he carry forth without the camp to a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn

in sin", in contradistinction to a High-priest "who is falsely so called"; and this idea is, in the New Testament, found in full development (Hebr. VII. 26—28, see p. 112). Therefore, the High-priest had to present the sin-offering here described not only for a neglect of the official obligations devolving upon him as the spiritual head of the people, but for any offence whatever; he could, on no account, be separated from his sacred office; his every action was to reflect the peculiar system which he embodied. Yet it is the opinion of Jewish expositors that a kid of the goats, one year old, was sacrificed for an unconscious act of idolatry, whether it had been practised by a king, a High-priest, a priest, or a private Israelite, because with regard to the worship of God all Hebrews were supposed to have been informed alike; and that for a sin of impurity committed with respect to the Sanctuary or the holy food, a female kid or a female lamb was offered by the High-priest in common with all Israelites; but that if any other law was transgressed, the distinctions between the offering of a High-priest, a chief, and a common Israelite were maintained. Nothing can be more opposed to the spirit of the ordinances under discussion; the very letter militates against that view;

for the general introduction, equally applying to all subsequent cases, speaks of "any of the commandments of the Lord" and of "anything of any one of them." But the following analogy, which indeed obviously offers itself, is more objectionable still, if urged too closely. It is true that, according to Hebrew and to Eastern notions generally, a misdeed of the head of the house is visited upon the whole family, and an offence of the chief of the state upon all the members of the community: but the High-priest is not only the head and chief, but the representative of the people; the sin of the one is *eo ipso* the sin of the other. The Eastern custom of making all the connections of the offender responsible for his guilt is barbarous; whereas the spiritual relation between High-priest and people, as sketched in the Pentateuch, is the result of a long and careful religious education; and it may be considered artificially refined and subtle rather than barbarous. — According to Talmudical teaching, the offences of the later sanhedrin were estimated and expiated like those of the High-priest; this is in so far in harmony with the spirit of the Pentateuch, as the sanhedrin was the highest authority in matters of faith; but it possessed [also worldly powers

him on the wood with fire; where the ashes are poured out shall he be burnt.

13. And if the whole congregation of Israel sins unawares, and the thing is hidden from the eyes of the community, and they have done anyone of the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and are guilty; 14. And if the sin, which they have committed concerning it, becomes known; then the community shall offer a young bullock for a sin-offering and bring him before the Tent of Meeting, 15. And the elders of the congregation shall lay their hands upon the head of the bullock before the Lord, and *one of them* shall kill the bullock before the Lord. 16. And the anointed *High-priest* shall bring *some* of the bullock's blood to the Tent of Meeting; 17. And the *High-priest* shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle *it* seven times before the Lord, against the vail. 18. And he shall put *some* of the blood upon the horns of the altar which *is* before the Lord, that *is* in the Tent of Meeting, and shall pour out all the *other* blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering which *is* at the door of the Tent of Meeting. 19. And he shall take all his fat from him, and burn *it* upon the altar. 20. And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the *first* bullock for a sin-offering, so shall he do with this: and the *High-priest* shall make an atonement for them, that they may be forgiven. 21. And he shall carry forth the bullock without the camp, and burn him as he burnt the first bullock: *it is* the sin-offering for the community.

that had before been vested in the elders of the people; it had not the character of a mediating body between God and Israel; and as it could not expiate the nation, so it could not directly defile it.

13-21. If any unintentional sin of the whole community was to be atoned for (comp. ver. 2.), our text prescribes the sacrifice of a bullock, as in the case of the High-priest's sin-offering; but on many occasions, and especially on the Day of Atonement, the animal slaughtered for the general expiation

of the people was not a bull, but a goat inferior in value (XVI. S, 15), for which discrepancy we have tried to account in another place (p. 33). It may here suffice to remark that "the whole congregation of Israel" treated of in our text, is indeed the people itself, whose very elders (ver. 15) are named, and not, as Rabbinical interpreters, anxious to account for the difference just pointed out, have contended, the great sanhedrim, which might, from error, proclaim a decree calculated to mislead the whole nation.

22. A ruler who sins and does unawares anyone of all the prohibitions of the Lord his God which ought not to be done, and *is* guilty; 23. If his sin, wherein he has sinned, is brought to his knowledge, he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a male without blemish; 24. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the goat, and kill him in the place where they kill the burnt-offering before the Lord: it *is* a sin-offering. 25. And the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out his *other* blood at the bottom of the altar of burnt-offering. 26. And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, like the fat of the thank-offering: and the priest shall make an atonement for him on account of his sin, that he may be forgiven.

27. And if any one of the common people sins unawares, because he does anyone of the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and is guilty;

22—35. The "chief" or "ruler", which term includes kings, Judges, military leaders, and the heads of the tribes or principal families, and perhaps also the elders, was less directly concerned with the religious doctrines or the Divine sovereignty; his unintentional offence against the Law was, therefore, atoned for by a sin-offering inferior in solemnity to that of the nation, the High-priest, or the priest; the victim was not a bull, but a kid of the goats; the principal ceremony was not performed by the High-priest but by a common priest; and the blood was neither sprinkled before the veil of the Holy of Holies nor on the altar of frank-incense in the Holy, but on the horns of the brazen altar in the Court. Yet the "chief" was, in some degree, identified with the unity of Israel; he either represented an important fraction of the people, or the entire nation in a political or social respect; and as, in the theocracy, the worldly

and the spiritual elements were inseparably allied, since every worldly institution was the embodiment of some spiritual truth or principle, and every spiritual truth was made the groundwork or support of some political arrangement; the sin-offering of the chief was higher in dignity than that of a private Israelite, which consisted, not of a male goat, but of a female victim, whether a goat or a lamb; yet both coincided in the ceremonies; no part of them was permitted in the Holy of Holies, which was reserved for acts directly theocratic; but all were performed in the Court, or near the altar of burnt-offering, which represented the ordinary religious life of the Hebrews.

Those who are accustomed to an historical analysis of ideas and institutions, will at once admit that the Hebrews could not arrive at the pure and spiritual notions of atonement sketched here and elsewhere by a sudden bound or at an early epoch of their national

28. If his sin, which he has committed, is brought to his knowledge, then he shall bring his offering, a kid of the goats, a female kid without blemish, for his sin which he has committed. 29. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay the sin-offering in the place of the burnt-offering. 30. And the priest shall take *some* of her blood with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all her *other* blood at the bottom of the altar. 31. And he shall remove all the fat, as the fat is removed from the thank-offering; and the priest shall burn *it* upon the altar as a sweet odour to the Lord; and the priest shall make an atonement for him that he may be forgiven.

32. And if he bring a lamb as his oblation for a sin-offering, he shall bring it a female without blemish. 33. And he shall lay his hand upon the head of the sin-offering, and slay her for a sin-offering, in the place where they kill the burnt-offering. 34. And the priest shall take *some* of the blood of the sin-offering with his finger, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offering, and shall pour out all her *other* blood at the bottom of the altar. 35. And he shall remove all her fat, as the fat of the lamb is removed from the thank-offering; and the priest shall burn them upon the altar, for offerings made by fire to the Lord, and the

existence. They had indeed to pass through almost all the stages by which untutored nations advance from rude materialism to intellectual elevation. What immeasurable distance separates the Israelite who sacrificed his only daughter in obedience to a blind and barbarous vow, from the Israelite who conceived the noble law which includes the native and the stranger in one bond of mercy, and assures both alike of Divine forgiveness for sins of human frailty! But the movement did not end there. The holy community, if it did not exclude, gradually ignored the stranger, unless he had, by conformity with the distinctive precepts of Mosaism, altogether

amalgamated with the Hebrew nation; in our section, which systematically treats of expiatory offerings, the stranger is not mentioned; the idea of the *chosen people* had become the foundation of all Hebrew institutions. This was indeed by no means a progress or a gain; it destroyed, on the contrary, the prospects, perhaps for some time entertained by enlightened men, of Mosaism becoming a universal faith; it contracted the circle which they fondly hoped to see one day become wide enough to embrace all mankind; but it was the natural and almost necessary consequence of the leading principles of "Mosaism"; and a *theocracy* was

priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he has committed, that he may be forgiven.

created which placed the people and every individual in an immediate and exclusive relation with God.

The details of the laws of expiatory

sacrifice, and the difficulties in the Scriptural text with regard to them, have been discussed in a preceding part of this volume (pp. 166—188).

CHAPTER V.

1. And if a person sins, because he hears the voice of adjuration, and *might be* a witness, whether he has seen *the offence* or learnt *of it otherwise*, and if he does not tell *it*, and bears his guilt; 2. Or if a soul touches any unclean thing, whether *it be* a carcass of an unclean beast, or a carcass of unclean cattle, or the carcass of unclean reptiles, and if it is hidden from him, and he is unclean and guilty; 3. Or if he touches the uncleanness of man, whatever his uncleanness *may be* where-with *a man* defiles himself, and it is hidden from him,

1—13. When first the scope of expiatory sacrifices was widened and their nature refined, that is, when an advance was made from the trespass-offering, to the sin-offering, the leading idea towards which the expiatory sacrifices in general struggled — atonement for *unintentional* offences — had not yet prevailed entirely; tardiness and fluctuations were natural in the attainment of an aim so high that it might almost appear to lie beyond the stage of all sacrificial worship; and we cannot, therefore, be surprised that, in the earliest sketch of regulations concerning *sin-offerings*, these sacrifices were prescribed for intentional and undesigned transgressions indifferently. The section under discussion forms that earliest sketch, and it was by the last revisers of Leviticus placed after the preceding ordinances (ch. IV), because they preferred beginning with that portion which displays the complete organisation of the theocratic community, and discloses, at a glance,

the principles which they desired to enforce and to see recognised. Now the first case in which a sin-offering was to be presented, still bore some affinity to the elementary class of expiatory sacrifices, the trespass-offerings; for it had a political rather than a religious character; and its object was as much the maintenance of temporal justice as the moral purity of the citizens. An imperfect machinery for the protection of society imposed the obligation upon every individual to aid the authorities to the utmost of his powers; when, therefore, some offence against the law had been committed, and the constituted tribunals were unable, from want of conclusive evidence, either to discover the offender or to convict him of the crime, it was justly regarded a dereliction of public duty if, on a solemn appeal or “adjuration” of the judges, anyone who had seen the perpetration of the outrage, or had later, by any chance, become cognisant of it, failed to come forward as

and he *then* learns *it*, and is guilty; 4. Or if a soul swears, rashly protesting with *his* lips to do evil or to do good, whatever *it may be* that a man rashly protests with an oath, and it is hidden from him, and he *then* learns *it*, and is guilty in any one of these *things*: 5. If he is guilty in any one of these *things*, then he shall confess *the sin* which he has committed in that *thing*; 6. And he shall bring as his forfeited debt to the Lord for the sin which he has committed, a female from the flock, a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sin-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him on account

witness, and so helped to baffle the ends of justice. It is evident, that such neglect must be classed among the *intentional* sins; it belongs to this category from its very nature; it was necessarily considered as a graver offence in politics depending for security upon the co-operation of all; we have proofs to show that the expedient of public adjuration was very frequently resorted to; and he who refused to respond to it, was regarded as having brought upon himself a guilt requiring a sacrifice of expiation. How such a precept can be reconciled with the general principle which permits no expiatory offerings for designed offences (Num. XV. 30, 31), we have examined in another place (pp. 180—182).

The aim of creating a "holy" community was pursued by the more spiritual minds of the nation from a comparatively early time; it suggested laws and institutions designed to familiarise the mass of the people with the ideas both of physical and internal purity, and to train them to a religious conception of all earthly affairs. Therefore, when sin-offerings were introduced, they were not only made subservient to social and political ends, but employed to impress upon the Hebrews the necessity of the most perfect purity, if they desired to become indeed the people of Jehovah. Therefore, every

contact, were it even accidental and unconscious, with unclean things, as the carcass of unclean quadrupeds or reptiles, or any one of the numerous conditions and ailments of man that cause uncleanness, was to be atoned for by a sin-offering. This ordinance suggested itself the more readily, as the older class of expiatory sacrifices, the trespass-offerings, had already, for some time, been used in several chief cases of impurity, as after the leper's restoration to health, and a Nazarite's defilement by the proximity of a corpse. It is not improbable that, for a considerable period, trespass-offerings were presented for a variety of similar contingencies; but that, as the Levitical rigour increased, the more solemn sin-offerings were substituted, which however, except in the choice of the victim, generally differed little from the trespass-offerings, and not even in the mode of disposing of the blood. This is no doubt the reason, why sometimes a sin-offering was superadded to the trespass-offering, because a custom long established and therefore difficult to suppress, was to be rendered more significant in accordance with the progress made in religious worship. However, the general and almost universal injunction contained in this section (vers. 2, 3) regarding sin-offerings in any case of Levitical impurity what-

of his sin. 7. And if his fortune does not suffice for a lamb, then he shall bring as his debt which he has forfeited by sin, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, to the Lord, one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering. 8. And he shall bring them to the priest, who shall offer *that* which *is* for a sin-offering first, and wring its head behind its neck, but shall not separate *it*. 9. And he [the priest] shall sprinkle of the blood of the sin-offering upon the side of the altar; and the rest of the blood shall be wrung out at the bottom of

ever, was later abandoned and very considerably restricted; it was retained in a few prominent instances only, while, as a rule, impurities were removed merely by ablutions (see p. 34).

As the idea of expiatory sacrifices was mainly derived from the notion of the holiness of God, it was natural that they should have been demanded whenever that holiness had been desecrated by pronouncing or implying the name of God in connection with some heedless oath or affirmation. If perjury was deemed a cardinal crime, because involving defiance of the supremacy of the invisible King, and was, therefore, included in the fundamental code of the Decalogue, a reckless oath or vow, the purport of which was not clearly intended or understood when uttered, was, on theocratic principles, a reprehensible offence, and a sin-offering was required not so much to rebuke the levity of the act, but to restore the bond of sanctity which should unite God and every Israelite. — It is interesting to pursue the gradual growth of that singular and wonderful system which is sketched rather than propounded in the Pentateuch; and though we seldom find more than fragmentary and isolated precepts or statements, it is, in most cases, feasible to trace them to leading principles, and thus to combine them into a connected system.

But this highly important task remains necessarily fruitless unless it is approached with that historical sense which discerns chronological periods and acknowledges development of ideas.

In the three cases of guilt just described, the ritual of the sacrifice was identical. The sin-offerings were themselves a new class, and gradations within this class were not yet contemplated. As the *ceremonial* of the sin-offering entirely coincided with that of the older trespass-offering (VII. 7), it needed no detailed description; if perchance it had here originally been mentioned, it could well be omitted, when this section was placed immediately after the elaborate precepts contained in the preceding chapter. Confession, probably made to God during the imposition of the hand, is the only point peculiar to this portion (ver. 5), whether it was later retained and deemed essential, or not. But it was important that the *victim* of the sin-offering should be specified. For all the clean domestic quadrupeds had been appropriated to the earlier classes of sacrifice, and lastly the male sheep and goat to the trespass-offering; there remained, therefore, for the sin-offering no other characteristic victims but the female sheep and goat. It was not regarded inappropriate to fix the least valuable beasts for the most solemn sacrifices; on the contrary,

the altar; it *is* a sin-offering. 10. And he shall offer the second *for* a burnt-offering, according to the ordinance: and the priest shall make an atonement for him on account of his sin which he has committed, that he may be forgiven.

11. But if his fortune does not suffice for two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, then he shall bring *for* his offering which he has forfeited by his sin, the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour for a sin-offering; he shall put no oil on it, nor shall he put thereon

such arrangement appeared desirable for various reasons; it recommended itself especially because it enabled persons of humbler means to participate in what was considered the highest exercise of religion. The same consideration suggested still more striking facilities — the substitution of two turtle-doves or two young pigeons, if a sheep or goat could not be afforded, and even of the tenth part of an ephah of flour, if the turtle-doves or the pigeons were above the offerer's means. If the idea, "You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy", was to become a reality, the sin-offering could not be made too general. It is not quite easy to explain the reason why *two* birds, one as a sin-offering and one as a burnt-offering, were to be presented. We know that one bird was not deemed too insignificant for a sacrifice; nay, a small quantity of flour was accepted as a lawful sin-offering. Another explanation must, therefore, be attempted. In all ordinary sacrifices of expiation, the fat and the fat parts were burnt to God on the altar, while the rest of the victim belonged to the priests. These two acts, the burning and the priestly meal, were, in addition to the sprinkling of the blood, supposed to constitute the ritual. Now one pigeon or turtle-dove was not sufficient for these purposes. It was scarcely possible to

burn less than one complete bird, and another one was, therefore, required as the portion of the priests. But the nature of the sin-offering suggested a peculiar proceeding with regard to the two fowls. Both could not be presented as sin-offerings; each bird, however trifling in value, is an independent sacrifice, because it possesses an independent life; if both had been killed as sin-offerings, not one, but two such sacrifices would have been offered for one sin; the same significant ceremonies would have been twice repeated for the same occasion; and the individual offender, for which expiation was sought, would have received an undue weight. Therefore, it was deemed appropriate, to employ the second bird for that sacrifice which, in meaning and import, approaches nearest the sin-offering, namely for a holocaust which implied a confession of the *general* sinfulness of the offender, and which, at the same time, could represent the fat and fat parts of quadrupeds. The bird intended for the sin-offering was presented first (ver. 5), because the procedure with the blood performed in connection with it, was the principal ceremonial and the chief means of atonement; that procedure differed markedly from the mode of disposing of the blood of birds offered as holocausts; it was in some way analogous to the treat-

any frank-incense; for it *is* a sin-offering. 12. Then shall he bring it to the priest, and the priest shall take his handful of it, *as* a memorial thereof, and burn it on the altar for an offering made by fire to the Lord; it *is* a sin-offering. 13. And the priest shall make an atonement for him for his sin which he has committed in anyone of these *things*, that he may be forgiven: and it shall belong to the priest like the bloodless offering.

ment of the blood of quadruped sin-offerings; for a part of it was *sprinkled* on the side of the altar, while the rest was pressed out at its base. From the view which we have taken of the two birds, another ordinance with regard to these sacrifices may be intelligibly explained. It was commanded that the head of the pigeon or turtle-dove employed for a sin-offering should be wrung or broken at the neck, but not entirely separated. For the head was not to be burnt; it was partially severed from the body merely for the sake of obtaining the blood which alone was destined for the altar; while the bird mainly belonged to the priest. This was different if the pigeon or turtle-dove was a holocaust; in that case, the head was entirely wrung off because it was burnt upon the altar, to represent, as if it were, the fat of the sacrifice; while the rest of the little bird was to rise upon the altar, as much as possible in its entirety, whence the wings were merely to be cloven, but not separated from the body. No analogous regulations with regard to the wings of birds presented as sin-offerings were

required, for the reason just alluded to, namely, because such birds, with the exception of their blood, were not disposed of upon the altar.

If the sin-offering was a cereal oblation, the ceremonial was, on the whole, identical with that adopted for ordinary bloodless offerings; the significant deviation — the absence of oil and frank-incense, the emblems of joyful elevation — is self-evident from the severe and solemn character of the expiatory sacrifices. — Offerings of birds were general among many other nations besides the Hebrews; and among some of them, provision was made for the sacrifices of the poor kindred in spirit to the laws under discussion. Among the Romans, several poor people might buy and offer one victim; or they presented baked images instead of real animals; or they put upon the altar milk, flour, and salt, or whatever they were able to afford. Among the Greeks, the poor often contented themselves with conciliating the gods by a kiss of the right hand (comp. pp. 66, 67).

β. TRESPASS-OFFERING V. 14—26.

14. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 15. If a

14—26. Inferior in religious importance, though earlier in origin, than the sin-offerings were the trespass-offerings. The significance which the sacrifices possessed for a theo-

cratical community formed the principle of arrangement in this section (ch. IV and V); that consideration was deemed more essential than their historical or genetic sequence; and as

soul commits a misdeed, and sins unawares *by taking* from the holy things of the Lord, then he shall bring *as* his forfeited debt to the Lord a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation by shekels of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary, for a trespass-offering. 16. And he shall pay what he has sinfully appropriated of the holy things, and shall add thereto the fifth part of it, and give it to the priest; and the priest shall make an atonement for him with the ram of the trespass-offering, that he may be forgiven.

17. And if a soul sins, and does any of all the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and he does not know *it*, and becomes guilty, and bears his sin; 18. Then shall he bring to the priest a

naturally religious ideas advanced in process of time, the order in which the various classes of sacrifice are here introduced, is exactly the reverse of that warranted by their chronological origin (see the Introduction). In the compiler's or reviser's time, the political organisation of the state, established on a securer footing, had been rendered more independent of religious institutions; his object was, therefore, in this part of the legislative code, not the creation of a *people*, but of a *holy people*; and he readily gave precedence to those regulations which more directly contributed towards the latter aim, although he could not but be aware that he thus disturbed, nay inverted, the natural order of his documents. He was, therefore, not content with placing the laws of the sin-offering first (IV. 1—V. 13), and among them again giving precedence to their latest and highest form (ch. IV); but he arranged the regulations concerning the trespass-offering so that their origin and true nature are best recognised in the very last portion (vers. 20—26). For him frauds upon the sacred property, such as firstlings, tithes, portions due to priests, or devoted objects were the gravest offences of this class;

he therefore commenced with them (vers. 14—16), though the precepts treat of an *unintentional* appropriation of such property, and atonement for inadvertent sins marks a much later stage in the history of religious training. He then proceeded to unjust acquisition in the general spheres of social life (vers. 17—19), though these cases are so vaguely defined, that he could hardly have hoped to convey to his readers a distinct notion and to afford them a practical guidance (see *infra*). But he concluded with ordinances, which evidently formed an independent portion (vers. 20—26): they are introduced by a separate heading (ver. 20); and they unmistakably disclose the antiquity of their date. They treat of intentional offences, and of offences of such a kind as are both most frequent and most dangerous in primitive societies, of daring encroachments upon the rights of a neighbour, defalcation of lost or entrusted property, deceitful fraud or violent plunder, lying and perjury. It was for such crimes as these that trespass-offerings had at first been instituted, as an important and welcome aid in the administration of justice. Though strictly offences against fellow-men,

ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation, for a trespass-offering; and the priest shall make an atonement for him concerning his error which he committed unawares, and did not know *it*, that he may be forgiven; 19. It *is* a trespass-offering; he has indeed trespassed against the Lord.

20. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 21. If a soul sins, and commits a misdeed against the Lord, and lies to his neighbour concerning a trust or a deposit or plunder, or has defrauded his neighbour; 22. Or has found lost property, and lies concerning it, and swears falsely regarding any of all *the things* which a man does, to sin thereby; 23. Now, if he *so* sins, and

they were regarded and described as offences against God, who had pronounced against them His solemn warnings and interdictions; and thus their gravity and reproach were enhanced, "If a soul sins, and commits a misdeed against the Lord, and lies to his neighbour" (ver. 21). Not only was the property to be restored and the fifth part of its value to be added to it, but an offering was to be presented to remind the guilty person of his transgression, and to deter him from a repetition of it by the consciousness that he thereby not only violated human laws, but incurred the displeasure of God. How different is this from simple and precise enactments like these, "If a man steals an ox, or a sheep, and kills it, or sells it, he shall restore five oxen for an ox and four sheep for a sheep" (Exod. XXI. 37); or, "If the theft be found in his hand alive, whether it be ox, or ass, or sheep, he shall restore double" (XXII. 3). Again, with regard to entrusted property, the provisions of the civil code are equally plain (Exod. XXII. 6—12); a reasonable responsibility was imposed upon the depositary; multiple restitution was demanded in cases of neglect or fraud; and the judges were, in all cases, the arbiters, whether witnesses could be

procured, or an oath was to be administered; there no mention is made of sacrifices; the statutes are positive and formal; and in the third case set forth in our passage, that concerning found property, the restoration was simply made a moral duty enjoined with pathetic earnestness (Deut. XXII. 1—3). How are these differences to be reconciled? We must again distinguish between the various documents and their authors. The legislation in Exodus (and Deuteronomy) is conceived in a secular and a strictly political, that of this part of Leviticus in a religious or theocratic spirit; the former was framed on the assumption that the authorities were strong enough to protect the weak and to curb the refractory; the latter was devised when that assumption was found to be groundless, and a religious check, in addition to that afforded by the penal law, was deemed advisable, and could, in harmony with the newly developed Levitical ideas, be safely ventured upon. Of the numerous traces of the gradual progress of ideas, two additional examples bearing on our section may be mentioned. We find here that perjury deliberately and basely committed was to be atoned for merely by a *trespass-offering*, together with increased restitution of

is guilty, then he shall restore the plunder which he has violently taken, or the spoil which he has acquired by fraud, or the trust which has been delivered to him to keep, or the lost property which he has found, 24. Or whatever *it may be* about which he has sworn falsely; and he shall restore it in the principal, and shall add thereto the fifth part of it, *and* give it to him to whom it belongs on the day *of the confession* of his guilt. 25. And he shall bring *as* his trespass-offering to the Lord a ram without blemish out of the flock, according to thy estimation,

the property acquired by the criminal oath (vers. 22, 24). But not much later, even a heedless oath sworn without a conscious defiance of the Divine name, was to be expiated by a *sin*-offering, holier in import and more solemn in ritual (p. 178); the sacrifice had no longer a worldly, but an entirely spiritual end; while, from another point of view, the sacredness of the name of God was merely enforced as a paramount duty of the pious, without being guarded by ceremonials. The other instance is more striking still and larger in its scope. Let the reader weigh with an unbiassed mind the following precept, "If a soul sins, and does any of all the prohibitions of the Lord which ought not to be done, and he does not know it . . . ; then shall he bring a ram without blemish . . . for a trespass-offering" (vers. 17, 18). It is as comprehensive and general as the corresponding commands with regard to sin-offerings (IV. 2, 13, 22, 27); it must clearly be understood of all offences whatsoever; and it forces us to the conclusion that at the time when it was conceived, trespass-offerings were supposed to expiate *all* unintentional sins, whereas they were, later, almost superseded by the more solemn and sacred class of sin-offerings; yet as they were retained for the expiation of sins committed against the rights of property, the reviser here inserted that

passage among the commands treating of offences of that nature; and from the contrast in which it stands to the preceding law on *holy* property, it was probably meant to refer to property in general. However, another step was made in the direction of the Levitical system. If the owner of defrauded property, at the time when the delinquent was discovered, had died without leaving a legal heir, the restitution was to be made to the priests, who then already could venture to claim it as the representatives of God (Num. V. 6—8). Thus everything tended to promote the rearing of an edifice which it required the struggles of centuries to complete.

In all cases of restitution, the fifth part of the value of the fraudulently acquired property was to be added to the original amount; the significance of the number *five* is derived from that of its double *ten* which typifies completeness and is usually employed in connection with Divine manifestations; the addition of one fifth is, therefore, also commanded with reference to the redemption of property sanctified to God, whether of houses or fields, of tithes or animals; the number five occurs, besides, in some other Levitical ordinances, and on the imposition of taxes. The valuation was to be made by the "holy shekel", which was of greater weight, and which was here prescribed in order to mark the sacrifice as a reli-

for a trespass-offering to the priest: 26. And the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord, that he may be forgiven for any of all *the things* which he has done *so as* to trespass therein.

gious act, and not as a merely pecuniary transaction. The victim to be selected for the trespass-offering was to be a ram; and it is not improbable that this animal naturally offered itself, because sheep, and especially rams, were from early times employed as means of exchange and currency, and would therefore be deemed peculiarly appropriate for a class of sacrifices which

centred in the restoration of property. In conclusion, if an argument were wanted to prove how much the Levitical legislation fluctuated, we might point to a clear case of appropriation of holy property in which simply restitution, but no trespass-offering was prescribed (XXII. 14), whereas in our section, the latter appears of equal importance with the former (vers. 14—16).

B. ANOTHER CODE.

CHAPTERS VI AND VII.

1. ON THE SERVICE OF THE ALTAR OF BURNT-OFFERING, VI. 1—6,
AND
2. ON BLOODLESS OFFERINGS, VI. 7—11.

CHAPTER VI.

SUMMARY.—This code contains 1. the law of the daily public burnt-offerings and of the perpetual fire to be kept on the brazen altar (VI. 1—6), and 2. The law of the bloodless offerings and the priest's share of them (VI. 7—11); 3. The ordinance regarding the bloodless offering to be presented by every High-priest, in all future time, on the day of his consecration (VI. 12—16); 4. The law of the sin-offering (VI. 17—23); and 5. of the trespass-offering (VII. 1—7); 6. Regulations concerning the portions of the priests in burnt- and bloodless offerings (VII. 8—11); 7. The law of the thank-offering (VII. 11—21); 8. The prohibition of fat and blood (VII. 22—27); 9. Precepts regulating the portions to be left to the priests in thank-offerings (VII. 28—34); and 10. A comprehensive conclusion of this code (VII. 35—38).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Com-

1—11. It might appear that in the preceding part of the Book, the outlines of the sacrificial laws were completed, or if any addition seemed desirable, that it would be appended by distinct

reference to the former sketch; for the four different classes of sacrifice have been introduced and treated of in the natural order of their origin—first the holocausts and bloodless offerings

mand Aaron and his sons, saying, *This is the law of the burnt-offering. This — the burnt-offering — shall be on the place of burning upon the altar the whole night till the morning, and the fire of the altar shall burn by it.* 3. And the priest shall put on his linen garment, and *his* linen drawers shall he put upon his

(ch. I, II), then the thank-offerings (ch. III), and lastly the expiatory sacrifices (ch. IV, V). Yet we find here a new series of laws on burnt-offerings (vers. 1—6) and on bloodless offerings (vers. 7—11), in some respects coherent in themselves, and compiled from a new point of view. Now let us suppose that we read for the first time the following injunctions, without being aware of the connection in which they here occur: "And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, Command Aaron and his sons, saying, *This is the law of the burnt-offering: This — the burnt-offering — shall be on the burning-place upon the altar the whole night till the morning, and the fire of the altar shall burn by it.*" The character of these commands would not for a moment be doubtful; our impression would unavoidably be that we have before us a separate and independent ordinance on burnt-offerings; nor would that impression be unfounded. For both the language and the spirit of the portion disclose its anterior origin. The wording is unusual, archaic, hard, and partially obscure; and the contents are just such as would most likely be embodied in the earliest outlines of a law concerning the earliest class of sacrifice: they refer to the regular or daily holocausts to be offered for the nation; they are written for the exclusive guidance of the priests; they embody no precept or allusion that concerns the Israelite; they are, in fact, designed to regulate the public worship and to instruct the public ministers. Nor is it difficult to discover the reason

why the compilers of Leviticus assigned to this portion the place it occupies. The enactments concerning burnt-offerings, contained in the first chapter, though not complete, are both more systematic and more intelligible; they suffice as a manual for the people whom it was above all deemed advisable to teach and to induce to acts of religious worship. They were, therefore, placed at the beginning of the Book, together with the laws on the three other classes of sacrifice, with which they had for some time formed one code (ch. I to V). It may be that the revisers omitted here some details which they deemed it unnecessary to repeat; nor is it unlikely that they desired to have this section considered as a supplement or appendix to the more comprehensive precepts of the first chapter; but the general nature of the portion cannot be mistaken; it relates to the priests and to the Sanctuary; and it bears the stamp of a higher antiquity.

If the Sanctuary was to be marked as the centre of the religious life of the nation, nothing was of greater importance than the perpetual and uninterrupted exercise of some significant act of devotion. But nothing appeared to serve this purpose better than daily and regular sacrifices designed for no other end than to express, in the name of the whole people, God's unlimited sovereignty. Therefore, when a law had ordained, that a holocaust should be offered in the Tabernacle every morning, and another in the evening, the Sanctuary was emphatically

flesh, and take up the ashes to which the fire has consumed the burnt-offering on the altar, and he shall put them beside the altar. 4. Then he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth

described as the Tent of Meeting between God and Israel: "And there I will meet with the children of Israel, that it be hallowed by My glory. . . . And I will dwell among the children of Israel, and will be their God" (Exod. XXIX. 38—46); for wherever the odour of sacrifices might ascend to heaven, God promised to appear and to bless the worshipper (Exod. XX. 24). The victim was invariably to be a lamb one year old, which represented the usual animal food of the nation, and was hence by general custom so decidedly used for ordinary sacrifices, that it was here not even mentioned. But another and even more striking symbol was adopted for conveying the idea of the constant and incessant worship of God, a symbol which a general Eastern or rather ancient custom readily offered, but which, among the Hebrews, assumed a peculiar character and meaning, in accordance with their monotheistic views. An old and intelligible conception assigns to the deity the attributes of fire, and declares the nature of both as entirely kindred. It arose among tribes which worshipped the sun because they considered it as the central fire of the universe or as the great god himself; or because they regarded fire as the primary element of creation, and the preserving and vivifying power of the world. The Hindoos raised fire, separating it from the nature and person of Shiva, to a distinct deity under the name of *Agnis*, that is, the Swift, who bore also the names of *Hutásas* or Consumer of Sacrifices, and *Pavaka* or Purifier, and was looked upon as one of the guardians of the world and the mediator between men and gods. The deity was frequently supposed to

have appeared in the form of a brilliant fire or light. The Persians, in common with many other nations, maintained a perpetual fire upon their altars; they carried some of "the sacred and eternal fire" with them on their military expeditions; to whatever god they intended to sacrifice, they first addressed a prayer to fire; and whoever blew the flame with his breath instead of fanning it, or threw upon the fire any carcass or unclean thing, was punished with death. Therefore, like some other nations both of the old and the new world, they considered it a profanation of the holy element to burn the dead. King Darius requested the Carthaginians by special messengers to bury the dead instead of burning them; and when Cambyses ordered the mummy of the Egyptian king Amasis to be burnt, he did, as Herodotus declares, an "impious" thing and one "repugnant both to the Persians and the Egyptians"; for the Persians, he remarks, "consider fire to be a god, and they deem it not right to offer to a god a dead body of a man; and by the Egyptians fire is held to be a living beast, devouring all it can lay hold of, and then expiring with what it has consumed"; and even at present the Parsi, evidently in observance of a very old custom, in order to prevent the pollution of a sacred element, neither bury nor burn their dead but expose them on a high scaffolding, to be consumed by the birds of prey. The Hindoos kept a perpetual flame in that apartment of the house which was devoted to sacrificial and other sacred rites; the offerings poured into the fire were deemed more particularly devoted to the gods; and the Brahmans were be-

the ashes without the camp to a clean place. 5. And the fire upon the altar shall be burning by it; it shall not be extinguished; and the priest shall burn wood on

lieved to possess the same purifying power as that element. The Japanese hold that, in order to please the Spirits or *Kamis*, it is necessary to keep up a pure fire in the firm conviction, that the prayers pronounced before that symbol of the highest deity are most efficacious to secure remission of sins, innocence of the soul, and removal of the five chief evils fatal to mankind, namely, the devastations of the elements, disease, poverty, exile, and premature death. The Greeks considered the fire, divine in its origin and therefore rising heavenward, to have at first been in the exclusive possession of the gods, till it was either spontaneously granted by them to men, or stealthily taken by Prometheus from the celestial abodes. Hence they extensively maintained a sacred flame in their temples, and were particular even in the selection of the wood or the oil to be used as fuel; they considered it as the most efficient means of purification and of symbolical removal of sin, and therefore devoted to the gods sacrifices almost exclusively through the flames of the altar; "fireless offerings" were extremely rare exceptions, as those presented to Athene at Lindus. But they deemed "pure" fire only fit for the service of the altar. When after the battle of Plataeae, they desired to celebrate the victory by sacrifices, they were commanded by the oracle of Delphi, to erect an altar to Jupiter, but not to sacrifice before they had extinguished the fire in the whole neighbourhood because it had been polluted by the presence of the barbarians, and to kindle a pure flame from the common hearth at Delphi. In some parts, it was the general custom to fetch fire for religious festivals from certain temples

of special sanctity. If anyone died in a house, the fire was deemed "defiled", was extinguished, and other fire was brought from an adjoining house; even the sin of man was held to contaminate the fire; therefore, at the annual festival of purification celebrated at Lemnos, the fire of the whole island was extinguished, and was replaced by that fetched from Delos. The Lacedaemonians, when marching out on a war-expedition, took with them from Sparta some of the fire of the last sacrifice, never allowing it to be extinguished, and employing it for all sacred acts. The colonies brought the fire to be used for the sacrifices from the public hearth of the mother town. Almost identical with these views were those of the Romans. Numa, so observes Florus, entrusted the charge of the hearth and the perpetual fire to the Vestal virgins, that "the flame might watch as guardian of the empire after the image of the heavenly stars"; the same ordinance was renewed in the laws of the Twelve Tables and the custom was noticed and approved of by later historians and poets. Often the sacred fire was traced to a miraculous origin; it was supposed to have descended from heaven, whether as a free gift of the deity, or in consequence of fervent prayer; it was hence most scrupulously guarded, and its extinction was believed to cause the inevitable downfall of the commonwealth. If it still happened to die away, it was not to be lighted again from another, but a new fire was to be made by producing from the sun, by means of burning-lens or mirrors, "a pure and undefiled flame", a mode of obtaining the sacrificial fire regularly adopted by several ancient tribes at their vernal

it [the fire] every morning, and arrange the burnt-offering upon it — and he shall burn thereon the fat of the thank-offerings. 6. A perpetual fire shall burn upon the altar; it shall never be extinguished.

festivals. It is related that the *Sagnicas*, a Hindoo sect numerous at Benares, when entering the priestly order, light with two pieces of the hard wood *semi*, a fire which they never allow to go out during the whole of their lives, but which is used for their sacrifices, the nuptial ceremonials, the obsequies of their relations, and their own funeral pile. It was generally held that "fire purifies, while water sanctifies." Yet at the rites of initiation in certain mysteries, fire was employed, while water was avoided mainly because the latter is the opposite of the former; or the water was hallowed by immersing in it a burning log taken from the altar. Leaping over the fire, a rite observed on the Roman festival of the Palilia, was supposed to have a purifying effect. Among the Greeks, children were, on the fifth day after their birth, purified by being carried round the fire on the domestic hearth. It was a rule both among the Greeks and Romans, that no sacrifice could possibly be performed without the use of fire. The bright and rising blaze of the flame was regarded as auspicious, the dull and smoky fire as ominous; and the sacrificial fire was, therefore, a common means of augury. Now the Hebrews shared with other nations some of the conceptions just stated. Fire was with them the pure and purifying element. It was called the purest of all essences. When Isaiah was initiated as prophet, a seraph took a live coal from the altar, laid it on Isaiah's mouth, and said, "Behold this has touched thy lips, and thy iniquity is taken away, and thy sin is purged." God is described as "a devouring fire." He reveals Himself in fire; and His word is fire. It was no

doubt this train of ideas which suggested the perpetual fire upon the altar of burnt-offering in the Court, and the perpetual light in the Holy of the Sanctuary; yet according to the Pentateuch, the fire on the altar did not represent the Deity, but His worship; it was no symbol of God, much less identical with Him; it could, therefore, not possibly be watched and examined as a means of augury; it was no more than a permanent proof that the Israelites were earnest in their endeavours to be the holy people, and an incessant exhortation to urge them on towards that grand aim. But Jewish tradition, as if unable to appreciate the simplicity of the Biblical notions, invented fabulous accounts nearly approaching the pagan ideas; it contended that the perpetual fire on the altar of burnt-offering had fallen from heaven (comp. IX. 24; X. 2; and notes *in loc.*); that it was clear and pellucid, like the sun; that it emitted no smoke; that it did not require the care of the priests, but miraculously fed itself; that it was never extinguished by the rain and that its rising column of smoke was never disturbed by any wind or tempest however violent; that it rested on the altar like a lion; that it consumed fluids no less than dry things; that it burnt uninterruptedly to the time of Solomon, when it was renewed (comp. 2 Chr. VII. 1), and then lasted to the reign of Manasseh who removed it; but that, at the destruction of the Temple, it was by the priests concealed in an empty cistern, and then, after the return from the Babylonian exile, recovered in an extraordinary manner. But independently of this sacred fire, they fabled of "the fire of the burnt-offer-

7. And this *is* the law of the bloodless offering: the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord, before the altar. 8. And *one of them* shall take of it his handful, of the flour of the bloodless offering and of its oil, and all the frank-incense which *is* upon the bloodless

ings", lighted indeed from the former, but requiring fuel, especially the wood of the wild fig-tree; and of "the fire of fumigation", from which the coals were taken for the burning of incense.

As, according to the Bible, the day begins with the evening, the evening holocaust is here exclusively prescribed, "it shall be ... on the altar the whole night till the morning"; but it naturally follows, that the morning holocaust was to burn on the altar, during the day, till the time of the next evening sacrifice, which took place between the declining and the setting sun. — While performing his holy functions, the priest was to wear his sacred garments, of which, though consisting of four pieces, two only are here mentioned — the *tunic*, the long tight robe of fine white linen or byssus, without folds, covering the whole body, and reaching down to the feet, with sleeves, woven as one entire piece, and with forms of squares intermixed and hence called tessellated; and the *drawers* reaching from the loins to the thighs, and principally designed for decency. The two other articles of the priestly dress are not referred to — the *girdle* tied over the tunic, and the *turban*. It is uncertain whether they are omitted accidentally and for the sake of brevity, or because they had, at the early date of our portion, not yet been fixed as essential and indispensable, whereas the tunic at least seems to have then already been the common and ordinary vestment of the priest ("he shall put on his linen garment"). It is undoubted that sacerdotal garments

were subject to manifold changes, as the descriptions of Josephus, himself a priest, compared with those of the Old Testament sufficiently prove. — It is unnecessary to point out that *linen*, because absorbing perspiration and not easily harbouring vermin, like wool, was a favourite material for priestly robes among ancient nations. The dress of the Egyptian priests especially was entirely of linen; their ministers were therefore frequently designated by Latin poets *linigeri*; and the linen of their long robes was of a texture so wonderfully fine as to be perfectly transparent, for which reason it was put over a short kilt of thicker quality reaching to the knees, while the chief priest of the temple usually threw a leopard-skin over it. The ordinary garment of common Egyptians even was a linen tunic fringed below; they indeed wore generally over it a white woolen raiment; but this they were obliged to take off when entering a temple; and nothing that was made of or contained wool was permitted to be buried with them. The same rules were adopted by the votaries of Isis in Rome; and a similar custom was rigidly maintained by the Hebrew priesthood. The reason of the preference given to linen over wool for priestly raiments is hardly because the former has its origin in the purified interior of the earth, while the latter comes from the most indolent animal; wool was not in itself despised; it was interwoven in the hangings of the Tabernacle; but it was, from considerations of cleanliness, less eligible for garments than linen. Now the priest, dressed in the prescribed manner, was

offering, and shall burn *it* upon the altar *for* a sweet odour, its memorial to the Lord. 9. And the remainder of it shall Aaron and his sons eat; unleavened shall it be eaten in the holy place; in the Court of the Tent of Meeting they shall eat it. 10. It shall not be baked

commanded to approach, in the morning, the brazen altar in the Court, to take off the ashes, into which the holocaust of the preceding evening had, in the meantime, been converted, and to put them temporarily in the appointed place, eastward of the altar. He then had to supply the altar with fresh wood, and to arrange and to burn upon it the holocaust of the morning, and the fat and the fat parts of the thank-offerings which might be presented by members of the community. Herewith ended his functions at the Sanctuary; it remained for him only to remove the ashes from the Court to a spot appropriated for them without the camp; and as he was never to wear his holy garments beyond the precincts of the Sanctuary, he was ordered, before proceeding with his last task, to exchange them for his common or ordinary dress. Whether he took the ashes every day to the place without the camp, or whether he did so from time to time only, is immaterial, although the context of our passage would lead to the former inference. And lest the spirit and essence of these commands be misunderstood, the text emphatically concludes with the repeated injunction, "A perpetual fire shall burn upon the altar; it shall never be extinguished" (ver. 6); it was meant to serve at once as a monitor and a witness of Israel's piety and of their unremitting zeal in the service of their God, as a visible symbol of their spiritual aspirations and their religious duties. — We have little historical evidence to prove to what extent the idea of a perpetual fire was really carried out among the Hebrews. Granted

even that it was conceived in so early a time as that of Moses, it could not be acted upon during the wanderings in the desert, where the scarcity of fuel alone would have rendered it impossible, or during the earlier wars of conquest in Canaan. It is expressly stated that, whenever the Israelites changed their encampments, the altar with all its vessels was carefully wrapped up in purple cloth and badgers' skins, and carried on poles (Num. IV. 13, 14). Jewish tradition tries to explain the difficulty by the supposition of a constant miracle which caused the fire to glimmer on without fuel and without injuring the cloth and the skins; and later apologists curiously confine the "perpetual" fire to the time when the Tabernacle was at rest. The holy fire that accompanied the Persians and other ancient nations on their military expeditions, is analogous to the "column of fire" which is said to have preceded the hosts of the Hebrews, but not to the "perpetual fire" to be kept on the brazen altar. Thus much is certain that burnt-offerings were presented, at some chief or national sanctuary, from the time of the Judges down to the period of the captivity; and after the return, we have distinct information with regard to the wood that was offered and gathered for the brazen altar (Neh. X. 35). From this time the sacred fire was no doubt kept up with constant continuity which was only interrupted, for a short interval, during the Syrian war against Antiochus Epiphanes. In these later periods, the wood was collected by appointed persons nine times every year; on one

leavened; I have given it *to them for* their portion of My offerings made by fire; it *is* most holy like the sin-offering and like the trespass-offering. 11. All the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it, *as* a statute for ever in your generations, from the offerings of the Lord made by fire: every one that touches them shall be holy.

day a festival was celebrated, when it was "customary for every one to bring wood for the altar, that there might never be a want of fuel for that fire which was unquenchable and always burning", and the wood was deposited in a special cell in the north-eastern corner of the Court of the Women; the latter task was fulfilled by Aaronites afflicted with some bodily defect, and therefore unfit for the immediate service of the Temple. Wood that was worm-eaten was strictly excluded from the altar.

It is not improbable that the bloodless offering here described (vers. 7—11) is meant to be understood of that cereal oblation which, in the Tabernacle and Temple, was to accompany the daily holocausts, and which was to consist of the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour mingled with the fourth part of a hin of beaten oil (Exod. XXIX. 40, 41). But the intention of the compiler or reviser of the different documents is one thing, and the original import of these documents individually is another; and it cannot be doubted that the precepts here stated refer to bloodless oblations in general: "And this is the law of the bloodless offering; the sons of Aaron shall offer it before the Lord, before the altar" (ver. 7); the succeeding verses do not contain a single allusion to morning or evening sacrifices, whereas the holocausts are distinctly and repeatedly described as such; and the injunctions possess a variety or almost completeness of detail which points to their

universal application. Cereal offerings were indeed frequently presented alone and independently of animal sacrifices; it was, therefore, important to define their ritual and their character, and to fix the portions that could be claimed by the priests. They probably consisted at first of simple flour (comp. II. 1—3), neither prepared in an oven, pan, or pot (II. 4—10); but oil and frankincense, sacred emblems throughout the East, were from early times deemed indispensable, as the one was used for libations, the other, extensively, for separate offerings. They were considered as "most holy", because they had always been entirely appropriated to God and His servants, and had thus been wholly surrendered by the worshipper. They could be dealt with by sacred persons only; "every one that touches them shall be holy" (ver. 11). They are here even described as equal in solemnity to the expiatory offerings (ver. 10); this is indeed not literally correct; for some kinds of sin-offering were regarded as so pre-eminently holy that not even the priests were allowed to partake of them, and were therefore to be delivered entirely to the flames; but this inaccuracy corroborates interestingly a conjecture which offers itself from other and larger considerations, namely, that this comparison "like the sin-offering and the trespass-offering" is a later addition, yet not so late as to fall into the time when the highest forms of the sin-offering were already developed (comp. ver. 23).

12. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 13. This is the offering of Aaron and of his sons, which they shall offer to the Lord in the day when he is anointed — the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour *for* a bloodless offering perpetually, half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening. 14. In a pan it shall be made with oil; thou shalt bring it well soaked; roasted cakes, an oblation of small pieces, shalt thou offer *for* a sweet odour to the Lord. 15. *And he who will be* the anointed priest in his place among his sons shall offer it: *it is*

3. ON THE BLOODLESS OFFERING OF THE HIGH-PRIEST ON THE DAY OF HIS CONSECRATION, VI. 12—16.

12—16. From a comparatively remote period, some fixed ceremonial was observed at the consecration of the religious chief of the people; it was extremely simple and contrasted strikingly with the complicated, solemn, and highly symbolical ritual that was adopted or recommended at a later epoch and a more advanced stage of theocratic institutions (ch. VIII). How this striking change could be made, although the ordinance is here enjoined *for ever* (ver. 13), and as an *eternal* statute (ver. 15), and how yet both sections so contradictory to each other could be inserted by the compilers of Leviticus almost successively, will not surprise those who have made themselves familiar with the composition and gradual growth of the Book. It is hardly probable that our passage was desired to be understood of the consecration of the *later* High-priests, and the eighth chapter of that of Aaron himself; for here also we read, "This is the offering of Aaron and his sons" (comp. ver. 15). Now this sacrifice was to consist simply of two bloodless offerings, one presented in the morning, and the other in the evening, probably in analogy to the two daily holocausts burnt from an early age. It was indeed so un-

pretending that the quantity of flour used for each oblation was below the minimum later prescribed for even the very poorest of private individuals, which was an omer or the tenth part of an ephah (V. 11); for it was no more than half an ephah (ver. 13); this circumstance has given rise to the supposition that both offerings, that of the morning and that of the evening, formed *one* sacrifice; they were evidently so understood by Jewish tradition, which ordained that the High-priest should bring from his house the whole ephah at the same time, and divide it afterwards; however, each oblation was complete in itself; and the double offering, at the beginning and the conclusion of the day, was evidently designed to impress the idea that the High-priest's whole existence should be devoted to his sacred duties and to the glory of God. It was prepared in the following manner. The flour was put into a pan, soaked or saturated with oil, and of course mixed with salt (II. 13); this mass was divided into pieces, and so baked or toasted (ver. 14); for the "pieces" were meant to be analogous to the limbs into which the animal holocaust was divided before it was burnt. This ceremonial was to be repeated at

a statute for ever to the Lord; it shall be wholly burnt. 16. And every bloodless offering of a priest shall be wholly *burnt*; it shall not be eaten.

17. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 18. Speak to 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 holy. 19. The priest that offers it for expiation shall eat it; in the holy place shall it be eaten,

the consecration of all the descendants of Aaron that might succeed him in the pontifical office (ver 15). But the offering could not be eaten by the High-priest because he presented it in his own name, nor by an ordinary priest, who was subordinate to the chief of his order; and it was, therefore, to be burnt entirely. With this individual case the writer or compiler connected the general rule, "Every bloodless

offering of a priest shall be wholly burnt; it shall not be eaten" (ver. 16); for, in principle, the entire sacrifice, at least if falling within the class of "most holy", belonged to God, who might leave a part of it to His representatives, the priests; but if these representatives themselves offered a sacrifice, it was claimed by God alone, and no one else could expect a share in it.

4. ON SIN-OFFERINGS, VI. 17—23; and

5. ON TRESPASS-OFFERINGS, VII. 1—7.

17—23 and VII. 1—7. To the laws concerning the holocaust and the bloodless offering (vers. 1—16), regulations regarding expiatory sacrifices (ver. 17—VII. 7) and eucharistic gifts (VII. 11—21) were later appended by a reviser desirous to complete the code in accordance with the progress which the sacrificial system had in the meantime made. Thus a certain consistency and fitness of arrangement are observable in these sections. Yet that arrangement is far from perfect. While the first two portions of this chapter (vers. 1—11) treat of general classes of offering, the third relates to a very particular and special case (vers. 12—16), but is again followed by laws on several great divisions of sacrifice (vers. 17—VII. 21). The sin-offering precedes the trespass-offering, contrary to the natural sequence of their respective

origin; and more anomalously still, the thank-offering follows after the expiatory sacrifices, though it is considerably anterior to them in antiquity. From the compiler's point of view, however, these incongruities may be easily explained. He left the regulations concerning the High-priest's offering in the place in which he found them (vers. 12—16), because he saw that they could be understood as an appendix to the preceding laws on bloodless oblations (vers. 7—11), especially as he desired the latter to be referred to the regular cereal gift which was to accompany the daily holocausts; but he gave to the expiatory sacrifices the precedence over the eucharistic offerings, because he attached to the former far higher religious importance; and from the same consideration, he placed the sin-

in the Court of the Tent of Meeting. 20. Whoever shall touch its flesh shall be holy: and if anyone sprinkles of its blood upon any garment, thou shalt wash that whereon he has sprinkled *it* in the holy place. 21. And the earthen vessel wherein it is cooked shall be broken; and if it be cooked in a brazen vessel, then it shall be scoured and rinsed in water. 22. All the males among the priests shall eat it; it *is* most holy. 23. But no sin-offering, whereof *any* of the blood is brought into

offering, in which the theocratic worship culminated, before the less solemn trespass-offering.

However, the ordinances respecting the expiatory sacrifices are quite general in their nature; there is indeed the main division into sin-offering and trespass-offering; but the distinction between these two species is vague and little defined; the victims are in both cases to be killed in the same place; they are both "most holy"; they are both to be eaten by male priests alone, in the holy place or the Court; the same parts of the animal were burnt in either sacrifice, though they are mentioned in the law of the trespass-offering only; it is, in fact, expressly urged, "The sin-offering is like the trespass-offering, there is one law for them" (VII. 7); which rule, though immediately referring to the portions of the priests, appears to have a much larger scope. If there is a difference intended, it can be conjectured rather than ascertained. From the force and emphasis with which the writer cautions non-Levites against any contact whatever with the sin-offering, especially its blood, it appears that he attributed, in some respect, a higher degree of sanctity to the sin-offering than even to the trespass-offering; but by what ceremony that superiority was conveyed, if it was conveyed at all, is in no way indicated. It may be contended that it was expressed by a different mode in the disposal of the blood, and that a statement to this

effect was deemed unnecessary, because it had been previously made (IV. 30, 34). But such assertion is based upon an erroneous estimate of the relative ages of the present and the previous sections (ch. IV), and is in no way borne out by the tenour and spirit of our verses. On the contrary, these regulations betray a time when the latest class of sacrifice had not been introduced long. Evidently to render them more intelligible to the reader, they are connected with the oldest and most familiar kind of offering, the holocausts, "In the place where they kill the burnt-offering, shall they kill the trespass-offering", and, "In the place where the burnt-offering is killed, shall the sin-offering be killed"; it is commanded that all the blood of the trespass-offering shall be sprinkled "on the altar round about", or on all its sides, exactly as was the case with the burnt-offerings, to which they were thus rendered equal in a most essential point; and the comprehensive maxim, "The sin-offering is like the trespass-offering, there is one law for them", almost compels the conclusion that, at first, there was scarcely any distinction between the two beyond the choice of the animals and the nature of the offences for which they were respectively presented. From all this it seems manifest, that the general rule with which the chapter concludes, "But no sin-offering, whereof any blood is brought into the Tent of Meeting, to make atone-

the Tent of Meeting to make atonement in the Holy, shall be eaten; it shall be burnt in the fire.

CHAPTER VII.

1. And this is the law of the trespass-offering: It is most holy. 2. In the place where they kill the burnt-offering, shall they kill the trespass-offering; and its blood shall he [the priest] sprinkle round about upon the altar. 3. And he shall offer of it all its fat; the tail, and the fat that covers the bowels, 4. And the two kidneys, and the fat that is on them, which is by the flanks, and the great lobe of the liver, which he shall take off by the kidneys. 5. And the priest shall burn

ment in the Holy, shall be eaten; it shall be burnt in the fire" (ver. 23) — that this rule is the addition of a much later time, when the gradation between the sin-offering of the High-priest, the whole nation, the ruler, and the common Israelite (ch. IV), had been established, and was chiefly indicated by the manner in which the blood, the medium of atonement, was applied, whether it was disposed of in the Court or in the Holy, and whether it was sprinkled round the whole altar or put on the horns, its most characteristic part. This addition caused the precepts under discussion (VI. 17—22), which were originally meant to have general application, to be restricted to the sin-offering of the common Israelite only. But it was considered the more necessary as, from the tenour of the preceding verse (22), it might have been inferred that all sin-offerings alike could be eaten by the priests, and thus mistakes, deemed very grave from a theocratic point of view, might easily have been committed.—As sin-offerings became customary for transgressions which more immediately concerned the character of the holy community, they were naturally invested with greater sanctity and were more scrupulously

guarded against every possible defilement. Not only were priests alone permitted to touch the flesh, but if by chance some blood was sprinkled upon a garment, it was to be washed out by the priest in the holy place, that is, in the Court of the Sanctuary, not by the Israelite to whom the garment belonged; because the holy blood could be touched by none but priestly hands, and it would be profaned were it taken, with the garment, beyond the precincts of the Sanctuary. If the flesh was cooked in an earthen vessel, the latter was to be broken, because the juice of the holy meat might soak into the unglazed earthenware, and then by cooking enter into a layman's food, or be applied to some unworthy use; but if the utensil was of metal, especially of brass, it required merely to be thoroughly washed and scoured with water (Jewish tradition says, with *boiling* water), because its hardness did not admit the holy fluid (VI. 20, 21).

The ritual of both sin- and trespass-offering is but imperfectly stated; but it appears, that the ceremonies necessarily common to all sacrifices and well-known from the practice of the *earlier* classes, particularly the holocaust, were

them upon the altar *for* an offering made by fire to the Lord; it *is* a trespass-offering. 6. Every male among the priests shall eat it; it shall be eaten in the holy place; it *is* most holy. 7. As the sin-offering *is*, so *is* the trespass-offering; *there is* one law for them: the priest that makes atonement therewith, shall have *it*.

8. And the priest that offers any man's burnt-offering, the priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he has offered. 9. And every bloodless offering that is baked in the oven, and every one that

designedly not specified in detail; so for instance is the rite of imposition of the hand omitted, though it was undoubtedly performed; for the personal connection which it typifies between the offerer and the victim, was pre-eminently essential and significant in expiatory sacrifices (see pp. 125, 126). Nor are the animals mentioned, though

the allusion to the "fat tail" in connection with the trespass-offering, proves that, for this class, sheep were the ordinary victims. If a priest presented a trespass-offering, it was, no doubt, entirely burnt, like the bloodless oblation of a priest, and for the same reasons, which have been pointed out above (p. 333).

6. THE PORTIONS OF BURNT-OFFERINGS AND BLOODLESS OFFERINGS TO BE LEFT TO THE PRIESTS, VII. 8—10.

8—10. One of the principal ends of the second code of laws (ch. VI and VII) is to define the portions which should belong to the priests in the various classes of sacrifice. With this view, some small but significant interpolations were inserted in preceding sections (VI. 5, 10); and with the same view some additions are here made, designed to further that object. They concern the holocausts and the bloodless offerings, which, in the writer's time, appeared to require more definite regulations. In holocausts, all the meat and fat were indeed to be consumed upon the altar (I. 5, 9, 12, 13); but no law seems to have existed with respect to the hide of the victim, which, for obvious reasons, was not burnt in the sacred flames. It is not impossible that originally the skin, not claimed by the Deity, remained the property of the

worshipper. But when the character of the holocaust, as an offering *entirely* to be delivered to the service of God, was more decidedly urged, it was deemed appropriate that the offerer should renounce the skin of the victim also, and surrender it to the priests, who in the mean time had grown into a numerous order, and required more ample provision. This arrangement must have appeared both more natural and more practicable at a time, when the introduction of expiatory offerings accustomed the Israelite to give up the whole animal to the sacred service, whether a part of the flesh was eaten by the priests, or the whole, including the skin, was burnt either on the altar or in a clean and appointed place (IV. 11, 12). But the hide of animals presented as thank-offerings, was most probably returned to the offerer, since

is prepared in the pot and in a pan, shall belong to the priest that offers it. 10. And every bloodless offer-

it is nowhere alluded to as a priestly appurtenance. Among other nations also, as the Greeks, the skin of victims, though occasionally burnt on the altar, generally belonged to the priests, who, however, superstitiously used it for seeking prophetic dreams by sleeping upon it (p. 196); in some instances, the offerer knelt upon the hide, and placed the victim's feet and head upon his own head, in order to indicate the animal's vicarious death (p. 298).

In a preceding section of this code (VI. 5—11), portions of the most simple kind of offerings only, those consisting of flour, oil, and incense, were assigned to the priests. It was deemed essential to secure for them the corresponding shares in all other classes of cereal oblations, especially those prepared in the oven, the pot, or pan (comp. II. 4—10); and the reviser, therefore, here supplied this omission (ver. 9). Now, it was the most natural practice, that the legal share in the offering should be allowed to the priest who performed the ceremonies of its presentation; this is expressly mentioned, in the earliest regulations on the sacrifices, with reference to the trespass-offering, "The priest that makes atonement therewith shall have it" (VII. 7), and to the sin-offering, "The priest that offers it for expiation shall eat it" (VI. 19); and now the same injunction is added with regard to the holocaust, "The priest that offers any man's burnt-offering, he shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he has offered" (ver. 8), with regard to many kinds of bloodless oblation, "Every bloodless offering that is baked in the oven, and every one that is prepared in the pot and in the pan, shall belong to the priest that offers it" (ver. 9), and to the thank-offering, "And he shall offer of it one

out of each oblation as a gift to the Lord; to the priest who sprinkles the blood of the thank-offering shall it belong" (ver. 11). But when the order of priesthood was, or was to be, better organised, it was found expedient, to reserve a part of the revenues to those priests also who did not exercise sacrificial functions, whether they were occupied at the Sanctuary, or were, for any reason, prevented from assisting in its work; therefore, some of the perquisites were to be collected for all priests alike, as a common stock, and to be distributed among them equally, thus affording subsistence to all; these perquisites were the simplest kind of the cereal oblations, "Every bloodless offering, mingled with oil, or dry, shall belong to all the sons of Aaron, to one as well as to another" (ver. 10), an ordinance later extended to all classes of cereal offering (II. 3, 10), and the right shoulder of the thank-offering, "He among the sons of Aaron, that offers the blood of the thank-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for his portion" (ver. 33); whereas the breast belonged to all the priests alike (ver. 34). — The "bloodless offering mingled with oil" comprises not only the cereal oblation which accompanied the burnt offering, but also all independent cereal gifts so prepared; whereas the "dry bloodless offering" embraces only the cereal sin-offering and the "offering of jealousy", to which neither oil nor frank-incense was to be added (p. 188). The reason why the bloodless oblations dressed in an oven, pan, or pot, belonged to the officiating priest exclusively, was no doubt, because the latter assisted in, or at least directed, their preparation, and had, therefore, greater labour to bestow upon them; evidently not, because they

ing, mingled with oil, and dry, shall belong to all the sons of Aaron, to one *as well* as to another.

11. And this *is* the law of the sacrifice of thank-offerings, which shall be offered to the Lord. 12. If *a man* offer it for praise, then he shall offer with the sacrifice of praise unleavened cakes mingled with oil, and unleavened wafers anointed with oil, and fine flour soaked *in oil and made into* cakes mingled with oil. 13. Besides *unleavened* cakes, he shall offer *for* his offering leavened bread with the sacrifice of praise of his thank-offering. 14. And he shall offer of it one out of each oblation *as* a gift to the Lord; to the priest who sprinkles the blood of the thank-offering shall it belong. 15. And the flesh of the sacrifice of his thank-offering for praise shall be eaten on the day of its sacrifice; he shall not leave *any* of it until the morning. 16. But if the sacrifice of his offering *be* a vow or a voluntary offering, it shall be eaten on the day that he offers his sacrifice; and on the morrow

were to be consumed more rapidly, which end would have been better secured by their distribution among all priests; or because they were but rarely and sparingly offered, whereas the simpler oblations were presented in such abundance that the officiating priest could not possibly consume them — an unsupported conjecture, weakened by the circumstance that each

oblation might have been presented by a different priest. — It is a matter of course, though here not mentioned, as it is omitted elsewhere (ver. 14), that of all the bloodless offerings “a memorial” was to be burnt to God (II. 2, 9, 16); for it is of the very nature of sacrifice that at least a part of it is to be devoted to the deity.

7. REGULATIONS REGARDING THANK-OFFERINGS, VII. 11—21.

11—21. The thank-offerings have, in the preceding part of this document, but incidentally and rather incongruously been alluded to in what is probably a later insertion (VI. 5). They are now treated of with considerable minuteness, yet more in reference to their ritual and their nature than with regard to the shares to be claimed by the priests. They were divided into two chief classes, those presented in grateful acknowledgment of some Divine favour, or “for praise” (ver. 12), and those offered in consequence of a vow or

as a free-will gift (ver. 16). The former was the more sacred kind, evidently because it was the spontaneous expression of pious devotion, whereas the vow rendered the sacrifice dependent on some future boon and was then compulsory, and even the free-will gift was probably regarded as a covert or indirect mode of supplication, and thus bore a less unselfish character. The animal praise-offering, connected as it was with a social repast, was accompanied by a very copious bloodless oblation which consisted not only

the remainder of it shall be eaten. 17. And the remainder of the flesh of the sacrifice shall be burnt with fire on the third day. 18. And if *any* of the flesh of the sacrifice of his thank-offering be yet eaten on the third day, he that offers it shall not be accepted, it shall not be imputed to him; it shall be an abomination, and the person that eats of it shall bear his iniquity. 19. And the flesh that touches any unclean *thing* shall not be eaten; it shall be burnt with fire; and as for the flesh, everyone *that is* clean may eat *of the* flesh. 20. But the person that eats *of the* flesh of the sacrifice of thank-offering, that *belongs* to the Lord, having his uncleanness upon him, that person shall be cut off from his people. 21. And if a person touch any unclean *thing*, *whether* uncleanness of man, or *any* unclean beast, or any unclean abomination, and eat of the flesh of the sacrifice of thank-offerings, which *belong* to the Lord, that person shall be cut off from his people.

of three kinds of unleavened cakes, but, besides, of leavened loaves, because the thank-offering had indeed a religious aspect, like every sacrifice, but as it generally referred to temporal prosperity, to rescue and safety, it was appropriately coupled with the ordinary staple of subsistence, or the daily bread. But though the latter was offered up together with the unleavened cakes, no portion of it was burnt on the altar as a part of the memorial, because the prohibition that nothing leavened should rise in the sacred flames "as an offering made by fire to the Lord", or "for a sweet odour" to Him, was universal and admitted of no exception (ll. 11, 12). Now the priest who performed the sacrifice or "who sprinkled the blood of the thank-offering", received one cake or loaf of each of the four kinds presented, while the rest belonged to the worshipper, to be consumed by him and his guests together with his share of the victim's meat.

But the meals were to be held within a certain specified time so limited that their connection with the sacrifice remained vividly impressed upon the offerer and his associates, and that, though joyful and convivial, they were to be felt as *sacrificial* repasts and as endowed with a character of holiness. How the law arose that the praise-offering was to be consumed on the day of sacrifice itself, while the vow- and voluntary offerings were permitted on the following day also; why the contravention of this injunction was threatened with the awful penalty of excision; how the extreme sacredness of the flesh was guarded (vers. 19—21); how we may discover traces of an earlier character of the *shelamim* as offerings for the confirmation of treaties, oaths, and vows, and as offerings of supplication; these questions and others connected with thank-offerings have been discussed in another place (pp. 29, 144, 165).

22. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 23. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, You shall not eat any fat of ox, or of sheep, or of goat. 24. And the fat of *the beast* that dies of itself, and the fat of that which is torn *by beasts*, may be employed for any *other* use: but you shall certainly not eat it: 25. For whoever eats the fat of the beast, of which *men* present an offering made by fire to the Lord, the person that eats *it* shall be cut off from his people. 26. And you shall eat no blood in all your habitations, *whether it be* of fowl or

S. PROHIBITION AGAINST EATING THE FAT AND BLOOD OF ANIMALS, VII. 22—27.

22—27. The aversion rooted in the Hebrew mind against partaking of what was supposed to be the seat or the emblem of animal life, was too strong and too universal, not to be embodied in a series of laws relating to animal sacrifices. Therefore, just as the interdiction against eating the blood and fat was appended to the code which begins the Book (III. 17), so it was inserted in the second code, but with greater fulness of detail. As the unlawfulness of eating fat was probably of later date and less familiar to the people, it was treated of first, and with unmistakable clearness: the fat of the sacrificial quadrupeds, the ox, the sheep, and the goat, was to be avoided, even if these animals were not killed as sacrifices, and of course if they died of themselves or were torn by beasts, since then they were entirely unclean; in the latter case, however, the fat was permitted for other purposes, "it may be employed for any *other* use"; but in what manner that of clean sacrificial animals, whether slaughtered for the altar or not, was to be disposed of, is not specified in the Pentateuch. However, it must be observed that the laws with regard to fat seem to have arisen from the sacrificial system; therefore, the fat of other clean quadru-

peds which were not offered, such as stags and roes, or of clean birds, was lawful; the fat on the bowels, the kidneys, and the flanks only was forbidden, not that imbedded in the flesh and remaining invisible unless the latter is cut; and the prohibition was probably at first limited to the places where offerings were presented, and but gradually extended universally (III. 17; see p. 93, 94). More comprehensive still is the precept concerning blood; it relates to all quadrupeds, whether sacrificial animals or not, and to all birds, and it is applicable to all times and countries: but the blood of fishes, and according to the Talmud, of the clean locusts, is not interdicted, probably because they were never presented as offerings; and thus we see here the partial operation of the same rule which pervades the regulations on fat. Hence Jewish tradition, though acknowledging the unlawfulness of all blood (ver. 26), restricted the dread punishment of excision to "the blood of life", that is, to the blood the loss of which causes the cessation of life; while it attributed a more lenient penalty to eating the blood found in the limbs, the liver, or the spleen; as indeed atonement also was wrought

of beast. 27. Any person that eats any blood, that person shall be cut off from his people.

28. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 29. Speak to the children of Israel, saying, He that offers the sacrifice of his thank-offering to the Lord shall bring his oblation to the Lord of the sacrifice of his thank-offerings. 30. His *own* hands shall bring the offerings of the Lord made by fire, the fat with the breast shall he bring, the breast to be waved *for* a wave-offering before the Lord. 31. And the priest shall burn the fat upon the altar; but the breast shall belong to Aaron and his sons. 32. And the right shoulder shall you give to the priest as a gift from the sacrifice of your thank-offerings. 33. He among the sons of Aaron, that offers the blood of the thank-offerings, and the fat, shall have the right shoulder for *his* portion. 34. For the wave-breast and the gift-shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel from the sacrifices of their thank-offerings, and have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons, for an eternal statute, from the children of Israel.

by "the blood of life" only, and not by any other (see p. 88). Why the prohibition of blood and fat is en-

forced with such vehement severity, and how it arose and took root, has been explained before (pp. 87—92).

9. THE PORTIONS OF THANK-OFFERINGS TO BE LEFT TO THE PRIESTS, VII. 28—34.

28—34. As with regard to the holocausts and the bloodless offerings (vers. 8—10), so with regard to the thank-offerings, it appeared important to the reviser to add injunctions on the share which the priests were entitled to claim. The offerer was to bring the gift which belonged to God and to His servants, with his own hands, spontaneously and cheerfully. On the altar were burnt the fat and the fat parts; the officiating priest was rewarded with the right shoulder; and the common order of the priests received the breast. The shoulder was

a portion or a present for the acting Aaronite, and was, therefore, "taken from" the whole victim; but the breast was to be devoted to God by the peculiar rite of "waving", which marked the offering as consecrated to the Lord of heaven and earth (see pp. 137—139). The *right* shoulder was intended as a peculiar distinction; for the right side was, among ancient nations, generally regarded as pre-eminently honourable or auspicious; right hand and happiness became identical terms — notions which were partially shared by the Hebrews from early times.

35. This *is* the portion of Aaron, and the portion of his sons, from the offerings of the Lord made by fire, in the day *when* they were presented to minister as priests to the Lord; 36. Which the Lord commanded to be given them of the children of Israel, in the day that He anointed them, *for* an eternal statute throughout their generations. 37. This *is* the law of the burnt-offering, of the bloodless offering, and of the sin-offering, and of the trespass-offering, and of the offering of consecration, and of the sacrifice of the thank-offering; 38. Which the Lord commanded Moses in mount Sinai, in the day that He commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations to the Lord in the wilderness of Sinai.

10. CONCLUSION OF THIS CODE, VII. 35—38.

35—38. Now the reviser considered that he had fully accomplished his object; he had supplemented the document, which he found treating of the ritual of the chief classes of sacrifice, by the insertion or addition of regulations regarding the share which the priests could demand in each case; and therefore, desirous that this sacrificial code so enlarged and qualified, should be looked upon as complete in itself, he appended a double formula of conclusion, one comprising the portions assigned to the priests (vers. 35, 36) which he was careful to describe as granted "by an eternal statute for all generations", and one reviewing all the various kinds of offering referred to in the code — the holocaust (VI. 1—6; VII. 8), the bloodless offerings (VI. 7—11; VII. 9, 10), the sin-offering (VI. 17—23), the

trespass-offering (VII. 1—7), the offering of consecration (VI. 12—16), and the thank-offering (VII. 11—21, 28—34), besides the prohibition of blood and fat applying to all classes alike (VII. 22—27); and he described all these ordinances as having been communicated to Moses "on Mount Sinai", whereas the compiler of the later code, who had formed a more complete theory of the progress of revelation, declared them to have been proclaimed "from the Tent of Meeting". This document, the first outlines and beginnings of which were an early effort of composing a sacrificial system, though its interpolations are of much later date, found its place *after* a subsequent and more developed code for reasons which have been indicated in the Introduction.



B. THE CONSECRATION OF THE SANCTUARY AND ITS UTENSILS, AND OF AARON AND HIS SONS AS PRIESTS.

CHAPTERS VIII TO X.

PRELIMINARY ESSAY.

ON THE HEBREW PRIESTHOOD.

I. SURVEY OF THE ORDINANCES OF THE PENTATEUCH WITH RESPECT TO THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

In order to arrive at a distinct view of the origin and progress, the nature and value of the order and system of priesthood among the Hebrews, it appears expedient to commence with a plain and accurate sketch of the ordinances of the Pentateuch regarding the priests and Levites; then to attempt an impartial estimate of these laws and arrangements; next to prove how they varied and fluctuated within the compass of the Pentateuch itself; and then to proceed to the testimonies of history tending either to support or to disprove their existence; after which we shall be enabled to draw, at least in general outlines, a picture of the gradual growth of priestly and Levitical institutions among the Israelites.

1. It is not difficult to deduce the nature and character of the Hebrew priesthood from the statements of the Pentateuch. The definitions are so distinct and the allusions so unmistakeable, that they scarcely leave room for conjecture or hazardous combination. It is true that the etymology of the Hebrew term for priest (*cohen*) is doubtful; but at the time of even the oldest part of the Pentateuch, the etymological meaning, even if it were still preserved in the consciousness of the nation, was less considered than the notion with which the word had gradually been invested. Now when the priests were consecrated to their office, they are said to have been *brought near God*.¹ It was their function *to come near God*,² or *to approach Him*.³ They are, therefore, those that are *near God*.⁴ They live and work in His presence, ready both to bring before Him the pious

¹ Lev. VII. 35; Num. XVI. 5; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 1.

² Lev. XXI. 17; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 15, 16.

³ Exod. XIX. 22; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 13.

⁴ Lev. X. 3; Ezek. XLIII. 13; XLIII. 19; Ezek. XL. 46; XLV. 4; comp. Jerem. XXX. 21.

or penitent devotions of Israel, and to convey to the latter from Him peace and atonement. They preserve the purity of the Divine abode which is constantly defiled by the transgressions of the community.¹ They receive, in particular, the flesh of the sin-offerings, in order "to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord."² They are appointed to fill up the vast chasm that separates the holiness of God from the sinfulness of His people. They "belong" to God,³ and to Him alone, for whose sake they must desert father and mother, and fight and suffer.⁴ They are His "servants" or ministers.⁵ They have been "chosen" by Him,⁶ not on account of their merit, but by a free act of His mercy.⁷ Therefore, whoever opposes them, is guilty of revolt against the majesty of God.⁸ No other or "stranger" is permitted, under penalty of death, to perform the priests' functions.⁹ Hence their chief characteristic must be *holiness*, since they were elected to be perpetually near the Holy One and to serve Him;¹⁰ they were singled out from the rest of their brethren "to be sanctified as most holy".¹¹ To hallow and to install as priests are used as correlative terms.¹² By neglecting what contributes to their sanctity they profane the holiness of God;¹³ and the High-priest is himself "the holy one of the Lord".¹⁴ Thus "to bring near God" means, in its deeper and more internal sense, to approach to His sanctity, and to remove, by securing pardon for the sins of the people, the distance by which they are separated from God, and to hallow them by expiation. — It is obvious that all these attributes of the priests coincide, in nearly every particular, with the characteristics by which the Pentateuch distinguishes the people of Israel. God bore the Hebrews on eagles' wings, and brought them to Himself.¹⁵ He has designed them as an instrument of blessing for all nations.¹⁶ He has chosen them to be His peculiar people,¹⁷ not on account of their power and greatness, but from the love He feels towards them,¹⁸ since He has declared Israel to be His firstborn son.¹⁹

¹ Lev. XVI. 16; Num. XIX. 13, 20.

² Lev. X. 17; comp. Exod. XXVIII. 38; Num. VIII. 19; XVIII. 1.

³ Num. XVI. 5. ⁴ Exod. XXXII. 27—29; Deut. XXXIII. 9.

⁵ Deut. XXI. 5; Ezek. XL. 46; XLIII. 19; 1 Chr. XXIII. 13.

⁶ Num. XVI. 5, 7; XVII. 5, 20; comp. Ps. LXV. 5; Exod. XXVIII. 1; Deut. XXI. 5; 1 Sam. II. 28; Hebr. V. 4.

⁷ Num. XVIII. 7, "I have given your priest's office to you as a service of gift"; comp. Hebr. V. 4.

⁸ Num. XVI. 1 *sqq.*; XVII. 5, 28.

⁹ Num. III. 10, 38; IV. 15, 19; XVIII. 7.

¹⁰ Num. XVI. 5.

¹¹ 1 Chr. XXIII. 13.

¹² Exod. XXIX. 33; comp. vers. 1, 44; XXVIII. 41; XL. 13.

¹³ Lev. XXI. 6—8. ¹⁴ Ps. CVI. 16.

¹⁵ Exod. XIX. 4.

¹⁶ Gen. XII. 3; XXVIII. 14.

¹⁷ Exod. XIX. 5; Deut. VII. 6; XIV. 2; XXVI. 18; Ps. XXVIII. 9; CXXXV. 4.

¹⁸ Deut. VII. 7, 8; comp. VIII. 17, 18.

¹⁹ Exod. IV. 22.

Holiness is to be their aim and constant yearning;²⁰ they shall be holy, because God is holy.²¹ They were, in fact, intended to be a "kingdom of priests."²² Every Israelite was, therefore, meant to be able to "come near God", or to act as priest for himself. Yet this great scheme of converting into a holy nation a people just redeemed from degrading bondage, was, according to the Pentateuch, too arduous to be at once accomplished. The Hebrews themselves felt their own unfitness for the mission. When they heard the Ten Commandments proclaimed from Sinai with thunder and lightning, they fled in consternation from the mountain, and implored Moses, "Speak thou with us, and we will readily hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die;" and then "they stood afar off," while Moses "drew near to God."²³ They renounced, not only spontaneously but eagerly, the full exercise of their sacerdotal rights, and God approved of their diffidence.²⁴ Hence arose the necessity of electing and appointing certain persons authorised and endowed to approach God as the mediators between Him and His people; but though the latter were still far removed from holiness, they were irrevocably chosen and unchangeably loved by God.²⁵

Now, from this character assigned to the priests by the Pentateuch, all the arrangements and laws prescribed with regard to them in that Book, may be easily deduced.

2. The idea of *election* is, in the simplest manner embodied and conveyed by establishing an *hereditary* right, which, irrespective of personal merit, secures the succession to the son simply on account of his birth. Therefore, Aaron and his descendants were appointed priests for all future time. Though belonging to a tribe which, on several occasions, had proved devoted zeal in the cause of God's worship,²⁶ Aaron himself had been guilty of culpable weakness in abetting the folly of the people anxious to make the golden calf;²⁷ and his two oldest sons, Nadab and Abihu, deserved sudden death by their wanton disregard of the laws of the Sanctuary.²⁸ He owed, therefore, his installation evidently to an election by the mercy of God. The priesthood was to remain strictly and exclusively not only in his family, but in his own branch of it; thus not only all the posterity of Gershon and Merari

²⁰ Num. XVI. 3; Deut. VII. 6; XIV. 2; XXVI. 19; Exod. XIX. 6.

²¹ Lev. XIX. 2; XX. 26; comp. XI. 15; Exod. XXII. 30; Deut. XIV. 21; 1 Peter I. 15, 16.

²² Exod. XIX. 6; comp. Num. XVI. 3.

²³ Ex. XX. 16, 18 (19, 21); comp. XIX. 21—24; Deut. V. 21—24.

²⁴ Deut. V. 25; comp., however, 1 Petr. II. 5, 9.

²⁵ See, however, *infra* Sect. II. 2.

²⁶ Comp. Exod. XXXII. 26—29; Deut. XXXIII. 9; see Comm. on Gen. p. 510.

²⁷ Exod. XXXII. 2—4, 21—25, and Comm. in loc. ²⁸ Lev. X. 1, 2; Num. III. 1—4; see notes on X. 1—7.

were excluded, not only all Kohathites who were not born from the line of Amram (as the offspring of Izhar and Uzziel), but also those members of the latter who were not Aaron's lineal issue; so that Moses and his family were rigidly banished from the priesthood, in reference to which they were classed among those "strangers" certain to forfeit their lives by arrogating to themselves priestly functions.¹ In fact, the priests are simply designated "the sons of Aaron."²

The matrimonial alliances were, therefore, too important a point to be left without legal directions. It was ordained that a priest must marry a Hebrew virgin or a widow of unblemished character; but no unchaste or defamed, nor a divorced woman, "for he is holy to his God;" while in one case (that of the High-priest), the choice was restricted to virgins, for "he must not profane his seed among his people."³ If the daughter of a priest married an Israelite, she lost the privileges of her birth, but regained them when she returned into her father's house as a childless widow or divorced wife.⁴ Hence the pedigree of Aaron's family was most carefully guarded and searched.⁵ The purity of sacerdotal families was so scrupulously watched that a priest's daughter guilty of immoral conduct while still in her father's house was to be burnt to death.⁶ Though a priest might marry from any tribe of Israel, yet, in later times, alliances with daughters of priests seem to have been preferred.⁷ — The question why Aaron and not Moses was honoured with the priesthood is not adverted to in the Pentateuch. Moses was scarcely rejected because he had defiled the nobility of his race by marrying Zipporah, the Midianite, but evidently because he was the younger brother.⁸ Indeed Aaron, the firstborn, and as such of higher authority, and prominent in the earlier stages of the struggle against Pharaoh, is simply denominated "the Levite", as if he were the representative of his tribe.⁹

3. The ceremonies prescribed to be performed at the first *consecration* of the priests consisted of "bringing them near" the Tent of Meeting, the abode of God, washing them, clothing them with their holy garments, and anointing them with the sacred oil, the emblem of the

¹ See *supra* p. 344; comp. Exod. VI. 16—25; Num. III. 15—20; XXVI. 57—61; 1 Chron. XXIII. 6—23.

² Lev. I. 5, 6, 8, 11; II. 2; III. 5, 8, 13, etc.

³ Lev. XXI. 7, 8, 13—15; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 22 (who limits the choice of all priests to Hebrew virgins, though per-

mitting widows of priests); see also Ezra X. 18, 19; Neh. XIII. 28—30.

⁴ Lev. XXII. 12, 13.

⁵ Ezra II. 62; Neh. VII. 64; comp. X. 39; XII. 47.

⁶ Lev. XXI. 9.

⁷ Luke I. 5.

⁸ Comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 14.

⁹ Exod. IV. 14; and Comm. *in loc.*

Divine spirit;¹⁰ and these rites, pointing to the nature of their office and its responsibilities, were accompanied by a sin-offering, a holocaust, and a thank-offering the blood of which was partially employed in sprinkling the hands, the ears, and the feet of the priests, an act of a plainly symbolical import.¹¹

4. During their ministrations, the priests were clad in garments which, by their number — for *four* typifies completeness and absolute perfection¹² —, their materials, their shape, their workmanship, and the symbolical figures woven into them, were designed to recall the character and holiness of their office as one of Divinely-instituted mediatorship between God and the Israelites; they had indeed to wear these vestments “for glory and distinction;”¹³ but they approached God and His service unshod, in all humility and in trembling veneration.¹⁴

5. As the priests were appointed to approach God in the name of the Israelites, their *duties at the Sanctuary* may be easily defined. These were comprehensively stated to embrace the whole service in connection with the sacred utensils, from the altar in the Court and in the Holy, to the functions within the vail which separated the Holy from the Holy of Holies.¹⁵ The priests had, therefore, to perform the more significant operations incidental to offerings, namely, in animal sacrifices, all the rites which succeeded the killing of the victim, especially sprinkling the blood and burning the flesh, and heaving and waving the dedicated portions; and in cereal oblations, taking off and burning “the memorial,”¹⁶ and perhaps partly the preparation of the offering itself.¹⁷ They had, in the Court, to preserve the perpetual fire on the brazen altar,¹⁸ there to offer the two regular daily holocausts,¹⁹ and to take away the ashes, as they accumulated.²⁰ They had, in the Holy, to burn on the golden altar the frank-incense twice daily;²¹ to dress, fill, and light the lamps of the golden candlestick;²² and to remove, every sabbath, from the

¹⁰ Exod. XL. 12—15; Levit. VIII. 6—13. ¹¹ See Comm. on ch. VIII. 6—13.

¹² See p. 54. ¹³ Ex. XXVIII. 40.

¹⁴ See Comm. on Exod. pp. 398—402; comp. *ibid.* p. 34. — It is a matter of course that those Aaronites only were so dressed who were fully qualified for the priestly office; whereas the rest had common clothes even in the precincts of the Sanctuary; and according to Jewish tradition, the qualified priests wore these garments constantly while in the Sanctuary, and even when not performing priestly functions, but were not permitted to

sleep in them. The garments were later preserved in the Temple, under the supervision of a special officer.

¹⁵ Comp. Num. XVIII. 1, 3, 7; see also Ezek. XLIV. 11, 14—16.

¹⁶ See p. 130.

¹⁷ See notes on VII. 8—10.

¹⁸ See notes on VI. 1—11.

¹⁹ See p. 158.

²⁰ See p. 330.

²¹ Exod. XXX. 7, 8; Num. XVII. 5; Deut. XXXIII. 10; 1 Chr. XXIII. 13; see Comm. on Exod. p. 371.

²² Exod. XXVII. 20, 21; XXX. 7, 8; XXIV. 2—4; Num. VIII. 2, 3; see Comm. on Exod. pp. 369, 370.

shew-bread table the twelve cakes, and to substitute for them fresh ones.¹ During the encampments of the Israelites, the place of the priests was eastward of the Tabernacle, which it was their duty to guard;² and on resuming the journeys, they had carefully to wrap up the sacred implements, and to hand them over to the Levites for transport.³ After the completion of the Temple, they had to watch, both day and night, over the safety of the edifice; those so engaged were called "the keepers of the threshold",⁴ and were controlled by an overseer;⁵ and in later periods, the regular duties at the Sanctuary were individually assigned to the priests by lot,⁶ under the supervision of a "chief of the lots."

6. The Books of Chronicles⁷ attribute to David a division of Aaron's descendants into 24 classes, — the progeny of Eleazar into 16, that of Ithamar into 8 — each of which was presided over by a chief,⁸ and performed, by lot, the service during one week, from sabbath to sabbath.⁹ But this division to which the older Books of the Hebrew canon contain no allusion whatever, was undoubtedly not introduced before the exile, but was by the Chronist, in accordance with his usual method, ascribed to David and invested, besides, with the sanction of Solomon,¹⁰ in order to give prestige to the new arrangement, which was so preserved up to the time of Josephus.¹¹ Each class was, according to Jewish tradition, divided into sections, 5 to 9 in number, which officiated successively, either singly or in groups, during the first six days of the week, one on each day, while the whole class acted on the sabbath. For the service on the festivals, the aid of additional priests was called in.

7. However, not in the Sanctuary only, but wherever the life of individuals or of the nation was to be hallowed or associated with religious observances, it was the office of the priests, the mediators and instruments of sanctification, to administer, or at least to assist in, the rituals. So they were concerned in the ceremonies prescribed at the release of the Nazarite;¹² at the ordeal imposed upon women suspected of infidelity;¹³ at the expiation of a murder the perpetrator of which was unknown;¹⁴ and at the examination of unclean, especially of leprous

¹ Lev. XXIV. 5—9; see Comm. on Exod. p. 369.

² Num. III. 38.

³ Num. IV. 4—15.

⁴ 2 Ki. XII. 10; XXV. 18; Jer. LII. 24.

⁵ Jer. XX. 1; 2 Chr. XXXI. 13.

⁶ Luke I. 9.

⁷ 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 4, 19; comp. 2 Chr. VIII. 14; XXXV. 4.

⁸ Ezr. X. 5; Neh. XII. 7; 1 Chr.

XXIV. 5; 2 Chr. XXXVI. 14; Matth. II. 4; XVI. 21; Luke XXII. 52; Acts IV. 1; V. 24.

⁹ Comp. 2 Ki. XI. 9; 2 Chr. XXIII. 4, 8.

¹⁰ 2 Chr. VIII. 14.

¹¹ Comp. pp. 24—26.

¹² Num. VI. 13—21.

¹³ See pp. 158—190.

¹⁴ Deut. XXI. 5.

persons, houses, or garments, and their purification. Thus they exercised a kind of sanitary supervision over the people and were hence supposed to possess a certain degree of medical knowledge.¹⁵ They were obliged by their connection with the festivals to regulate the calendar, and by their relation to the sacrifices to watch over the legal accuracy of the weights and measures.¹⁶ They had to make valuations of property which had been vowed or devoted to the Sanctuary, but which the owner desired to redeem.¹⁷ They had, at certain times, to blow the silver trumpets, the sound of which was intended either to summon the whole people or its chiefs for public deliberations, or, on festive days, to enhance the solemnity of the public sacrifices and thereby to rouse the community to a feeling of religious devotion, when this would be "for a memorial before God",¹⁸ or to give the sign for resuming the marches in journeys¹⁹ and campaigns, or lastly for commencing a battle, when the combatants would "be remembered before the Lord their God and be saved from their enemies",¹⁹ for priests accompanied military expeditions,²⁰ sometimes with the Ark of the Covenant, for the protection of the army;²¹ before the commencement of the battle they had probably to offer a sacrifice; and they were charged to encourage the soldiers by the following address; "Hear, o Israel, you approach this day to battle against your enemies; let not your hearts faint, fear not, and do not tremble, nor be terrified on account of them; for it is the Lord your God who goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies to save you."²²

8. By virtue of the spirit of God which rested on them through their election and anointment, it was their special mission to search in the Divine Law, to teach, to expound, and to diffuse it; to enforce its supreme authority; and to preserve it in its purity among the nation for ever. They had to "instruct the children of Israel in all the statutes which the Lord had spoken to them through Moses".²³ They were

¹⁵ Lev. XIII. 2 *sqq.*; XIV. 2; comp. Deut. XXIV. 8; Matth. VIII. 4; Luke XVII. 14.

¹⁶ Comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 29; also Lev. XIX. 35, 36; Am. VIII. 5; Mic. VI. 10, 11.

¹⁷ Lev. XXVII. 5, 12, 14, 18, 23; see Comm. in loc.

¹⁸ Num. X. 10.

¹⁹ Num. X. 2—10; comp. Ezra III. 10; Neh. XII. 35, 41; 1 Chr. XV. 24; XVI. 6; 2 Chr. V. 12; VII. 6; XIII. 12, 14; XXIX. 26; also Josh. VI. 4 *sqq.*; Joel II. 1, 15.

²⁰ Num. XXXI. 6; 2 Chr. XIII. 12, 14; 1 Macc. XVI. 8. According to Jewish tradition, a field-priest specially appointed, and anointed with the same oil as the High-priest followed the army though that officer has sometimes been considered merely as "a legislative idea never actually carried out", or as "existing in theory only and not in history".

²¹ 1 Sam. IV. 1, 5, 11, 17, etc.

²² Deut. XX. 2—4; comp. 2 Chr. XX. 20, 21.

²³ Lev. X. 11.

commanded to read the whole Law, after every seven years, on the Feast of Tabernacles, before all the people then assembled at the central Sanctuary, men, women, children, and strangers, "that they may listen, and learn, and fear the Lord, and observe to do all the words of the Law".¹ They were to provide every Hebrew king with a faithful copy of the Law, which he was enjoined to keep and read "all the days of his life".² In a word, "they shall teach God's judgment to Jacob, and His Law to Israel."³

9. From the same reason of peculiar holiness, the priests were charged to bless the people in the name of God;⁴ and God promised to make that blessing effectual.⁵ They were empowered, previous to great national enterprises, especially military expeditions, to consult for an oracle the Ark of the Covenant,⁶ or the Urim and Thummim.⁷ And as judicial decisions were looked upon as the result of Divine suggestions, since "bringing a matter before the judges" was, in the usage of the language, equivalent to "bringing it before God";⁸ the priests were the chief arbiters and authorities in all cases of jurisdiction; "by their word shall every controversy and every violence be tried;"⁹ if the local magistrates were unable to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion, whether in matters of blood, property, or violent onslaught, the cause was to be referred to the priests and the judges then sitting at the place of the common Sanctuary; their decision was final and irrevocable; disobedience to their decree was visited with death, as a well-deserved punishment on the refractory, and a terrifying example to the evil-disposed;¹⁰ since it was impiety towards God Himself. Thus they naturally acquired important influence, if not a legally defined share, in the public administration;¹¹ and justly could Josephus observe that the Law "permits the priests in general to be the administrators of the principal affairs and ordains them to be the inspectors of all, the

¹ Deut. XXXI. 9—13; comp. vers. 25, 26. In later times, the *king* read the Law in the Temple.

² Deut. XVII. 18, 19.

³ Deut. XXXIII. 10; comp. 2 Ki. XVII. 27, 28; Jer. XVIII. 18; Ezek. VII. 26; XLIV. 23, 24; Mal. II. 7; Neh. VIII. 9—11; 2 Chr. XVII. 8, 9; XXXV. 3. The older priests had, of course, to instruct the younger members of their order in their duties.

⁴ Perhaps especially after the conclusion of the daily sacrifices.

⁵ Lev. IX. 22, 23; Num. VI. 22—26;

Deut. X. 8; XXI. 5; XXVII. 14; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 13; 2 Chr. XXX. 27.

⁶ Judg. XX. 27, 28.

⁷ Num. XXVII. 21; comp. 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6; Ezra II. 63; Neh. VII. 65; see Comm. on Exod. p. 411.

⁸ Exod. XXI. 6; XXII. 8; Comm. on Exod. p. 294.

⁹ Deut. XXI. 5.

¹⁰ Deut. XVII. 8—13; comp. XIX. 17; Num. XXVII. 2, 19; Josh. XVII. 4; XXII. 30sqq.; Ezek. XLIV. 24; 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 8—11.

¹¹ Num. XXXI. 12, 13, 21, 26; XXXII. 2; comp. 1 Ki. I. 7, 8, 39.

judges in doubtful cases, and the punishers of those who were condemned to suffer punishment."

10. Nor is it difficult to account for the *qualifications* required of the priests. Those destined to come near the perfect God, and to "present His food" or "the offerings made by fire", must necessarily be *perfect* in form and appearance; for as the gifts were to be perfect,¹² so those who laid them before God for His gracious acceptance. The recipients of Divine holiness were demanded to possess that symmetry of physical organisation which, if not deemed an indispensable condition of spiritual and moral excellence, was certainly considered a most desirable accompaniment of it. The priests were, therefore, prescribed to be without blemish, not only free from those defects which would incapacitate them for their manual duties, as blindness, lameness, or fracture of the hand, but from those also which cause disfigurement or imply a deviation from the normal structure of the human frame, such as a flat nose, a crooked back, a dwarfish size;¹³ whoever was affected with any similar infirmity and yet officiated in the Sanctuary, "profaned" it, and was responsible for his desecration to God who watches over the holiness of His service.¹⁴

For similar considerations, we must suppose that the period of life during which the priests were qualified for their functions, comprised the best years of their vigour, and that, though no age is stated in the Old Testament, they were probably neither admitted "too young nor too old", scarcely before their twentieth year,¹⁵ though Jewish tradition considered adolescence sufficient.¹⁶ In later periods, we find frequently young priests, and occasionally very young High-priests; Aristobulus was only 17 years old when appointed by Herod the Great.

External *purity* was, next to integrity of life and perfection of form, considered the most characteristic attribute and emblem of godliness. Therefore, the priest was commanded to avoid everything calculated to render him unclean; he was not permitted to approach dead bodies, except those of his nearest blood-relations, of his father and mother, his son and daughter, his brother and unmarried virgin sister; he was

¹² See p. 69.

¹³ In later times, the priests, before being admitted to their office, were closely examined, and Jewish tradition worked out the Biblical precepts with regard to the disqualifying faults with its usual trifling minuteness. If during their period of priesthood, they were afflicted by a bodily defect or by

leprosy, they became unfit for further service.

¹⁴ Lev. XXI. 17—23, and Comm. *in loc.*; comp. XXII. 1—7.

¹⁵ Comp. 2 Chr. XXXI. 17.

¹⁶ Samuel "ministered to the Lord" almost in his childhood (1 Sam. II. 11, 18; III. 1, 3).

not even to "defile himself" by the corpses of those who were connected with him by marriage only, and not by consanguinity, as his wife, his mother-in-law, or daughter-in-law.¹ The priest who performed functions at the altar while in a state of Levitical impurity, was threatened with excision.² Therefore, during his period of active duty, he had to abstain from sexual intercourse, because this rendered him unclean till the evening,³ a law observed among most ancient nations.⁴ Even want of scrupulous cleanliness was visited with death; hence the priests were rigidly enjoined, whenever they entered the holy edifice, to wash their hands and feet with the water of the laver placed in the Court for that special purpose.⁵ This requirement of permanent purity was, probably, one of the reasons why women, though for a long time and numerous employed at places of worship for various duties,⁶ were excluded from the priesthood; yet this exclusion of women may have been prompted by other motives besides, such as the excesses to which their admission gave rise in many heathen worships, and the superiority attributed to the male sex;⁷ and when the principle of the substitution of the Levites for the firstborn sons of the Hebrews was currently adopted, the service of women was naturally out of the question.

11. But priests had, above all, to lead a life of holiness and piety. They were called upon to glorify the name of God not by their teaching only, but by their conduct. As they enjoyed the highest privileges, so they were judged with the greatest severity. It was a proverbial adage, "Through those that are near Me I will be sanctified."⁸ From their families even the most unexceptional morality was expected; a priest's daughter who abandoned herself to a reproachful life, profaned her father, and she was to be burnt to death.⁹ Before or during their ministrations, they were forbidden to drink wine or any strong beverage that might disturb their absorbed attention or self-possession; a contravention of this precept was visited with death.¹⁰ As their lives were to be devoted to the service of peace and atonement, and to the unwearied study of the Divine Law, they were commanded to shun everything tending to destroy the calm serenity of their minds or indicating an undue attachment to temporal boons or interests, since they were to find their happiness mainly in their spiritual mission. Hence they were not

¹ Lev. XXI. 1—4; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 25 (see also XXIV. 16—18).

² Lev. XXII. 3; comp. *Joseph. Bell. Jud. V. v. 6.*

³ Lev. XV. 18.

⁴ Comp. Exod. XIX. 15; 1 Sam. XXI. 5; see Comm. on Exod. p. 250.

⁵ Exod. XXX. 18—21; XL. 31, 32.

⁶ Exod. XXXVIII. 8; 1 Sam. II. 22; comp. Ps. LXVIII. 26; Exod. XV. 20; Judg. XXI. 21.

⁷ See *supra* pp. 70, 71.

⁸ Lev. X. 3; see Comm. in loc.

⁹ Lev. XXI. 9.

¹⁰ Lev. X. 9; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 21.

to yield to any vehement demonstrations of grief or mourning in cases of bereavement. They were specially forbidden to make baldness upon their heads, shave off the corner of their beards, or make any incision in their flesh;¹¹ for though the same injunction applied to the whole nation,¹² its transgression was in the ministers of God particularly blameable.

Moreover, in order to relieve them from worldly troubles and anxieties, the Law amply provided for them by imposts levied from the Israelites, and by the shares assigned to them in the various kinds of offering; and they were to receive for their abodes thirteen towns conveniently situated in the vicinity of the central Sanctuary, within the territory of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin.¹³ They were exempted not only from military service but from all taxes and civil burdens. Thus freed from all mundane occupation and depressing care, they were to devote their whole existence, undisturbed, to truth and its diffusion, to holiness and pious mediation.¹⁴

12. Now, if the peculiar character and office of the priests be considered, it will be found, as a natural consequence, that they required, on the one hand, a chief who, by his person and dignity, concentrated the whole power and holiness of their order, and who could, therefore, occasionally represent the whole people of Israel as their intercessor; and that, on the other hand, they could not properly be charged with the menial duties unavoidably connected with the service of the altar and the Sanctuary. The Law of the Pentateuch gave them a visible head in the *High-priest*, and subordinate assistants in the *Levites*.

13. The HIGH-PRIEST was naturally distinguished by peculiar holiness. His duties were more solemn, his responsibilities more grave. He was, in fact, the embodiment of the theocracy itself. As, therefore, he required the spirit of God in an eminent degree, he was consecrated with a more complete and copious anointment than the common priests. He is described as having "the crown of the anointing oil of his God upon him."¹⁵ Every new High-priest was anointed in the same manner as Aaron, the first, whereas the ordinary priests were in later times not anointed.¹⁶ He was hence simply called "the anointed priest."¹⁷ He was

¹¹ Lev. XXI. 5, 6; and Comm. *in loc.*; comp. Ezek. XLVI. 20.

¹² Lev. XIX. 27, 28.

¹³ Josh. XXI. 4.

¹⁴ See *infra* Sect. III. 6—15; comp. also 1 Cor. IX. 1—14; XXXI. 4; Rom. XV. 27.

¹⁵ Lev. XXI. 12; comp. ver. 10.

¹⁶ Exod. XXVIII. 41; XXIX. 7, XXX. 30; XL. 15; Lev. VI. 13; VIII. 12, XVI. 32; Num. XXXV. 25; see notes on VIII. 6—13.

¹⁷ Lev. IV. 3, 5, 16; VI. 15, XVI. 32; compare notes on IV. 3—12.

“the great priest”,¹ or later “the head-priest”,² or “the priest” *par excellence*;³ and as in him the sum of the sanctity of the priesthood was concentrated, he was even designated “the Holy of the Lord.”⁴ His dignity is therefore hardly exaggerated in these words of Philo, “The Law designs that the High-priest should partake of a nature superior to that of man; he approaches more nearly to that of the Deity; for he stands properly on the borders between the two, in order that men may propitiate God by some mediator, and that God may have some subordinate minister by whom He may offer and give His mercies and boons to mankind.”

From this character of the High-priest several points follow as matters of course. One High-priest only was possible at a time; because the whole people in its unity could fitly be represented by one spiritual chief only. The sin of the High-priest caused or implied the sin of the nation, for which he acted as delegate and mediator;⁵ and his expiation wrought at the same time the expiation of the community.⁶ The *election* was particularly marked, and confined to Aaron and his descendants through Eleazar, the eldest of his surviving sons. The *hereditary succession* was strictly reserved to his branch of the family and extended to no other.⁷ The High-priest was not even permitted, like the common priest, to marry a widow, but none except a Hebrew virgin; and though the ordinance is not quite distinct, it is not improbable that he was enjoined to observe monogamy,⁸ as was the case with the Egyptian High-priests. He held his office for life; for it was impossible that the sanctity once bestowed upon him by God should ever decrease, much less depart from him. Thus the matter was also understood by Jewish tradition, according to which “he remained in his holiness” even after he had resigned his functions; and if he sinned subsequently, he had even then to present a bullock for a sin-offering, whereas a king who had been dethroned or had abdicated, had merely to bring the sin-offering of a private Israelite. His death marked an epoch in

¹ Lev. XXI. 10; Num. XXXV. 25, 28; Josh. XX. 6; 2 Ki. XII. 11; XXII. 4, 8; XXIII. 4; Hagg. I. 1, 12; Zech. III. 1, 8; Neh. III. 1; XIII. 28; etc.

² 2 Ki. XXV. 18; Ezra VII. 5; 2 Chr. XIX. 11; XXIV. 6, 11; XXVI. 20, in contradistinction to the priests of second rank or the common and ordinary priests.

³ Ex. XXIX. 30; Lev. XXI. 21; comp. IV. 5 and 6, 16 and 17; Num. III. 6; IV. 33; XXXV. 32, comp. ver. 28;

Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1; 1 Sam. I. 9; II. 11; 2 Ki. XII. 8, 10; Nehem. VII. 65; see 2 Sam. VIII. 17; 2 Esdr. IX. 39, 42. ⁴ Ps. CVI. 16.

⁵ Lev. IV. 3; see note on IV. 3—12; comp. also X. 6.

⁶ Lev. IX. 7 and notes on IX. 5—14.

⁷ Num. III. 32; XX. 28; Deut. X. 6; Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1; comp. Judg. XX. 28; see, however, *infra*.

⁸ Lev. XXI. 13—15; comp. 1 Tim. III. 2.

the civil and political life of the nation," when the involuntary homicide who had escaped into a city of refuge was permitted to return to his home; since for a theocratic community, there could be no more important event than a change of its spiritual chief. Therefore, Philo describes him aptly thus: "The High-priest is the relation and nearest of kin to the whole nation; he offers up supplications and sacrifices daily on behalf of the whole nation, and prays for the people as for his own brethren, and parents, and children, that every age and every portion of the nation, as if it were one body, may be united into one and the same community and union."

14. The relation between the people, the priests, and the High-priest, is, therefore, this. The Israelites are a community of priests: their character and their aim virtually coincide with the character and aim of the priests; but as they have renounced "to approach to God" (see *supra* p. 315) and thus helped or at least consented to confer their peculiar mission on one particular order, every one of them individually must be represented by a priest. But the whole people and the High-priest are, in their moral and religious life, organically connected, equivalent in religious importance and identical in their theocratic dignity. Both the High-priest and the common priest are mediators; but the intercession of the former is required to render the intercession of the other complete; for the Israelite is no isolated unit, he is an integral part of a chosen community, and his atonement as an individual is imperfect without his atonement as a citizen of the theocratic commonwealth. And as an Israelite and a priest are different only in their degrees of holiness, and not absolutely in the absence or presence of this attribute, so the priest and the High-priest are distinguished only by the degrees in which they are severally endowed with the spirit of God. People, priests, and High-priest were meant to be allied by a common bond of spiritual aspiration, like the members of one body, each performing its separate functions, but each sustained by, and sustaining, the rest.⁹ Yet the theocratic status of the three component divisions was distinctly marked. The people was limited to the Court; the priests were admitted to the Holy also, while the High-priest alone was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies, and to minister before the Ark of the Covenant and the mercy-seat adorned with the Cherubim which typified the Divine presence.¹⁰ So the priest approached nearer to God than the Israelite, and the High-priest nearer than either; by this gradation their sacerdotal character was pointedly conveyed.

⁹ Num. XXXV. 28, 32.

¹⁰ How far this object was attained by the institutions of the Pentateuch,

will be pointed out and proved below, sect. II.

¹¹ Lev. XVI. 13—15.

15. While, therefore, the High-priest shared both many rights and duties with the common priests, he was, in either respect, distinguished from them by various special enactments. Though he was, of course, permitted to perform the ordinary sacrifices, he was probably not meant to do so, except on the sabbaths, the days of the new-moon, and the great festivals; he certainly did not offer the regular daily holocausts; although this would seem peculiarly appropriate for him as the appointed chief of the theocracy. It was he especially who consulted the Urim and Thummim which he wore on his breast. He was the guardian of the Temple treasury and exercised the supervision over the entire public worship.¹ He sacrificed the sin-offerings for himself and the community of Israel.² But his most solemn function was on the Day of Atonement, when he, and none else, was allowed to enter the Holy of Holies, and to perform those imposing rites, by which the expiation of the people was to be wrought. At the division of the land of Canaan, he together with the chiefs of the tribes is said to have directed the arrangements.³ He no doubt occupied a prominent position, if he did not preside, in the high tribunals, mainly composed of priests.⁴ It needs, therefore, hardly be observed that the High-priests were held in supreme respect and reverence. They occasionally married princesses,⁵ and their daughters were demanded in marriage by the most influential in the land.⁶ The High-priest was forbidden to approach the dead body even of his father and his mother; he was required to remain in constant and the most perfect purity; for, observes the Law, "he shall not go out of the Sanctuary, nor profane the Sanctuary of his God; for the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him."⁷ Nor was he, in times of mourning, to go with dishevelled hair or rend his garments, in compliance with the ordinary custom; he should, on all occasions, preserve tranquillity of mind and comeliness of outward appearance; he was to rise above the disturbing influences of human joys and human sorrows.⁸ His vestments were, like those of the common priests, to be made "for glory and distinction";⁹ but they were marked both by pre-eminent splendour and symbolical significance. They tended to indicate the nature, the holiness, and the exalted importance of his office; so especially the ephod, on the two shoulders of which he was

¹ 2 Ki. XXII. 4; 2 Chr. XXXI. 10;
2 Macc. III. 9. ² Lev. IV. 4—21.

³ Num. XXXIV. 17; Josh. XIV. 1;
XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1.

⁴ Deut. XVII. 8—13; comp. Num.
XV. 33; XXVII. 2; see p. 350; comp.
also *infra* sect. V.

⁵ 2 Ki. XI. 2; 2 Chr. XXII. 11.

⁶ 1 Macc. XVI. 12; comp., however,
Sect. V. 6.

⁷ Lev. XXI. 11, 12.

⁸ Lev. XXI. 10; comp. X. 6; Ezek.
XLIV. 20.

⁹ Exod. XXVIII. 2.

to wear, engraven on two onyx-stones, the names of the children of Israel, "for a memorial" before the Lord;¹⁰ the breast-plate with its twelve precious stones, each of which was to bear the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel — "and Aaron shall bear the names of the children of Israel on the breast-plate of decision upon his heart, when he goes into the holy place, for a memorial before the Lord continually";¹¹ the Urim and Thummim, the oracle of God, which "shall be on Aaron's heart when he goes in before the Lord, and Aaron shall bear the decision of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually";¹² the golden bells on the hem of the robe, which "shall be upon Aaron to minister", and the sound of which, when heard on Aaron's appearance before the Lord, shall remind the Israelites of the awe and sanctity of the moment;¹³ and so also the golden plate on the mitre bearing the solemn words, *Holiness to the Lord*, and always preserved on Aaron's forehead "that he may bear the iniquity of the Israelites' sacred gifts," and render them acceptable before the Lord.¹⁴ The High-priest's vestments, therefore, ingeniously and strikingly conveyed that he was the sole mediator between God and the entire nation, that he was designed constantly to remind the holy people of its mission and its obligations; and that he assisted them, in these noble aims, by effecting their expiation and securing their forgiveness by God.¹⁵ But on the Day of Atonement, when he entered the Holy of Holies, he was commanded to wear garments of plain white linen; he could not appropriately, when craving remission of his own sins and acting as the intercessor of a sinful and penitent people, appear before God arrayed in splendid attire made "for glory and distinction": feelings of humility and contrition behoved him when approaching the presence of the omnipotent Judge; and they were best typified by a simple vesture of spotless white.

16. The LEVITES, in relation to the priesthood, comprised all the descendants of Levi, except those of Aaron¹⁶ — the progeny of Gershon and Merari, of Izhar and Uzziel, and of Moses. They had no immediate connection with the internal and important part of the public service. Their task was not spiritual, but menial and mechanical. They were the ministers and attendants of the priests, for whom they executed all physical and subordinate work. For they were not properly *elected* by God, like the priests, but merely *separated* from among the

¹⁰ Exod. XXVIII. 12.

¹¹ Exod. XXVIII. 21, 29.

¹² Exod. XXVIII. 30.

¹³ Exod. XXVIII. 35.

¹⁴ Exod. XXVIII. 37, 38.

¹⁵ See in general Comm. on Exod. pp. 398—417.

¹⁶ Num. III. 9.

Israelites, or set apart for certain services,¹ because they had, on some prominent occasions, evinced an ardent zeal for God's cause, even conquering and suppressing their natural instincts and human sympathies.² They were, in fact, mere substitutes for as many Israelites, according to a peculiar theory of the Pentateuch. For its doctrine is this. All the firstborn males, both of men and beasts, belong to God;³ for when the firstborn were smitten by Him in Egypt, He saved those of the Hebrews;⁴ but instead of every firstborn male Israelite, He ordered a Levite to be substituted and dedicated for His service; and the firstborn Hebrews that were at that time in excess of the Levites, and those born in future generations, were to be redeemed by five shekels each, to be given to the priests;⁵ while the firstborn male animals, whether of the clean or unclean species, were the objects of special enactments.⁶ Therefore, the Levites were indeed also "brought near",⁷ yet not only to God,⁸ but to the priests as well whom they *served*,⁹ to whom they were *joined*¹⁰ or *given*¹¹ as a *present*.¹² They were forbidden to approach the holy implements, especially the altar; if they did so, they were menaced with the punishment of death, together with the priests who permitted the desecration.¹³ They were, like the common Hebrews, restricted to the Court, which, however, uncircumcised non-Israelites were forbidden to enter.¹⁴ It was their office "to keep the charge of the Sanctuary", that is, "to do the service of the Tent of Meeting".¹⁵ Therefore, when during the journeys of the Israelites, the camp was about to be removed, the *priests* carefully enveloped all the holy utensils,¹⁶ and then only the Kohathites were permitted to approach, and to receive, for transportation, the vessels assigned to them individually; for they were sure to die, nay their whole race was certain to be extirpated, if they ventured to go into the Sanctuary "but a moment" to see it.¹⁷ But just as the Levites were "strangers" in relation to the priests, so were the other Israelites strangers in relation to the Levites; any common

¹ Num. VIII. 14.

² Deut. XXXIII. 8, 9; Exod. XXXII. 27—29.

³ Exod. XIII. 2, 12; XXXIV. 19, 20.

⁴ Num. III. 12, 13; VIII. 16, 17; Exod. XIII. 14, 15.

⁵ Num. III. 40—51.

⁶ Exod. XIII. 13; XXXIV. 20. Num. XVIII. 15, 17; Deut. XV. 19—22; see *infra* Sect. III. 9—11.

⁷ Num. III. 6; comp. XVIII. 2.

⁸ Comp. Num. XVI. 9, 10.

⁹ Num. III. 6—9; VIII. 26; XVIII. 2.

¹⁰ Num. XVIII. 2, 4.

¹¹ Num. III. 9; VIII. 16, 19.

¹² Num. XVIII. 6.

¹³ Num. XVIII. 3, 5; XVII. 5; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 13, 14.

¹⁴ Comp. Ezek. XLIV. 7—9.

¹⁵ Num. XVI. 9; XVIII. 3, 4, 6; VIII. 19, 22; 1 Chr. XXIII. 24; comp. vers. 28, 32; see also Exod. XXXVIII. 21; Num. IV. 3, 30; VIII. 24—26.

¹⁶ Num. IV. 5—14.

¹⁷ Vers. 15—20; comp. I. 49—51; X. 17, 21.

Hebrew who attempted to perform even the manual services appropriated to the Levites forfeited his life; and the Law warned the people "that there be no plague among the children of Israel, when the children of Israel come near the Sanctuary."¹⁸ The Israelites were effectually and totally to be kept away from the ministrations of the Sanctuary; they were, therefore, replaced by the Levites who, in this respect, formed the connecting link between the people and the priests, in a similar manner as the priests stood between the people and God.

17. The work of the Levites, in detail, was as follows. They had to take care of the Tabernacle and its vessels.¹⁹ They were stationed round it during the encampments.²⁰ They took it down, when the journey was to be continued, and they set it up when the camp was to be pitched.²¹ They carried it with its implements during the wanderings, as has just been stated;²² and in proportion to their degree of relationship to the sacerdotal family of Aaron, they were entrusted with objects of greater or inferior holiness.²³ They had, of course, to assist in the offering of the sacrifices on week-days, sabbaths, and festivals,²⁴ especially in receiving the blood of the victims in the appointed vessels and presenting it to the priests for sprinkling.²⁵ The charge with which they were entrusted over the utensils and implements of the Sanctuary, included the duty of keeping them properly cleaned. They had to prepare the holy ointment, the oblations made in pans²⁶ or soaked in oil, the shew-bread, and the other unleavened cakes.²⁷ At the Temple, they were the keepers of the entrances, courts, chambers, and porticoes, round which they resided; they were the porters at its gates, which they had to open and to close.²⁸ In later times, they were, together with the priests, the guardians of the treasures of the Temple,²⁹ with an inspector, a vice-overseer, and subordinate officers;³⁰ they were charged with the care of the stores of flour, oil, wine, frankincense, and spices kept in the chambers, and with the control over the

¹⁸ Num. VIII. 19; I. 51, 53; III. 10, 38; XVII. 27, 28; XVIII. 22; comp. 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

¹⁹ Num. III. 8, 25—38.

²⁰ And later, they lodged round the Temple, 1 Chr. IX. 27.

²¹ Num. I. 50, 51, 53.

²² Comp. Deut. XXXI. 25; 1 Sam. VI. 15; 1 Chr. XV. 2, 27; XXIII. 26; 2 Chr. V. 4; comp., however, Deut. XXXI. 9; Josh. III. 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17; IV. 9, 10, 16, 18; VI. 6, 12; VIII. 33; 1 Ki. II. 26; VIII. 3; where either "the

priests" or "the priests the Levites" are stated to have carried the Ark; see *infra* Sect. IV. 1.

²³ Comp. Num. IV. 1—33, containing a minute and characteristic enumeration.

²⁴ Comp. 2 Chr. XXIX. 34; XXX. 17; XXXV. 11. ²⁵ 2 Chr. XXX. 16.

²⁶ See note on VI. 12—16.

²⁷ Comp. 1 Chr. IX. 32; XXIII. 29.

²⁸ Comp. 1 Chr. IX. 23—25, 27.

²⁹ Neh. XIII. 13; 1 Chr. IX. 26; XXIII. 28; XXVI. 20—26.

³⁰ 2 Chr. XXXI. 12—15.

measures and weights. They had to collect the contributions volunteered by the Israelites for the necessary repairs,¹ and to superintend the progress of the works.² They had to attend the morning and evening services, and to adorn them by vocal and instrumental music, while the priests generally sounded the trumpets.³ According to the Chronist, they were, from the time of David, chosen for civil and municipal officers,⁴ for attendants of the kings,⁵ and, in common with the priests, for judges, perhaps of the inferior courts,⁶ and for teachers of the people;⁷ and later still, they had to enforce the sanctity of the sabbath.⁸

18. When thus their authority increased, they were considered too holy for many of the lower services of the Sanctuary; and hence they were assisted by subordinates, exactly as they themselves had before been associated with the priests.⁹ These *nethinim* lived partly in Jerusalem,¹⁰ and partly in the Levitical and other towns;¹¹ they were probably captives of war made proselytes,¹² as the Book of Joshua exemplifies with regard to the Gibeonites;¹³ they were supposed to have been given up to the Sanctuary by David, Solomon, and other kings;¹⁴ and seem to have been held in great contempt.

19. In the Pentateuch, the Levites are merely subdivided into their principal houses and families; each of the former was presided over by a chief; and the degree of their consanguinity with the holy family of Aaron decided their position and functions. But the Chronist¹⁵ attributes to David a division of the Levites, whose number he states at 38,000 men above 30 years, into four classes. 1. The *servants of the priests* or the proper *Levites*, 24,000 in number; 2. *Judges and civil officers*, 6,000; 3. *Porters*, 4,000; and 4. *Singers and Musicians*, 4,000.¹⁶ — This statement of the Chronist must be estimated and judged, in the same manner as the division of the priests mentioned by the same writer, namely, as a much later arrangement unwarrantably ascribed by him to David.

¹ 2 Chr. XXIV. 12.

² 2 Chr. XXXIV. 12, 13.

³ 1 Chr. IX. 29; XV. 16—24; XVI. 4—8; XXIII. 5; XXV. 1—4; 2 Chr. V. 12, 13; VII. 6; VIII. 14, 15; Ezra III. 10; Neh. XII. 27.

⁴ 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 11.

⁵ 1 Chr. XXVI. 30.

⁶ 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XIX. 11; XXXIV. 13.

⁷ 2 Chr. XVII. 7—9; see in general 1 Chr. IX. 14—32; XXIII. 4—32; XXVI. 12—30.

⁸ Neh. XIII. 22.

⁹ 1 Chr. IX. 2; Ezr. II. 43; VII. 7; Neh. VII. 46.

¹⁰ Neh. III. 26, 31; XI. 21.

¹¹ Ezr. II. 70; Neh. VII. 73; XI. 21.

¹² Neh. X. 29. ¹³ Josh. IX. 21, 23, 27.

¹⁴ Ezr. VIII. 20; comp. II. 43—58; Neh. VII. 60; XI. 3.

¹⁵ 1 Chr. XXIII. 4—32; XXVI. 12—30.

¹⁶ Comp. also Ezra II. 40—42, 70; VII. 24; 1 Chr. XXV. 1—31; 2 Chr. XXIII. 2—8. Neh. VII. 43—45.

20. This being the character and the office of the Levites, they were, indeed, amply provided for, so as to be able to pursue their peculiar occupations without interruption or harassing care; for though they did not obtain the territorial possessions¹⁷ to which they were properly entitled,¹⁸ since their portion and their inheritance were God or "the offerings of the Lord God of Israel",¹⁹ they received, according to the most favourable ordinances, in return for their services at the Sanctuary, the tenth part of all produce of the soil and of the annual increase of cattle; of the former, however, they had to give the tenth part to the priests.²⁰ They were naturally exempt from military service and all taxes,²¹ and yet probably received a share of the booty of war.²² For their abodes were assigned to them 35 cities,²³ whether partially or exclusively, on both sides of the Jordan, within the territories of all tribes, except Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon, which were reserved for the habitations of the *priests* (see *supra*); and to each town was attached landed property to the extent of a thousand cubits round the wall, or two thousand from one extreme point to the other, to serve as pasturage for their cattle,²⁴ an arrangement the purpose and propriety of which will be discussed hereafter.²⁵

But, in all other respects, they were, by the ordinances of the Pentateuch, marked out not only as strikingly inferior to the priests, but as endowed with a character of no peculiar significance or holiness. As regards their qualification, physical perfection was not required as a necessary condition; any member of the families of Levi, except that of Aaron, was admitted, and served from the twenty-fifth or thirtieth to the fiftieth year of his life.²⁶ They were initiated in their office by rites of the simplest description; they were neither clothed nor anointed, but merely "cleansed" by purifying water, "waved" before God, and introduced by a sin-offering and a holocaust.²⁷ They had no distinguishing garments, in which important point, therefore, they did not differ from the common Israelites.²⁸

¹⁷ Num. XVIII. 20, 23, 24; XXVI. 62; Deut. X. 9; XII. 12; XIV. 27, 29; XVIII. 1.

¹⁸ Num. XXXV. 2.

¹⁹ Num. XVIII. 20; Deut. X. 9; XVIII. 2; Josh. XIII. 14, 33; XIV. 3; XVIII. 7; Ezek. XLIV. 28; Sir. XLV. 27; comp. also Ps. XVI. 5; Lam. III. 21.

²⁰ Num. XVIII. 21—32; comp. Neh. X. 36—40; XII. 44; XIII. 12; 2 Chr. XXXI. 4—8; see, however, *infra*, Sect. III. 6—8.

²¹ Comp. Ezra VII. 24.

²² Num. XXXI. 26—47; see *infra*.

²³ To the Kohathites 10, the Gershonites 13, and the Merarites 12 (Josh. XXI. 4—7; 1 Chr. VI. 16—18).

²⁴ Num. XXXV. 1, 5.

²⁵ See *infra*, Sect. III. 4.

²⁶ Num. IV. 3, 23, 30, 39, 43, 47; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 3; and Num. VIII. 23—26; see *infra* Sect. III. 5.

²⁷ Num. VIII. 5—22.

²⁸ The musicians, however, are in 2 Chr. V. 12 stated to have been "arrayed in white linen" (comp. 1 Chr. XV. 27).

After this sketch in which we have endeavoured to admit no features except those warranted by the Pentateuch, while scrupulously excluding or separating from them all elements derived from other sources, we may be prepared to furnish

II. AN ESTIMATE OF THE LEGISLATIVE VALUE OF THESE ORDINANCES.

1. It is true, that the priests of the Hebrews were not, like those of other nations, the supposed depositaries of secret or exclusive wisdom and learning; they simply expounded and diffused the teaching of that Book which was the common heirloom of the whole community; for all had entered the covenant with God on the basis of that Law which Moses handed over not to the priests alone, but also to the elders of the people,¹ of which the kings were ordered to have a copy prepared for themselves to study in it constantly,² and which was to be read, at regular intervals, to the assembled people.³ Justly, therefore, might Josephus write, "There were in the Temple not any mysteries that may not be spoken of ... for what I have now said is publicly known, and supported by the testimony of the whole people, and the operations of the priests are entirely manifest." Nor does that Book contain any doctrines that were not within the capacity of the humblest Israelite, for it disclosed no cosmic mysteries or intricate problems of nature, but narrated, in simple language, the origin and early history of the Hebrew race, and enforced moral and religious laws, which were either traced to incidents of that history or are derived from our common humanity. Yet, why were the priests appointed the special, if not the exclusive guardians, of the Law? The reply is, because they were supposed, by their anointment, to have been endowed with the holy spirit which enabled them to penetrate more infallibly into the depths of the revealed word. Thus a supernatural element of the most dangerous kind was introduced. It cannot be called otherwise than hierarchical. The foundation of the system seemed to be a common equality of all Israelites; but the very first layer above it was an exceptional qualification of the priests of so extraordinary a nature, that, in reality, not only all parity between priests and Israelites was destroyed, but almost all spiritual community between them became impossible. Hence the priesthood annulled, in a great measure, the benefits which the

¹ Deut. XXXI. 9.

² Deut. XVII. 18, 19.

³ Deut. XXXI. 10—13; see p. 350; comp. also XXX. 11—14, "this law is

not hidden from thee nor is it far off. ... but the word is very nigh to thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart, that thou mayest do it".

diffusion of a moral code like that of the Pentateuch was calculated to produce; for it engendered, in the minds of the people, mistrust in their own ability of fathoming the whole truth of the Law, and thus caused a deplorable feeling of spiritual dependency; and since the priests were supposed to understand the precepts more profoundly than the Israelites, that unfortunate mode of Biblical interpretation was encouraged, which discovers extraordinary and hidden meanings in the plainest texts, and which degenerated into mysticism or pharasaical playfulness.⁴ For the history of all religious and philosophical systems proves that similar aberrations are unavoidable from the moment that the simple and intelligible words of the masters or founders are made the subject of speculative enquiry by a separate class of men.

2. It will, therefore, be easy to judge of the value of the declaration that the Hebrews were to form "a kingdom of priests". Great importance has been attached to this term, and lofty theories have been built upon it. But was the institution of the priesthood designed to make it a reality? The family of Aaron was represented as specially *elected* by God for a particular and holy mission. Thus it was severed from the rest of the people, and raised above it to an unapproachable distance. It monopolised all the sacred functions which, in any way, tended to connect the Israelite with his God. But this was not sufficient; the common Hebrew was not only debarred from the more significant rites of public or private worship; he was to be absolutely excluded from all participation in sacred things. Not even the menial and most subordinate labours of the Sanctuary was he permitted to perform. For this purpose, another body of men, the Levites, was interposed between him and the priests. If he dared to appropriate to himself even any of these low offices, it was a crime of death. In a word, he was, by the precepts of the Pentateuch, utterly deprived of the natural privileges which he enjoyed in a simple state of society. The Hebrews were, by the Law, not *made* "a nation of priests", but they *ceased* to be one. A hierarchy was organised. We find, in the Hebrew writings, a strong and marked contrast between priests and people.⁵ The apparent parallels in the designation of the one and the other (p. 341) were no more than a theory without a practical embodiment. The pretence that the Hebrews themselves renounced their priestly privileges (p. 345), is illusory: for even if it be taken as historically true, it would alter nothing in our estimate of the priestly institutions. For while the resignation of the Hebrews could only have been temporary, the priestly institutions were meant to be unchangeable for all future times: if an untutored people

⁴ See pp. 101—103.

⁵ Comp. Isai. XXIV. 2; Hos. IV. 9; Jer. I. 18.

just loosed from oppressive fetters, was disqualified for sacerdotal dignities, it need and ought not to have remained so after centuries of training through the Law. How different was the voice of enlightened prophets who fervidly longed for the time when the Lord would pour out His spirit over "the house of Israel",¹ nay over "all flesh",² a sentiment attributed in the Pentateuch to Moses also in the memorable words, "Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His spirit upon them".³ — The expression "kingdom of priests" remained a phrase which, so far from being realised, was rendered impossible by the leading principles of the Pentateuch; it had no influence upon the development of the nation; it was a fine but fleeting idea of a gifted mind;⁴ and the only notion, vague as it is, that can, from the system of the Pentateuch, be attached to it, is that the Hebrews should one day become the links between God and the heathens, just as the priests are the links between God and the Israelites; though it is very doubtful, whether this meaning was intended by the words, "You shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation."

3. The chasm between the priests and the people was perpetuated and widened by the principle of *hereditary* right, according to which the priesthood was for ever restricted to one family. It may be that this principle facilitated the traditionary preservation of the ritual ordinances, and that it favoured a higher degree of culture within the priestly order; but it completed the seclusion so effectually that it is idle to deny a *caste* of priests among the Hebrews, no less distinct and exclusive than that of the Hindoos or Egyptians.

4. Irrespective of the separation itself between priests and people, it is necessary to refer to the manner in which the Pentateuch describes that separation to have been effected. It was *God* who singled out the family of Aaron as His ministers, His representatives, and the teachers of His Law; and it was He who confirmed this election by miraculous interference, the budding staff of Aaron and the fearful destruction of Aaron's opponents, of Korah and his associates. What is the true scope and import of these statements? They imply the artful fiction of an author or of authors, who attempted to promulgate their own devices as Divine or supernatural arrangements, and thus to awe an impressionable nation into their acceptance and reverential observance. If the laws of priesthood had been represented as the work of a human legis-

¹ Ezek. XXXIX. 29.

³ Num. XI. 9.

² Joel III. 1, 2; comp. Isai. XI. 9;

⁴ Comp. Isai. LXI. 6.

LIV. 13; Jer. XXXI. 34; etc.

lator, they would simply have been a human failure, because they degraded the people instead of elevating it; but as the pretended emanation of a Divine will, they are both a failure and a fraud; and to the weakness of human judgment is added the offence of human arrogance and deceit.

5. We readily admit that the Levitical system of the Pentateuch is eminently logical and admirably consistent, and we have endeavoured so to arrange its individual features, as best to disclose and unfold its beauty; its main office was *atonement*,⁵ and the attributes of God upon which that office was based were His *holiness* and His *mercy*. But the *priests* were the indispensable mediators between God the holy one and sinful man, and it was through them alone that the atonement could be accomplished, which was but seldom attributed directly to God.

6. It is true that the laws of the Pentateuch admit but *one* High-priest at a time who retained his office for life, whereas in Egypt, there was a High-priest for each temple or for each God; and in other countries, there was a new High-priest appointed every year. This is a natural consequence of Hebrew monotheism, which admitted but one intercessor, and of the organisation of the Hebrew people, which formed a unity, and therefore required one representative. But was the High-priest of the Hebrews indeed no more than their representative? His chief office as mediator, like that of the common priests,⁶ was indeed the expiation and sanctification of the whole people; but he did not hold this dignity as a delegate of the *nation*; he held it as the elected and anointed of *God*. His authority thus became necessarily exaggerated and dangerous. He was no longer the mouth-piece of his fellow-men only, but the messenger and special servant of the supreme Being. It was a grave aberration when he assumed a position of higher sanctity than the nation itself; when he was placed above the community, as if he were anything else but its reflex;⁷ and when his sin-offering was made more solemn than that of the nation, as if his purity were of greater moment than the purity of those for whom he was supposed to act.⁸ This mistake tended likewise to corrupt the theocracy into a hierarchy; it utterly destroyed the idea of a "kingdom of priests;" it was the rock upon which the fair hopes of the Hebrew patriots were ultimately wrecked. Nay, any sin which the High-priest committed caused at the same time the guilt of the whole people;⁹ even as a frail and erring man, he was inseparably bound up with the community; he might save it by

⁵ Lev. X. 17; 1 Chr. VI. 34; etc.
comp. also Exod. XXVIII, 38.

⁶ Lev. X. 17.

⁷ Comp. Lev. IV. 3—12 and 13—21

⁸ Lev. XVI. 6 and 15.

⁹ Comp. notes on IV. 3—12.

his piety or bring misery and destruction upon it by his iniquity: is it possible to conceive the pontifical office in a more hierarchical spirit?

7. It is generally contended that the Hebrew priests and Levites, though enabled to live in plenty, were, according to the enactments of the Pentateuch, not in a condition to obtain undue influence by their wealth and property. We will admit this at present, for argument's sake, though we shall prove later that this opinion must be essentially modified.¹ Yet thus much is certain that their territorial possessions were insignificant. In this respect, the laws of the Pentateuch contrast favourably with the arrangements of other ancient polities. In Egypt, the caste of the priests, the first in the country, possessed the third part of the arable land, free from all taxes, the remaining fields being claimed by the king and the soldiers; each temple had large and hereditary domains, and every High-priest was the owner of princely territories; so that, in fact, the king and the priests were the chief proprietors of the land; moreover, the other priestly revenues and immunities were important and varied. A similar state of things existed among other ancient nations. The priests of Olympia and Delphi could lend money at interest to whole republics; and they increased their income by every imaginable contrivance, and even by entrance-fees imposed upon visitors at the temples. However, the Pentateuch, more decidedly perhaps than any other religious code, assigns to the priests their emoluments on a principle which again strongly reflects the hierarchical nature of the whole institution. For the priests received the imposts, such as tithes, firstfruits, the portions of the sacrifices, and other perquisites, not from the other tribes as contributions towards their support, which would only have been fair and reasonable, but they derived them from God Himself, to whom the gifts belonged by His command, and who then ceded them to the tribe of Levi; for, said God, "the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder have I taken from the children of Israel from the sacrifices of their thank-offerings, and have given them to Aaron the priest and to his sons, for an eternal statute from the children of Israel."² Thus the life of the Levites was, even with regard to their physical sustenance, removed from the ordinary and natural sphere of men, and placed into a region of exceptional and unjustifiable elevation. Their existence was directly connected with the veneration of God Himself. The readiness with which they were provided for was an act of dutiful piety tending to test the people's

¹ See *infra*, Sect. III.

² Lev. VII. 34; XXVII. 30; Num. XVIII. 21, 24; Deut. XVIII. 1, "they shall eat the

offerings of the Lord made by fire and His inheritance"; comp. Num. XXXV. 2; etc.

submission to God's behest's; while their neglect was contempt of His sovereignty. "The privations of the priests and Levites", observes Philo, "were a silent but powerful reproach of the iniquity of the Israelites deserting God through His ministers;" while their affluence was "a great proof of their common holiness and their accurate observance of all the laws." Suppose even that their income was small, it obtained a higher value, and created greater authority and influence than the largest property of other men, on account of the donor who granted it. The sustenance of the priests, whether abundant or moderate, had a glory far beyond the splendour of kings and princes. It was another instrument of spiritual supremacy. The Law preserves in this point consistently its general tendency. Yet the want of a proper executive power, a radical defect in the political system of the Pentateuch, rendered the enforcement of the Levitical laws uncertain, and the utter destitution of the priests could not be prevented.³

S. The Pentateuch indeed leaves the office of priest distinct from that of prophet,⁴ representing throughout the one by the High-priest Aaron and the other by the prophet Moses; and it thus acknowledges a religious influence besides its own. But if the priest taught, blessed, and judged the people; if his decisions were regarded as the infallible utterances of Divine wisdom itself; if he could, on all extraordinary emergencies, consult God, was certain of His directions, and thus secured all that fatal influence which heathen priests maintained by the alleged gift of divination; it may be well asked what scope remained for the prophet's activity? It might appear, that the mission of the latter was essentially of a political nature; but the political condition of the Hebrews was constantly traced to their religious life; national prosperity was considered the consequence of a faithful devotion to God, national calamity as the result of idolatry and impiety. Hence the prophet's work lay no less in the religious than in the political sphere. But the religious ground seems, in the Pentateuch, to be entirely occupied by the priests; they warned, exhorted, reprov'd, and advised the people; they narrowed the province of the prophets so much, that the latter had scarcely a special field for themselves. Thus those devoted and enlightened teachers who form the glory of Hebrew antiquity, and whose fervent utterances roused and ennobled a torpid nation, were gradually silenced. From the time of the promulgation of the Pentateuch, prophecy decayed in Israel; depraved and mercenary men, coming forward as "prophets", who flattered the prevailing and worldly principles of government, joined depraved and mercenary priests in the oppress-

³ See *infra* Sect. V. 6.

⁴ Deut. XVIII. 18, 19; XXXIV. 10.

ion and corruption of the people. A severe but unequal struggle ensued. The priests, generally aided by royal or secular power, gained the victory. The example of Jeremiah, though himself, like Ezekiel, of priestly descent, suffices to prove how prophets were crushed, persecuted, and massacred. What greater misfortune could the Levitical ordinances of the Law bring upon the nation? The very literature degenerated, and reflected the narrowness and sterility of a system which allowed no scope to originality of research or speculation. The Books of Chronicles compared with the Books of Samuel and Kings, are like the monotonous spasms of automata compared with the free movements of a living organism. A tree without vitality, the Levitical spirit produced those withering branches of Talmudism, in which subtle casuistry took the place of creative thought, and which would have deadened the Jewish mind, had it not, consciously and unconsciously, and in spite of the Talmud, incessantly refreshed itself from the living stream of extraneous, especially pagan civilisation.

From whatever side we examine the laws of the Pentateuch, we are forced to the conclusion that they created a hierarchy spiritually separated, by strong and artfully devised barriers, from a dependent and enthralled people, and necessarily opposed to intellectual freedom and progress. The Levitical system was indeed sufficiently fraught with mischief to the Jewish nation; that it did not engender more, is owing to the peculiar political condition of the people during the centuries that followed its latest development and its diffusion: but it was the cause, and in many respects the model, of that Christian hierarchy in the middle ages, which utterly enslaved the minds, banished and denounced reason, and kept for centuries the civilised world in ignominious darkness and superstitious terror.

III. FLUCTUATIONS OF THE PENTATEUCH IN REFERENCE TO THE LAWS ON THE PRIESTHOOD.

However, it would be entirely erroneous to suppose that the arrangements of the Pentateuch with regard to the priesthood were the result of one age or the work of one man. They bear internal evidence of long fluctuations and of gradual growth. To point out that evidence, will be the next preparatory step for a history of the Hebrew priesthood; and this task, though not without difficulties, leads to results so indisputable and so important, that we trust, the reader will follow us in this enquiry without reluctance.

1. The middle Books of the Pentateuch establish that decided distinction between priests and Levites which we have above pointed

out. But the Book of Deuteronomy alludes to all Levites alike as priests. The latter are never designated "sons of Aaron" as they are described in the middle Books,¹ but "the priests the Levites",² or "the priests the sons of Levi",³ and even "the priests the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi".⁴ In the very same chapter, first the priests and then the Levites are stated to have borne the Ark,⁵ as if both were identical. Indeed, according to Deuteronomy, the Levites perform offices, from which they were in the other Books rigidly debarred, and which were reserved for the priests exclusively. They proclaim the curses from mount Ebal.⁶ They deposit the Book of the Law at the side of the Ark of the Covenant, which involves their admission even to the Holy of Holies.⁷ Indeed their functions are comprehensively stated thus, "At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister to Him, and to bless in His name, to this day"⁸ — terms which exactly apply to the priestly ministrations in the middle Books. And as the offices, so are the privileges common to all Levites, "The priests the Levites, the whole tribe of Levi, shall . . . eat the offerings of the Lord made by fire, and His inheritance;"⁹ whereas the portions of certain sacrifices were in the other Books strictly limited to the male members of Aaron's family.¹⁰ The Levite Korah is not branded as an audacious usurper of the priestly dignity, like the Reubenites Dathan and Abiram,¹¹ because his claim was by the author of Deuteronomy not regarded as impious or even illegitimate; whereas it is, in the other Books, denounced at least as equally criminal with the arrogance of the firstborn tribe and punished with the same awful destruction.¹² It is, therefore, impossible to doubt that at the time of the Deuteronomist, other members of the tribe of Levi, besides the Aaronites, were admitted to the priesthood.

2. The case is quite similar with regard to judicial qualifications. While in the preceding Books we find only one instance of the *High-priest* acting as judge in a social difficulty,¹³ the precepts of Deuteronomy confide the administration of the law to "the priests the Levites", that is, to the whole tribe of Levi, and grant them unlimited power to enforce their decisions;¹⁴ but they suppose the seat of the chief tri-

¹ See p. 345.

² Deut. XVII. 9, 18; XXIV 8; XXVII. 9; comp. Josh. III. 3; VIII. 33; XXI. 1—3.

³ Deut. XXI. 5; XXXI. 9.

⁴ Deut. XVIII. 1; comp. X. 8, 9; XXXIII. 8—11.

⁵ Deut. XXXI. 9 and 25.

⁶ Deut. XXVII. 14.

⁷ Deut. XXXI. 25, 26.

⁸ Deut. X. 8, and similarly XVIII. 6, 7.

⁹ Deut. XVIII. 1; comp. X. 9.

¹⁰ See p. 143. ¹¹ Deut. XI. 6.

¹² Comp. Num. XVI. 1—32; XXVI. 9—11.

¹³ Num. XXVII. 2, 19; comp. Josh. XXII. 30sqq.

¹⁴ Deut. XVII. 8—13; XXI. 5; comp. XIX. 17; 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; XXVI. 29;

bunal to be in the town of the national Sanctuary, whether at Jerusalem or elsewhere.¹ And so, according to Numbers, the High-priest only seems to have consulted God by means of the Ark or the Urim and Thummim;² whereas we find, in other parts of the Old Testament, that privilege extended to the whole order of priests.³

3. On the one hand, the entire tribe of Levi was elected and sanctified by God for His service; while, on the other hand, the Levites were substitutes for the firstborn who properly belonged to God.⁴ But if the Levites were holy by election, why was it necessary to give up, for their acquisition, the firstborn who were no less holy to God? We can understand the surrender of a consecrated class for a profane one, which thereby shall become consecrated. But the surrender of one consecrated class for another is gratuitous. The firstborn could never cease to be God's property, if they were replaced by a body of men as holy as themselves, and therefore not requiring to be substitutes of others in order to become holy. The difficulty is simply solved by the circumstance that the election of the whole tribe is set forth in Deuteronomy,⁵ the substitution of the Levites, in the more restricted sense, in Numbers; the difference of the authors accounts for a discrepancy which may historically be thus explained. At first, the chiefs of every family, that is, the firstborn, performed the worship for the household, and were thus *naturally* holy to God. Gradually and by a process traced elsewhere,⁶ they were replaced by the Levites, who hence were represented as consecrated to God *by election*, since they had no natural claim to the priesthood, not being the eldest tribe. In this light, the Levites were regarded for a considerable period; and so they appear in Deuteronomy. But imperceptibly, the family of Aaron was distinguished from the other branches of the tribe, and placed at an immeasurable distance above them. Then the election was restricted to that family alone, while the Levites were simply regarded as substitutes for common Israelites, and could, therefore, be handed over to the priests for the most subordinate tasks,⁷ but be excluded from all higher or sacred offices; and so they appear in the middle Books of the Pentateuch.

4. With this subject another point of interest is connected. It is in the middle Books that the 35 cities are assigned to the Levites in all parts of the country, both east and west of the Jordan (see p. 361);

2 Chr. XIX. 8—11; see also Ezek. XLIV. 24.

¹ Deut. XVII. 8, 12.

² Num. XXVII. 21; comp. Judg. XX. 27, 28.

³ Comp. Ezr. II. 63; Neh. VII. 65.

⁴ Num. III. 12, 13, 41, 45; VIII. 16—18; see p. 582. ⁵ See *supra* No 2.

⁶ See Comm. on Gen. pp. 504, 505; comp. *infra* Sect. V.

⁷ Num. VIII. 19; etc.

and it is in the middle Books that the line of demarcation between the Levites and the priests is rigidly drawn, the former being nothing but the menial assistants of the latter in the offices of the Sanctuary. Now, what purpose did the dispersion of the Levites through the land serve? How is it reconcilable with their necessary attendance at the Tabernacle or Temple? It is usually averred that it was designed to qualify them for their mission as teachers and religious guides of the whole nation; but these functions are, in Leviticus and Numbers, exclusively reserved to the priests, and entirely denied to the Levites, whose sole occupation was connected with the public worship. But nothing could obviously be more inappropriate than an arrangement which, on the one hand, scattered the Levites through the length and breadth of Palestine, and on the other hand, tied them to one central spot. Moreover, if the priests were indeed to be the instructors and spiritual advisers of the people, they ought not to have been confined even to a certain number of cities, but allowed to settle wherever there was a town or village that required their counsels and ministrations. One solution only is possible. The arrangement was not *made* by the legislators but partly *found* by them in existence. The dispersion of the Levites into all provinces was a fact, and a fact which, in the consciousness of the nation, was owing to their wanton cruelty and ungovernable recklessness.⁸ The authors of the Pentateuch, anxious for the honour of a tribe which, in their time, had gained considerable spiritual influence, represented that dispersion as having been ordained by the wisdom of God, and then they regulated it so far as to restrict it to a certain number of cities, which the Levites inhabited together with the population of other tribes. This expedient appeared, under the circumstances, the most acceptable, although it ceased to be entirely satisfactory, when the duties of the Levites were strictly limited to the Temple.

5. In some passages, the age of the active service of the Levites is fixed from the 30th to the 50th year of their lives,⁹ but in others from the 25th to the 50th year.¹⁰ The texts are in both cases equally plain and unmistakeable; on the one hand, "Take the sum of the sons of Kohath from among the sons of Levi . . . from thirty years old and upward until fifty years old, all that come forward to do duty, to do the work at the Tent of Meeting";¹¹ and on the other hand,

⁸ Comp. Gen. XLIX. 5—7; see *infra*, Sect. V.

⁹ Num. IV. 3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43, 47; comp. 1 Chr. XXIII. 3 (they were numbered from the age of thirty years).

¹⁰ Num. VIII. 23—26.

¹¹ Num. IV. 3, and exactly the same terms are in that chapter used with reference to the other families of the tribe of Levi.

“From five and twenty years old and upward they (the Levites) shall go in to do duty in the service of the Tent of Meeting; and from the age of fifty years they shall cease from the duty of the service, and shall serve no more”.¹ To harmonise the two precepts is clearly out of the question; the devices that have been proposed are equally forced and ineffectual. It is indeed probable that the compilers and revisers of the Pentateuch supposed some reconciliation between them possible, or else they would not have allowed them to stand as they do; yet whatever it may have been, it is necessarily unavailing. It is impossible to resist the conclusion that the two figures proceeded from two different authors, either of them basing his law upon the usage and requirements of his time, which varied in successive epochs; and indeed, according to the Chronist, the age fixed for the active service of the Levites was up to David’s reign 30 years,² but after this time, when the Tabernacle and its vessels were no more to be carried and the duties were less onerous, it was lowered to 20 years,³ as seems to have remained customary in later times.⁴

But the fluctuations of the Pentateuch are most palpable and most remarkable in the laws regarding the revenues of the priests and Levites; and we propose to treat of them here with some completeness, because they form an important link in the chain of our enquiries.

REVENUES OF THE PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

We begin with the regulations concerning the *Tithes*.

6. According to the middle Books of the Pentateuch, the Levites were to receive, as part of the compensation due to them for their services at the common Sanctuary,⁵ the tenth part of all annual produce of the soil and of all trees, especially of corn, wine, and oil,⁶ and the tenth part of the annual increase of the herds and flocks, of cows, lambs, and goats, that is, of the clean sacrificial quadrupeds, to be surrendered without selection or substitution, just “as they pass under the rod”,⁷ which the shepherd generally carried, and by which he daily counted his cattle; if an animal was changed for another, *both* belonged unalterably to the Levites, without the choice of redemption; but the owner had the option of redeeming the vegetable tithes by paying their value with the addition of the fifth part of it.⁸ The tithes could be eaten by the Levites and their families in any town in which they resided.⁹

¹ Num. VIII. 24, 25.

² 1 Chr. XXIII. 3.

³ Vers. 25—27.

⁴ 2 Chr. XXXI. 17; Ezra III. 8.

⁵ Num. XVIII. 21—24, 31.

⁶ Comp. Num. XVIII. 27; Deut. XIV.

22, 23; also Nehem. XIII. 5, 12.

⁷ Lev. XXVII. 32.

⁸ Lev. XXVII. 30—33.

⁹ Num. XVIII. 31.

However, the Levites were bound to give the tenth part of the tithes¹⁰ to the priests, the direct descendants of Aaron; and compliance with this command was accounted to them as if they had devoted to God tithes out of their own produce.¹¹

7. From these regulations the Deuteronomist differs in several important points. He demands the tithes of the agricultural produce only, not of the flocks and herds. Nor does he allow even the agricultural tithes to the Levites for their exclusive use; he merely directs that these should be invited as guests at the repasts to be held by the Israelites, whether the meals consist of the produce itself or of the provisions bought for its value. He can, therefore, neither make allusion to the redemption of tithes by Israelites, to whom they virtually belong; nor can he command the Levites to give the tenth part of the tithes to the Aaronites. He, moreover, prescribes that the repasts are to take place exclusively in the town of the central Sanctuary "before the Lord". But in order to fix a wavering custom, he institutes a separate "year of the tithes", to be observed every third year, when all the tithes collected from every town were to be handed over partly to the Levites, and partly to the strangers, the orphans, and the widows; but though they were eaten at any place of residence, they were of course, on account of their sacred character, to be carefully protected from impure use, and after their due delivery, the owner had to make a solemn confession regarding his conscientious observance of the tithes' laws, concluding with an invocation of the Divine blessing.¹²

6. Following the principles of criticism hitherto adopted, it will not be difficult to account for these discrepancies. It was a primitive custom among many ancient nations to devote to the deity the tenth part of the production of the soil, of the booty of war, and of all gains of commerce and industry, especially for the purposes of public worship or national enterprise, and sometimes as a fine or tribute imposed upon disloyal or unpatriotic citizens; and it was a common practice to pay to kings or rulers the tenth part of the income as a civil tax. It is more than probable that the same custom was, from early times, adopted by the Hebrews; it is, in the Pentateuch, appropriately attributed to the patriarchs;¹³ and it recommended itself to the leading minds of the nation especially on account of the spiritual significance of the number ten, which they understood to typify per-

¹⁰ Num. XVIII. 26; Neh. XVIII. 26.

¹¹ Num. XVIII. 26—30; comp. Neh. X. 39, 40.

¹² Deut. XII. 6, 11, 17—19; XIV.

22—29; XXVI. 12—15; comp. XVI. 11, 14; XXVI. 11.

¹³ Gen. XXVIII. 22; the tithes belong to God, Lev. XXVII. 30; Num. XVIII. 24.

fection¹ and Divine revelation, and which they connected with some of the profoundest ideas of their religion.² Therefore, the tithes, limited to vegetable produce, were originally employed by the proprietors for religious repasts, to which the Levites as well as other needy and helpless persons were piously and charitably invited. But at a later time, when hierarchical ideas took deeper root, they were entirely withdrawn from the control of the owners, and, extended to animal increase, they were fixed as an ordinary and legal impost, to be scrupulously paid to the Levites every year, when of course the "triennial tithes" were discontinued. Hence the laws of Deuteronomy manifestly exhibit an earlier phase in the history of Levitical power; they prove how the priests gradually and prudently enlarged their influence and ameliorated their temporal welfare, and what stages they had to pass, before they could venture upon a system so favourable to their order as that propounded in Leviticus and Numbers.

This is clearly the historical relation between the enactments of Deuteronomy and those of the middle Books. Many attempts at harmonising them have been made; but they have absolutely and necessarily failed. It is not surprising that the traditional interpretation, starting from the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, supposed the three different sorts of tithes mentioned in the Law and above pointed out, to be alike obligatory — namely, the annual tithes both of cattle and of vegetable produce to be eaten by the Levites in their respective towns; the annual vegetable tithes, taken from the remainder and to be consumed by the proprietors and the Levites in Jerusalem; and the triennial vegetable tithes to be shared, in any town, by the Levites, the poor, and the helpless. And, in later periods, all the three tithes were indeed faithfully given up by the pious, as the first, second, and third tenth, the one for the Levites, the other for the feasts and festivals at Jerusalem, and the third for the indigent.

9. We now proceed to the laws in respect of the *Firstborn*, which involve another and strikingly obvious proof of the gradual growth of Levitical institutions.

It will be necessary to premise a short sketch of the origin of these laws. It would be superfluous to remind the reader of the idea prevailing among primitive nations that the deity could claim both the firstborn of men and of animals, and that consequently both the one and the others were to be sacrificed as burnt-offerings. The ancient

¹ Because $1+2+3+4=10$, which was hence called "the all-comprising number", beyond which there is no

new one, since what follows after it returns to the units.

² See p. 323.

Hebrews shared these notions. "Sanctify to Me", commanded God, "all the firstborn whatever opens the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and beast".³ But when, in the lapse of ages, their religious education advanced, the spiritual leaders apprehended lest this principle encourage the same cosmic views regarding the powers of nature, to which it owed its first adoption, and which it helped to strengthen among pagan nations. Therefore, they attributed to it a new and very different origin. They connected it with the miraculous deliverance of the firstborn Hebrews supposed to have been effected at the tenth plague in Egypt, "All the firstborn are Mine", says God, "for on the day that I smote all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, I hallowed to Myself all the firstborn in Israel, both man and beast; Mine shall they be; I am the Lord".⁴ Therefore, the following ordinances were fixed. Every firstborn boy, when one month old, was to be redeemed for five holy shekels.⁵ Every firstborn male and unclean animal unfit for sacrifice, like the ass, was either to be killed or to be replaced by a clean beast, as a lamb, or redeemed for five shekels.⁶ Every faulty firstborn animal of the clean species belonged unreservedly to the proprietor, and might be eaten by anyone, whether clean or unclean, "like the roebuck and like the hart".⁷ But every firstborn male and faultless beast of the clean species, particularly the sacrificial animals, of bulls, sheep, and goats, was to be sanctified to God within the first year, so that, for instance, the ox should not be employed for work, nor the sheep be shorn, but should be sacrificed on the altar by sprinkling its blood and burning its fat, yet not as a *burnt-offering*, but as a *thank-offering* — a noteworthy distinction; for the former would have befitted the pagan origin of firstling-sacrifices, the latter was in harmony with the new meaning which the legislator had attached to those victims, and in grateful reminiscence of a marvellous rescue at a memorable epoch of Hebrew history.⁸

³ Exod. XIII. 2, 12; XXII. 28; XXXIV. 19, 20.

⁴ Num. III. 13, 41—51; VIII. 17; Exod. XIII. 14, 15; see Comm. on Exod. p. 165. Hence it became a custom still observed by orthodox Judaism, that the first-born men should fast on the day before Passover.

⁵ Exod. XIII. 15; XXXIV. 20; Num. XVIII. 16; comp. Neh. X. 37.

⁶ Exod. XIII. 13; XXXIV. 20; Num. XVIII. 15; comp. Levit. XXVII. 26, 27.

⁷ Deut. XV. 21—23.

⁸ Num. XVIII. 17, 18; Deut. XV. 19, 20; Neh. X. 37. — At present, as the Jews can offer no sacrifices, it is their custom, either to sell, or to give away, or to allow in partnership to a non-Israelite, any part, however insignificant, of the dams or the young, or to feed the firstborn males of clean animals till perchance they get a fault or defect when they may be slaughtered and eaten, a custom derived from the practice which prevailed in the time of the Temple with regard to animals

10. Now we have arrived at the point which enables us to notice a fluctuation in the precepts of the Pentateuch similar to that manifest with regard to the laws of tithes.

For, according to Deuteronomy, the priests received of those firstling thank-offerings no more than the portions which fell to their share in all sacrifices of the same class, namely the breast and right shoulder, while the Israelites consumed the remainder of the meat: "Thou shalt eat the firstling males that come of thy herd and of thy flock, before the Lord thy God year by year, in the place which the Lord shall choose, thou and thy household."¹ Yet the Book of Numbers assigns to the priests not the breast and right shoulder only, but the whole animal, of course with the exception of the fat and fat parts which were burnt on the altar: "But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy, thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet odour to the Lord. And the flesh of them shall belong to thee (Aaron), like the wave-breast and like the right shoulder it shall belong to thee."²

11. It is clearly impossible, in the face of these unmistakable texts, to harmonize the various precepts of the Pentateuch, and to attempt the proof that they belong to the same time or legislative system; the efforts that have been made to effect this agreement and to combine what is absolutely contradictory, are partly inefficient and partly fanciful; and we are compelled to admit the existence of three distinct laws with regard to the firstborn, in the following succession:

a. The oldest regulation is that of Exodus;³ it verges on the stage of the natural or cosmic views of primitive religions; for it ordains that *all* the firstborn males of men and beasts shall belong to God; the firstborn boys are to be redeemed; the firstborn of clean animals to be sacrificed, evidently as *burnt-offerings*; the firstborn of unclean animals either to be redeemed by clean beasts, or to be killed.

b. The next step is embodied in the ordinances of Deuteronomy,⁴ which exhibit a decided advance of hierarchical power, and at the same time efface the traces of the pagan origin of the law: all the firstborn

of which it was doubtful whether they were firstborn or not; but the unclean animals, which, however, are limited to the ass alone (with reference to Exod. XIII. 13), are redeemed for a lamb. The firstborn boys, except those of Aaronites and Levites or of their daughters, even if these are married to Israelites, are

on the thirty-first day after their birth, or if this be a sabbath on the thirty-second, redeemed from the priests for a small sum of money representing five shekels or between six and seven shillings.

¹ Deut. XV. 19, 20; comp. XII. 17, 18; XIV. 23. ² Num. XVIII. 17, 18.

³ XIII. 2, 12, 13. ⁴ XV. 19—22.

of clean animals are to be sanctified to God, to be killed as *thank-offerings* at the national Sanctuary, and to be eaten by the Israelites; while the breast and the right shoulder fall to the share of the priests, as was the case with all thank-offerings.

c. The last and boldest measure is enjoined in Leviticus and Numbers,⁵ and was evidently promulgated at a time when the priests could venture, at least theoretically, to set forth their principles with rigorous consistency. The firstborn boys are to be redeemed, as before. Every firstborn unclean animal is either to be redeemed by its value *increased by one fifth* of it, or to be sold at an estimated price, and the money is in either case to be given over to the priests. Every firstborn clean animal belongs to God, that is, entirely to the priests, who are indeed to kill it as a thank-offering, with the usual rites, sprinkling the blood and burning the fat, but are then to receive not the breast and right shoulder alone, but all that remains of the animal, in accordance with the historical reason then distinctly urged, of the destruction of the firstborn Egyptians and the deliverance of the firstborn Hebrews at the time of the exodus:⁶ such a deviation might have appeared desirable in order to distinguish the remarkable thank-offerings of the firstborn from the ordinary sacrifices of the same class; it made them analogous to *public* thank-offerings,⁷ and, in some respect, brought them nearer to the nature of holocausts, and thus helped to recall their original character.

12. No less significant are the disagreements in the laws concerning the *Firstfruits*. In Numbers, all the firstfruits are unreservedly and exclusively assigned to the priests; but in Deuteronomy it is ordained that every Israelite shall "take of the first of all the fruit of the earth", and putting them into a basket, repair to the town of the common Sanctuary; here the priest shall place the basket "before the altar of the Lord", while the Israelite pronounces an address of praise and thanks-giving; after which "he shall rejoice in every good thing which the Lord has given to him and his house, he, and the Levite, and the stranger".⁸ Whether the firstfruits here treated of formed, or did not form, a part of the "good things" in which the Israelite was to rejoice at the succeeding repast in common with the Levite and the stranger, is of little importance; they were certainly insignificant as an impost and a source of revenue; they were carried even from distant parts in

⁵ Lev. XXVII. 26, 27; Num. XVIII. 15—18; III. 3.

⁶ Exod. XIII. 14, 15; though, therefore, the *law* in Exod. XIII. 12 is probably very old, the *reason* or the *explanation*

assigned to it is evidently a later addition of the revisers of the Pentateuch, in harmony with the spirit of the law of Leviticus.

⁷ Lev. XXIII. 20.

⁸ Deut. XXVI. 1—11.

a "basket"; they were evidently a symbol of the acknowledgment of God as the Bestower of all agricultural blessings, rather than a material gift; the whole command centred in the placing of the basket "before the Lord",¹ and in the pious address of the Israelite. But very different is the corresponding command in Numbers.² It assigns all the firstfruits unrestrictedly and exclusively to the priests: "All the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, their firstfruits, which the Israelites shall offer to the Lord, these I have given to thee (Aaron); whatsoever is first ripe in the land, which they shall bring to the Lord, shall be thine."³ It admits no Israelite or "stranger" to any share; "every one that is clean *in the priest's house* shall eat of them."⁴ It mentions no common meals in connection with them at the place of the national Sanctuary; and it is evidently meant to provide for the priestly order another and very considerable source of income. These striking differences in reference to the same subject have induced ancient and modern interpreters to suppose that two distinct laws are meant, and to take the precept in Deuteronomy as relating to firstfruits, while already the Mishnah and Jewish tradition understood the injunction in Numbers to mean "a great gift" or a part of the vegetable produce, which the Israelites, immediately after the conclusion of their labours with respect to it, and even before setting apart the tithes, appointed to the priests. We need hardly observe that the Pentateuch warrants no such division, which is analogous to the equally unfounded distinction between first, second, and third tithes, and has been prompted by kindred difficulties.

Now taking a larger scope, we proceed to survey the *general Revenues and Resources of the Priests and Levites*, excluding the tithes, the firstborn, and the firstfruits, and this review will inevitably lead to results analogous to those arrived at in the preceding sections.

13. It has not unfrequently been averred that it was the main object of the sacrificial system of the Pentateuch to provide for the comfortable sustenance of the priests and Levites. But nothing can be more erroneous. This view is overthrown by the fact alone that both the holocausts and the most solemn kinds of expiatory offerings, were burnt entirely; therefore, a large number of sacrifices served obviously no other than purely religious ends. However, it is equally certain that many of the sacrificial ordinances aimed, collaterally, at providing a competence for a tribe which owned no territorial property,

¹ Vers. 4, 10.

² Num. XVIII. 12, 13.

³ Comp. ver. 8, forming a comprehensive introduction to all the taxes

levied upon the "hallowed things", which shall belong as a portion "to Aaron and his sons by an ordinance for ever."
⁴ Ver. 13.

and was to be shielded from want or care because it might derogate from the efficiency of its spiritual functions. We may easily judge whether the portions assigned to them were in excess of their wants, and whether they were likely to have been given up from early times.

The priests received

a. Of *burnt-offerings*, the hide,⁵ an impost of very considerable value, since holocausts were probably the most frequent of all the sacrifices; and Philo observes distinctly,⁶ "the skins of burnt-offerings amount to an unspeakable number". However, it appears that originally the hide of holocausts was burnt among the Hebrews,⁷ as was the case among other nations, but that it was later assigned to the priests who were to have a share in all classes of offering, and especially in one so important and so common as the holocausts.⁸

b. With regard to the *private thank-offerings*, the priests were, according to Deuteronomy, to receive the *fore-shoulder*, the *two cheeks*, and the *man*,⁹ portions comparatively small in value; but, according to the middle Books, the *right shoulder* and the *breast*,¹⁰ considered as the choicest and most palatable parts, and generally reserved for distinguished persons or honoured guests. Various expedients of reconciling a contradiction so apparent and so fatal to the defenders of the unity of the Pentateuch, have been proposed; but all are necessarily unavailing.

Of the *public animal thank-offerings*, which seem to have been of later introduction, the priests could claim all the flesh.¹¹

c. Of all the *trespass-offerings*, and of those *sin-offerings* the blood of which was not sprinkled in the Holy, the priests appropriated to themselves the whole of the victims, with the exception of the fat and fat parts, which were to be burnt on the altar; and the flesh was to be eaten by the males, in the Court of the Sanctuary. As the blood of the sin-offerings of the High-priest and the whole nation only, not of the chiefs or common Israelites, was brought into the Holy,¹² the priests received those portions in the vast majority of cases; and it could, therefore, be said, without great inaccuracy, that they had a share in "all the sin-offerings and all the trespass-offerings of the Israelites".¹³

It may be interesting to compare herewith the corresponding laws or customs of the Carthaginians as recently disclosed by discovered inscriptions. According to the sacrificial tablet of Marseilles, the honorary

⁵ Lev. VII. 8. 18; comp. Exod. XXIX. 26, 27; Lev. VII. 28—34. ¹¹ Lev. XXIII. 20.
⁶ De Præm. c. 4. ⁷ Lev. I. 9. ¹² Lev. VI. 18—23; VII. 6, 7; XIV. 13.
⁸ See notes on VII. 8—10. ¹³ Num. XVIII. 9.
⁹ Deut. XVIII. 3. ¹⁰ Lev. VII. 30. comp. Ezek. XLIV. 28.
—32; X. 14, 15; Num. VI. 20; XVIII.

portion of the priests or *Mas'et* consisted only of a small quantity of meat of about one and a half pound in weight (150 *zuz* or drachmas); while the hide, the legs, and all the remaining meat were left to the worshipper, although occasionally the hide was allotted to the priests. Equally moderate was the tariff to be paid by the offerer to the priest instead of the various sacrifices, namely, for a bullock, whether to be presented as an offering of purification or thanksgiving, 10 shekels; for an ox or a ram to be killed for the same sacrifices, 5 shekels; for a he-goat or she-goat in the same cases, "one foreign shekel"; for a lamb or a kid of the goats, for a sheep that has born no young, or a stag, three-fourths of a foreign shekel; for a young marshbird, likewise three-fourths of a shekel; and for any other bird, if it is a firstling-sacrifice, or one to be presented with flour or oil, one shekel. But persons "poor in cattle" were, by public decrees, expressly exempted from all sacrificial imposts payable to the priests. According to the celebrated document of Halicarnassus, the priestess received, besides a salary, certain fees, and the produce of an annual collection, at all public sacrifices, the legs, the fourth part of the intestines, and the hides; at all private offerings, the same portions with the exception of the hides. And similar regulations obtained in Attica; the offered fruits and pastry fell commonly to the share of the priests.

d. Of the bloodless offerings, whether merely consisting of flour or in any way prepared by fire, and whether presented alone or as an accompaniment of animal sacrifices, the male priests were entitled to eat, in the Court of the Sanctuary, the whole except the "memorial", consisting of a handful together with the frank-incense, which was burnt on the altar.¹ The same was the case with the *firstfruit-offering* of roasted ears of corn,² and the *firstfruit-sheaf* presented on the second day of Passover.³ But the *shew-bread* of twelve cakes, renewed every week, belonged to them entirely;⁴ and so did the two *firstfruit-loaves* offered on Pentecost, of which nothing could be burnt on the altar, because they were leavened.⁵ Of the bloodless oblation presented in connection with the praise-offering, and composed of four kinds of cereal gifts, the officiating priest claimed one cake of each kind.⁶ And hence again it could be summarily said that the priests received "all the bloodless offerings of the Hebrews."⁷

e. Besides, a cake as *the first of the dough*,⁸ an impost or gift akin

¹ Lev. II. 3, 10; VI. 9, 11; VII. 9, 10.

² Lev. II. 14—16. ³ Lev. XXIII. 10.

⁴ Lev. XXIV. 9; Matth. XII. 4.

⁵ Lev. XXIII. 16—18, 20; comp. II. 11, 12; Exod. XXXIV. 22; Num. XXVIII. 26.

⁶ Lev. VII. 12—14; see notes *in loc.*

⁷ Num. XVIII. 9; comp. Ezek. XLIV.

29. ⁸ Num. XV. 18—21; comp.

Ezek. XLIV. 30; Nch. X. 38; also Rom.

XI. 6.

to the tithes, and like them originating in the desire of acknowledging God as the Bestower of every blessing. With these demands may be classed *the fruits of every young tree in the fourth year* after it was planted, those of the first three years being thrown away as useless;⁹ and the *first of the wool of sheep* required by the Deuteronomist,¹⁰ but not mentioned in any other part of the legislation. The quantity of the gifts is, in none of these cases, fixed by the Law, but was left to the pious impulses of the people.

f. The priests, moreover, received every thing that was *devoted*, whether animals, landed or other property, which, when "devoted," was considered so irrevocably sacred that it could on no account be redeemed.¹¹

g. They could claim the *fifth part* of the value of *sacred property* that had unawares been appropriated by an Israelite,¹² and *any property*, increased by the fifth part of its value, which had been *acquired by fraud*, if there was no legal representative of the defrauded person.¹³ It appears, moreover, that, for some periods, a *pecuniary fine* was attached to *sin-offerings*, as it was generally connected with trespass-offerings: for we read, "The money of the trespass-offering and the money of the sin-offering shall not be brought into the house of the Lord; it shall belong to the priests;"¹⁴ but this fine was later abolished evidently because incompatible with the spiritual nature of the sin-offerings, and unduly checking their free performance.¹⁵

h. It seems to have been the intention of the legislators, to allow to the priests and the Levites, though exempt from military service, a share in the *booty of war*. This is the obvious inference to be drawn from the arrangements said to have been made after the expedition against the Midianites.¹⁶ The entire spoil, with the exception of trinkets and precious metals, was divided into two halves, the one intended for the soldiers who had fought, the other for the people that had remained in the camp; of the former the priests received, by lot, one head of cattle and one captive of every 500; of the latter the Levites received one of every 50; of the gold and silver the soldiers offered gifts spontaneously for the sacred service "to make an atonement for their souls" and as a "memorial for the children of Israel before the Lord."¹⁷ This narrative with its accurate numerical details has evidently been inserted by the author

⁹ Lev. XIX. 23, 24; see notes *in loc.*

¹⁰ XVIII. 4.

¹¹ Lev. XXVII. 28; Num. XVIII. 14; comp. Ezek. XLIV. 29.

¹² Lev. V. 16; XXII. 14.

¹³ Num. V. 6—8; comp. vers. 9, 10.

¹⁴ 2 Ki. XII. 17.

¹⁵ See p. 182.

¹⁶ Num. XXXI. 26—47.

¹⁷ Num. I. c. vers. 50—54; comp. Josh. VI. 19, 24; 2 Sam. VIII. 11; 1 Chr. XXVI. 27, 28.

as a hint for imitation, although he makes no allusion to the custom observed in the matter at his time.¹

i. According to the enactments of the third and fourth Books of the Pentateuch, the priests and Levites were to live in 48 cities assigned to them, at least principally, as a part of the territory due to them as one of the tribes of Israel,² and were to receive, besides, a district of land comprising 2000 yards round each town in every direction³ as pasturage for their cattle,⁴ and deemed sufficient for their abodes and their sustenance. These cities, as far as they belonged to members of the tribe of Levi, were even to enjoy special privileges; for the houses and the fields could never be forfeited when sold, and were, without compensation, to be restored in the year of jubilee.⁵ However, in Deuteronomy, the Levites appear as living scattered throughout the land; they are constantly alluded to as being "within the gates" of the Israelites;⁶ and they are expressly permitted to settle wherever they might deem fit, "And if a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned and come with all the desire of his mind to the place which the Lord shall choose, then he shall minister in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren the Levites do who stand there before the Lord"⁷ — a passage which proves that the Levites, scantily cared for in the towns of the Israelites, had a tendency to congregate in the place of the central Sanctuary, where they were promised equal portions with those who had served there before, without losing whatever they might have realised by the sale of their patrimony. In fact, the very idea of Levitical towns with territorial domains, contradicts the fundamental notion that the Levites were to have no property, because God was their inheritance and their wealth. The Book of Joshua (XIV. 1) endeavours indeed to remove the contradictions; for it makes a distinction between "a share in the land" and "cities to dwell in with their suburbs for their cattle and their substance;" but this distinction, prompted as it is by apologetic reasons, is artificial and untenable; for 48 towns with a territorial addition to each, is nothing else but "a share in the land" or "an inheritance". Moreover, the Pentateuch itself is at variance with its own statements on the subject. The Levitical towns are already incidentally mentioned in the laws promulgated at Mount Sinai, and

¹ Comp., however, Josh. XXII. 8; 1 Sam. XXX. 24, 25; 2 Macc. VIII. 28, 30.

² Num. XXXV. 2.

³ Num. XXXV. 4, 5.

⁴ Num. XXXV. 1—5; comp. Josh. XIV. 4; XXI. 2—12; 1 Chr. VI. 46—66.

⁵ Lev. XXV. 32—34.

⁶ Deut. XII. 12, 18; XIV. 27, 29; XVI. 11.

⁷ Deut. XVIII. 6, 7; comp. Judg. XVII.

7—11; XIX. 1; 1 Sam. I. 1; see *infra* Sect. V.

made the object of legislative arrangements; and yet they are formally assigned to the Levites only about forty years later, "in the plains of Moab," and are there treated of as if they had never before been alluded to:⁹ those arrangements, so favourable to the Levites, must, therefore, fall *after* the encampment in Moab, that is, beyond the lifetime of Moses.

14. Now, if the Levites, free from all taxes and burdens, indeed received all the emoluments and gifts bestowed upon them in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, they could be certain of a life of ease and almost luxury. Even those members of the tribe who, for any reason, were unable to officiate in the Sanctuary, and especially to perform the sacrificial rites, for instance, those disqualified by some bodily defect, were considerably provided for. For it was ordained that, while in most cases the appurtenances fell to the share of the acting priest,¹⁰ they formed, in others, a common stock to be equally divided among all priests.¹¹ The position of the Levites was, therefore, well-established and commanding. They were indeed, as Philo observed, "invested by the Law with the dignity and honour that belongs to kings." Yet we find, in Deuteronomy, repeated and almost pitiful appeals made to the Israelites in their behalf. "Take heed that thou forsake not the Levite as long as thou livest upon the earth;"¹² and "the Levite that is within thy gate, thou shalt not forsake him; for he has no part nor inheritance with thee."¹³ They appear helpless like the poor, the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, and are generally included in the same recommendation to private charity;¹⁴ and their sustenance is derived not from a regular or legally defined income but from occasional relief. It is, therefore, evident, that the advantages of the Levites were but gradually gained; they could be secured with precaution only and by imperceptible steps. It was no easy task, requiring no ordinary amount of shrewdness and firmness, to deprive the Israelites of their natural rights in matters of religion; but it is probable that the privileges demanded in Leviticus and Numbers remained, on the whole, not much more than a priestly theory, and were seldom, if ever, actually granted to the Levites. In the historical Books of the Old Testament, it is only under the theocratic king Hezekiah and the zealous leader Nehemiah

⁸ Lev. XXV. 32—34; comp. XXVI. 46; XXVII. 34. ⁹ Num. XXXV. 1—5.

¹⁰ As the right shoulder in thank-offerings, or the cereal oblations baked in the oven, or dressed in a pan or pot.

¹¹ As the breast in thank-offerings, the shew-bread, and the cereal offer-

ings presented dry or merely mingled with oil.

¹² Dent. XII. 19.

¹³ XIV. 27, 29; X. 9; XII. 12, 18.

¹⁴ Dent. XII. 18; XIV. 29; XVI. 11, 14; XXVI. 11—13; comp. 1 Sam. II. 36; see *supra* p. 369.

that the firstfruits and tithes, the firstborn animals and other gifts, are reported to have been collected for the priests;¹ in earlier periods, they are never mentioned nor alluded to. It is as improbable in itself as it is opposed to the general laws of Levitical development, that the precepts of the Pentateuch represent the priests as having *lost* again a great part of the privileges once acquired. This unhistorical conclusion is forced upon those who place Leviticus chronologically before Deuteronomy. But it is simply a perversion of facts to contend that the Levites were more amply provided for by the laws of Deuteronomy than by those of the middle Books.

15. Though, therefore, the question whether the Levitical income, as fixed in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, was excessive or not, is of little practical moment; it is yet of considerable historical interest, as it is calculated to illustrate the character of an important part of the legislation. It is utterly inappropriate to found the claims of the Levites upon the plea that they had a legal right to the twelfth or thirteenth part of the territory of Canaan, which they ceded to the other tribes, and for which they could demand ample sustenance. It is true that the Book of Numbers represents the matter in this light; for it ordains that the towns should be given to the Levites "from the inheritance of their possession."² But it requires, after the preceding observations, no further arguments to prove that this is nothing but a Levitical view or rather pretence. The tribe of Levi had, by its own daring and recklessness, forfeited the territorial possessions which it might have owned; and, scattered through the land, it was compelled to seek subsistence by whatever means it could devise. In reality, the priests and Levites could fairly demand compensation for their ministerial and other services; and so their income is indeed regarded in some passages.³ But if tithes, firstfruits, and firstborn animals, their shares in holocausts and thank-offerings, in expiatory and bloodless oblations, the devoted property, the booty of war, the forty-eight towns with their surrounding districts, and the manifold minor privileges, are surveyed and computed, it will be found that the Levites received infinitely more than their due proportion. According to the double census, recorded in the Book of Numbers,⁴ the Israelites over twenty years of age amounted, in round figures, to 600,000, the Levites over one month to 22,000, which, at a very moderate calculation, would be about 17,000 over twenty years; the proportion of Levites to Israelites was, there-

¹ 2 Chr. XXXI. 4—8; Neh. X. 36—40; XII. 44; XIII. 5, 12, 31; Judith XI. 13; Tobit I. 7, 8; comp., however, Neh. XIII. 10; Mal. III. 8, 10.

² Num. XXXV. 2.

³ Num. XVIII. 21, 31.

⁴ Chapters I and XXVI.

fore, as 17,000 to 600,000; that is, the Levites formed about the *thirti-fifth* part of the Israelites. But by the tithes alone they received the *tenth* part of the whole agricultural produce of the soil and of the annual increase of cattle; one Levite had, therefore, from this source only, an income equivalent to that of three or four Israelites. If the other revenues are added, they must indeed be regarded as exorbitant; and it has been observed that if all the enactments of the Pentateuch had been carried out, the priests would soon, without working, have acquired all the property of the land. Though the Levites increased, their income grew proportionately; for industry and agriculture, and therefore the Levitical revenues, kept pace with the growth of the population; and in some periods, the territory or arable land of the Hebrews was considerably enlarged. It is irrelevant to enquire whether all the prescribed imposts were burdensome to the Israelites or not in a land of remarkable fertility; the question is, whether they were fairly required for the sustenance of the Levites. If wealth was obtained through the fruitfulness of the soil, it belonged more justly to those who produced it by their exertions. And it is against the spirit of the Pentateuch to suppose that the Levites were required to bear the expenditure for the costly worship of the Sanctuary; for all offerings were indispensably to be the gift and property of those in whose name they were presented; the *public* offerings, therefore, must have been provided by the *people*. Hence it will be admitted that the ordinances of the middle Books regarding the Levitical income, were suggested not by expediency or the actual requirements of the case, but by those principles of theocratic rule which the Pentateuch saw fit to enforce by every possible device. The tithes, the firstfruits, the firstborn, and the 48 cities were to be given to God's ministers, because they were looked upon as properly belonging to Him as the true owner of the land and its produce. Portions of the sacrifices and the whole of the devoted property were allowed to the priests, because all offerings and hallowed objects were regarded in the same light. All these laws were the consistent results of a peculiar theory; they were the ideal claims of a priesthood founded upon an ideal political organisation; and they hence inevitably overlooked or disregarded the considerations of equity and justice.

IV. DEVIATIONS FROM THE LEVITICAL LAWS FOUND IN THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Our views of the origin, date, and gradual development of Levitical institutions are very significantly confirmed by a comparison between the regulations of the Pentateuch and the independent, because inci-

dental, statements scattered in other parts of the Hebrew canon, which comparison will afford us another welcome clue to the chronology of the Law.

1. It is true that the historical Books mention various facts in harmony with the precepts of the Pentateuch. To a certain extent, the High-priests, in the first times after the settlement in Canaan, are in accordance with the Levitical directions. Aaron is succeeded by Eleazar, the eldest of his surviving sons, the two first, Nadab and Abihu, having died before him.¹ Eleazar is followed by his son Phinehas, whom we find in office in the early periods of the Judges.² When, in the time of Joshua, the transjordanic population erected an altar on the eastern side of the river, and the other tribes, incensed at their supposed revolt against God, were bent upon a war of extermination, the High-priest Phinehas was at the head of the tribunal, which amicably settled the threatening rupture;³ and in the war between Benjamin and the other tribes, he consulted the Ark of the Covenant in the name of the people,⁴ as, later, the priests are stated to have sought oracles by the Urim and Thummim.⁵ It is likely that Phinehas was in his dignity succeeded by some of his direct descendants; for the High-priesthood was supposed to have been promised "to him and to his seed after him," because he had evinced ardent and pious zeal.⁶ Towards the end of that epoch, Eli, believed to be descended from Ithamar, and certainly belonging to the stock of Aaron or the oldest priestly family,⁷ was both High-priest and Judge.⁸ In the reign of the three first kings, are mentioned as High-priests two sons of Ahitub, the grandson of Eli, through Phinehas, namely Abiah⁹ and his brother Ahimelech,¹⁰ and Abiathar, the son of Ahimelech.¹¹ The numerous priests likewise who served at Nob, seem to have been relatives.¹² In fact, "a man of God" is reported to have said to Eli, "Thus says the Lord, did I plainly appear to the house of thy father, when they were in Egypt in Pharaoh's house? And did I choose him out of all the tribes of Israel to be My priest, to offer upon My altar, to burn incense, to wear an ephod before Me? and did I give to the house of thy father all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel?"¹³ — which words not only imply an uninterrupted

¹ Josh. XIV. 1; XVII. 4; XIX. 51; XXI. 1; XXIV. 33; comp. Num. III. 32; XX. 25; Deut. X. 6.

² Josh. XXII. 30—32; Judg. XX. 27, 28.

³ Josh. XXII. 30sqg.; comp. XVII. 4.

⁴ Judg. XX. 27, 28.

⁵ Ezra II. 63; Neh. VII. 65.

⁶ Num. XXV. 11—13.

⁷ 1 Sam. II. 27—30.

⁸ 1 Sam. I. 9; IV. 18.

⁹ 1 Sam. XIV. 3.

¹⁰ 1 Sam. XXII. 11, 12.

¹¹ 1 Sam. XXII. 20.

¹² 1 Sam. XXII. 11, 16, 18.

¹³ 1 Sam. II. 27, 28.

priesthood, hereditary in Aaron's family, from the time of the exodus, but also a regular sacrificial service with appointed functionaries. Levites were employed as priests for public worship,¹¹ and were preferred as ministers for private or domestic devotions, as is evident from the instance of Micah.¹⁵ When, in the time of Samuel, the Ark was returned by the Philistines to Beth-shemesh, the Levites took charge of it and carried it;¹⁶ for although that town was meant to be a priestly city,¹⁷ the text distinguishes strictly between "Levites" and "inhabitants of Beth-shemesh."¹⁸ The Levites took the Ark from the vehicle which the people broke into pieces for the sacrifice;¹⁹ and though, at the subsequent removal of the Ark, the Levites are not again mentioned, they were usually entrusted with its transport by David²⁰ and Solomon;²¹ yet, on extraordinary occasions, that office was confided to the *priests*, as at the passage of the Israelites over the Jordan under Joshua,²² or at the siege and capture of Jericho,²³ or when the blessing and the curse were recited before Mount Ebal and Mount Gerizim,²⁴ and of course at the completion of the Temple, when the Ark was finally deposited in the Holy of Holies, while the Levites carried the other implements of the Tabernacle.²⁵ David availed himself of the services of the priests Abiathar and Zadok in appealing to the elders of Judah.²⁶ Priests anointed kings, and were, on various occasions, prominently employed in political matters of importance.²⁷ Under David, 6,000 Levites were civil officers and judges.²⁸ When Jeroboam appointed priests from all sections of the people "that were not of the sons of Levi,"²⁹ the Levites emigrated from his dominions, and settled in the rival empire of Judah.³⁰ The king Jehoshaphat instituted a court of law composed of Levites, priests, and heads of families, and presided over by the High-priest; he appointed Levites to places in the public service,³¹ and he sent priests and Levites to all the towns of Judah to instruct the people in the Law.³² King Hezekiah availed

¹⁴ Joel I. 9, 13; II. 17; etc.

¹⁵ Judg. XVII. 13; comp. also 1 Ki. XII. 31; XIII. 33, 34.

¹⁶ 1 Sam. VI. 15; comp., however, *infra*.

¹⁷ Josh. XXI. 16; 1 Chr. VI. 11.

¹⁸ Ver. 15. ¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ 2 Sam. XV. 24; 1 Chr. XV. 2, 12, 14, 15, 27; comp. XXIII. 26.

²¹ 2 Chr. V. 4.

²² Josh. III. 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17; IV. 9, 10, 16, 18.

²³ Josh. VI. 6, 12. ²⁴ Josh. VIII. 33.

²⁵ 1 Ki. VIII. 3, 4, 6—11; 2 Chr. V. 5—7; comp. 1 Ki. II. 26.

²⁶ 2 Sam. XIX. 12.

²⁷ 1 Ki. I. 7, 39; etc.

²⁸ 1 Chr. XXIII. 4; comp. XXVI. 29; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 13.

²⁹ 1 Ki. XII. 31; comp. XIII. 33.

³⁰ 2 Chr. XI. 13, 14; *see infra*.

³¹ 2 Chr. XIX. 8—11.

³² 2 Chr. XVII. 7—9; comp. XXXV. 3, 15; Neh. VIII. 9—11.

himself of Levites for the execution of his reforms.¹ In the time of Shalmanassar priests taught the Assyrians who had settled in the territory of Israel.² The High-priest Hilkiah, in the reign of Josiah, had the control over the treasures of the Temple.³ The priests were accustomed, during the period of their official duties, to abstain from sexual intercourse.⁴ Tithes, firstlings, and other gifts were abundantly offered in the reign of the theocratic king Hezekiah and in the time of Nehemiah.⁵

2. But all these facts are very far from establishing the existence of a Levitical organisation like that described in the Pentateuch. They show indeed a growing influence of priests and Levites, and render their ultimate power intelligible; but it must be urged, that many of these facts and incidents belong to a very late period of Hebrew history, and that the greatest part of them is derived from the Books of Chronicles, an unreliable source compiled at a time when the Levites had attained their highest hierarchical authority, and written with the purpose of strengthening and glorifying it. It is this source alone which attributes to David the division of the priests into 24, and of the Levites into 4 classes, and which mentions, under Hezekiah, a complete distribution of offices and duties among the whole tribe.⁶ We should not be justified in accepting these statements as historical, unless they be confirmed or rendered probable by other and more trustworthy testimonies. But such confirmation is furnished from no source; on the contrary, we are able to point out, in the historical Books, many serious deviations from the Levitical Law. We do not lay much stress, for this purpose, upon discrepancies described and censured as unlawful by the historians themselves, as the reckless conduct of the sons of Eli, who took of the sacrifices cooked instead of raw meat, and demanded their portions before the fat and the fat parts had been burnt on the altar;⁷ or upon the facts that David, the layman, partook of the shew-bread in a time of necessity and distress,⁸ or that the Ark was, in exceptional cases, carried by the priests and not the Levites,⁹ or that the rebellious Jeroboam appointed priests "of any class of the people who were not of the sons of Levi;"¹⁰ nor do we attach much importance to the circumstance that thirteen priestly towns seem to be out of all proportion to the requirements of the priests, the sons of

¹ 2 Chr. XXX. 22.

² 2 Ki. XVII. 27, 28; comp. Jer. XVIII. 18; Ezek. XLIV. 23, 24; Mal. II. 7.

³ 2 Ki. XXII. 4.

⁴ 1 Sam. XXI. 5. ⁵ See *supra* p. 383.

⁶ 2 Chr. XXXI. 12—17.

⁷ 1 Sam. II. 12—17; see p. 29.

⁸ 1 Sam. XXI. 4—7.

⁹ Josh. III. 3, 6, 8, 13, 14, 17, etc.;

¹⁰ 1 Ki. XII. 31; 2 Chr. XI. 13, 14.

Eleazar and Ithamar, who at the time of the occupation of Canaan, could have hardly numbered more than a dozen souls, since the priestly towns are introduced as a prospective arrangement, designed to meet the wants of a future age. And it may be accidental that the long white linen robe, a chief garment of the common priests, which in the historical Books is always called *ephod*,¹¹ is in Exodus described by the name of *kethoneth* or *tunic*,¹² though if the former was indeed entirely identical with the latter, it might surprise us to find no allusion whatever to its peculiar "tesselated" workmanship.¹³

3. But irrespective of these doubtful yet remarkable and questionable disagreements, there are others of an indisputable and more decided character.

The office of the *High-priest*, its peculiar nature and significance, belong to the most remarkable and specific features of the system of the Pentateuch. But in many respects, no trace of it is found elsewhere. For a long time, it was even without a special name; the High-priest was simply called "the priest";¹⁴ the appellations "the anointed priest" or "the great" or "chief priest" were adopted at later epochs when the hierarchy was systematically regulated, and the various functions distinctly fixed. The elder prophets never mention the term High-priest. Jehoiadah who saved and concealed Joash, and secured for him the throne, was certainly a priest of particular and exceptional authority, though he is never called High-priest;¹⁵ mentioned as such is first that Hilkiah who became so famous by the discovery of the Book of the Law.¹⁶ In several periods, we find two chief priests, evidently endowed with equal authority; so in the time of David and Solomon, Zadok and Abiathar,¹⁷ or Zadok and Ahimelech,¹⁸ one of the line of Eleazar and one of that of Ithamar;¹⁹ whereas, according to the very nature of the dignity, the High-priesthood could be held by *one* individual only at a time; and one only was ordained and is invariably alluded to in the Pentateuch.²⁰

4. In a similar manner, the High-priesthood as instituted in the Pentateuch, was necessarily held for life, and could be lost by death

¹¹ 1 Sam. II. 18; XXII. 18; 2 Sam. VI. 14.

¹² Exod. XXVIII. 4; XXXIX. 27.

¹³ See Comm. on Exod. p. 399.

¹⁴ Exod. XXIX. 30; Lev. XXI. 21; Josh. XIV. 1; etc.

¹⁵ Comp. 2 Ki. XII. 8.

¹⁶ 2 Ki. XXII. 4. See p. 28.

¹⁷ 2 Sam. XV. 24—29, 35; XVII. 15;

XIX. 12; XX. 25; 1 Chr. XV. 11; 1 Ki. IV. 4.

¹⁸ 2 Sam. VIII. 17; 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 6, 31.

¹⁹ 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 6.

²⁰ Exod. XXIX. 30; Lev. IV. 3, 5, 16; VI. 15; VIII. 7—9; XXI. 10; Num. XXXV. 25, 28; see also *supra* pp. 354—357.

alone;¹ for the spirit of God had, by the sacred anointment, been poured out upon the holy representative of the people. But we find that, for a long time, the High-priest was under the control of the secular, and particularly the royal power; he could be removed if disliked or objected to, and especially if his political views were opposed to the king's party. Ahimelech, though animated by the most scrupulous loyalty towards Saul, was with his whole house mercilessly massacred, because he had assisted David in his flight.² Solomon deposed the High-priest Abiathar, and appointed Zadok in his stead.³

5. It was evidently the intention of the Law that the father should be followed in the High-priesthood, if not by his firstborn son, at least by one of his sons, in regular succession. It is observed, in reference to Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, "He and his seed after him shall have the covenant of an everlasting priesthood."⁴ But supposed even that the office was preserved in the line of Eleazar up to the time of Eli, it is admitted on all hands that, with Eli, it passed into the branch of Ithamar. Now follow indeed some of Eli's descendants, Abiah, Ahimelech and Abiathar; but then the line breaks off and begins anew with Zadok the son of Ahitub,⁵ the ancestor of the chief priesthood in the Temple.⁶ That Ahitub, the father of Zadok, is not identical with Ahitub, the father of Abiah and Ahimelech, is unquestionable from historical statements. The whole family of Eli was for ever to be excluded from the chief priesthood on account of the iniquity of his sons, though some were, to their own vexation, always to be employed for poor and paltry offices.⁷ This prediction was realised first by the death of Eli's sons Hophni and Phinehas;⁸ then by the slaughter of the whole house of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, numbering eighty-five persons, when Abiathar alone, a son of Ahimelech, escaped, but no Zadok;⁹ and lastly by the degrading removal of Abiathar, that last scion of Eli's house, when, as the historian expressly remarks, "the word was fulfilled which the Lord had spoken concerning the house of Eli in Shiloh,"¹⁰ and when, in Abiathar's place, Zadok was installed,¹¹ who was, therefore, manifestly that "faithful priest", whom according to the same prophecy, God selected irrespectively of birth and succession, solely from merit, for ever to perpetuate the holy

¹ Comp. Num. XXXV. 25, 28.

² 1 Sam. XXII. 9—19.

³ 1 Ki. II. 26, 35.

⁴ Num. XXV. 13; comp. 1 Sam. II. 35.

⁵ 2 Sam. VIII. 17; XV. 24, 29, 35, 36; XVII. 15; XIX. 12; 1 Chr. XXIV. 3, 6; comp. Ezra VII. 1—5.

⁶ Ezek. XL. 46; XLIII. 19; XLIV. 15.

⁷ 1 Sam. II. 31—33, 36.

⁸ Ver. 34; IV. 11.

⁹ 1 Sam. XXII. 11—20.

¹⁰ 1 Ki. II. 26, 27.

¹¹ Ver. 35.

dignity during the reign of His anointed kings, because he acted in obedience to His will.¹² Therefore, the chief priests of the Temple occupied their offices not by right of uninterrupted or hereditary succession: and they did not accord with the requirements ordained by the Pentateuch.

6. The Levites did not, during the whole of the historical time, live exclusively in the towns assigned to them in the Pentateuch, but in any part of the country. A Levite had, in the period of the Judges, resided in Beth-lehem in Judah; but desirous of change, evidently on account of poverty and want, he "departed out of the city from Beth-lehem-Judah to sojourn wherever he could find a place;"¹³ he settled, for a time, in mount Ephraim, till he was happy to follow the Danites northward, and to remain with them in the ancient town Laish.¹⁴ Another Levite is related to have lived "on the side of mount Ephraim."¹⁵ Elkanah, the Levite,¹⁶ resided in Ramathaim-Zophim, in Ephraim;¹⁷ and priests settled in Nob which was hence called "a town of priests", and where they established a regular worship.¹⁸ Some have indeed attempted to prove that, down to the time of Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the "majority" of the Levites lived in the towns set apart for them; but the arguments are unsafe, being derived from statements of the Chronist.¹⁹ The same source has supplied equally untenable pleas for explaining the helplessness of the tribe; for it contends that the Levites who, in Jeroboam's time, resided in the empire of Ephraim, in order to escape from that king's idolatrous measures, emigrated and repaired to Judah;²⁰ but as they could not be accommodated in the thirteen priestly towns of the kingdom, they were compelled to wander about homeless in search of abodes, and were, therefore, recommended to the charity and pity of the pious. We will not even urge that the older account relates nothing of such an emigration;²¹ that, on the contrary, it speaks of god-fearing and learned priests of Jehovah in the empire of Ephraim.²² If the law in Numbers with regard to the Levitical towns and their surrounding districts had existed, it would have been a sacred duty of the government and the people, adequately to provide for the holy representatives of God, to assign to them fixed dwellings,

¹² 1 Sam. II. 30, 35. This "faithful priest" is therefore not Samuel, as many infer from passages like 1 Sam. VII. 3, 4; IX. 12, 13;

¹³ Judg. XVII. 7, 8.

¹⁴ Judg. XVIII. 20, 30, 31.

¹⁵ Judg. XIX. 1.

¹⁶ 1 Chr. VI. 12, 13, 18, 19; see *infra*.

¹⁷ Comp. also 1 Sam. VI. 15, where *Levites* are mentioned as dwelling in the *priestly town* Beth-shemesh.

¹⁸ 1 Sam. XXI. 1—19; XXII. 19.

¹⁹ 1 Chr. XIII. 2; 2 Chr. XI. 13; XIII. 9 *sqq.*

²⁰ 2 Chr. XI. 15—18.

²¹ 1 Ki. XII. 31; XIII. 33.

²² 2 Ki. XVII. 27, 28.

and to secure to them in their new homes those privileges which, from devotion to the true faith, they had so magnanimously abandoned. There is, moreover, no trace of Levitical towns after the exile, in the arrangements of Ezra and Nehemiah; it is, on the contrary, stated, that Jews, priests, Levites, and servants of the Temple lived together in Jerusalem and the other cities of Judah, "every one in his inheritance."¹

7. Again, the list of the priestly and Levitical towns contained in the Book of Joshua differs materially from that furnished by the Chronist.² The latter, though correctly stating the aggregate number of towns assigned to each branch of the tribe, enumerates only 42 out of the 48 cities, evidently because he was unable to supply a complete list; but if the towns had really been set apart for so specific a purpose from early times, it would have been an easy matter for any writer to obtain the necessary information. Again, the two lists have but 26 names in common, that is, little more than one half of the whole; 5 are slightly different, and may be accounted for by a deviating orthography or by provincial and dialectic shades; the rest are utterly discrepant; this is the more surprising as the list in the Book of Chronicles does not, as might perhaps be conjectured, refer to a later time or a second distribution, but to the very same early period of Hebrew history related in the Book of Joshua:³ circumstances which must prove to every unbiassed critic that, as we have above shown from other arguments, the injunction regarding the Levitical towns was never carried out and remained a pious wish of the priestly order. Indeed even Ezekiel in his freely created institutions introduces no priestly towns; according to his arrangements, all the priests live round the Sanctuary, as their functions indeed demanded; he there assigns to them a space of 25,000 yards in length and 10,000 yards in breadth, and there orders their houses to be built.⁴

8. The Levites were, according to the regulations of the Pentateuch, to serve from the 30th or 25th to the 50th year of their lives;⁵ but David is related to have fixed the time of admission at 20 years;⁶ the same rule obtained in the time of Hezekiah⁷ and after the return from exile under Zerubbabel⁸ — a disagreement which places the fluctuations on the same subject within the Pentateuch itself into a still stronger light. The Chronist⁹ accounts for the modification under

¹ Neh. XI. 3, 10—14, 18, 20, 22, 36;

¹ Chr. IX. 10—13; comp. Deut. XVIII. 6—8.

² Josh. XXI. 2—42; 1 Chr. VI. 40—66.

³ Comp. 1 Chr. VI. 39—41.

⁴ Ezek. XLV. 3—5; XLVIII. 10—14.

⁵ See p. 371. ⁶ 1 Chr. XXIII. 24, 27.

⁷ 2 Chr. XXXI. 17. ⁸ Ezra III. 8.

⁹ 1 Chr. XXIII. 26.

David by urging that, from his time, the Levites had no longer to carry the Tabernacle and its vessels, and this has, by apologetic writers, been described as a "spiritual" interpretation of the Law, since "a longer but easier service is equivalent to a shorter but heavier one." But it is impossible to see why men of 20 years were not as well qualified to bear the utensils as men of 25. There evidently existed no decided and uniform practice at all; and legislators and historians stated the age either in accordance with the general custom of their time, or they attempted to fix one in harmony with their particular views regarding the character and functions of the Levites.

9. Among minor discrepancies we shall only advert to the following. When the Philistines brought back the Ark of the Covenant to Beth-shemesh, we are told, that the people of this town "lifted up their eyes, and saw the Ark and rejoiced to see it";¹⁰ this sacred implement was, therefore, exposed to view, and not wrapped up, as is commanded in Numbers;¹¹ and for this reason, the town was visited by a fearful plague which carried off upwards of 50,000 souls, "because they had looked upon the Ark of the Lord."¹² Now, it is further related, "The Levites took down the Ark of the Lord";¹³ they could, therefore, not help seeing it; but this is plainly against the law of the Pentateuch, which, for such offence, threatens quick and inevitable destruction not only to the Levites, but also to the priests whose duty it was to watch jealously over their sacred privileges.¹⁴ But the narrative alludes to no such punishment. The people suffered, but the Levites escaped. Thus another proof confirms the view that, in earlier times, the strict distinction between priests and Levites established by the Pentateuch did not exist.

When king Hezekiah was severely pressed by Sennacherib, he sent to Isaiah, besides other high officials, also the "elders of the priests" in mourning attire, "covered with sackcloth", with the request that he should pray for the welfare of the land;¹⁵ but all marks of mourning were by the Pentateuch forbidden to the priests except for the nearest relatives, and to the High-priest even for these. — The same king went himself into the Temple with the menacing letter he had received from the king of Assyria, and "spread it before the Lord", and there prayed "before the Lord."¹⁶

10. The historical Books offer a very considerable number of in-

¹⁰ 1 Sam. VI. 13. ¹¹ Num. IV. 5, 6.

¹² Ver. 19. It is incorrect to translate, as the Engl. Vers. does, "because they had looked *into* the Ark." ¹³ Ver. 15.

¹⁴ Num. IV. 15, 20; see p. 358.

¹⁵ 2 Ki. XIX. 2.

¹⁶ 2 Ki. XIX. 14, 15; comp., however, XXIII. 2, 3.

stances of non-Levites performing the functions rigidly reserved for Levites or priests, and not to be undertaken by others under penalty of excision. The following are some of the principal incidents.

Gideon, of the tribe of Manasseh, offered sacrifices at Ophrah;¹ Manoah, of the tribe of Dan, at Zareah.² Micah, a man of mount Ephraim, appointed one of his sons as priest for his domestic sanctuary, evidently without any particular solemnity.³ The inhabitants of Kirjath-jearim "sanctified" Eleazar, the son of Abinadab, the Israelite, to keep the Ark of the Covenant which remained under similar charge "a long time", at least twenty years.⁴ Samuel, the Levite, and not one of the priests who were supposed to have accompanied the army, offered the sacrifice before the encounter of the Hebrews with the Philistines;⁵ and on a later occasion, Saul performed the same rite, though on this account severely reprimanded by Samuel.⁶ The latter, according to the laws of the Pentateuch equally disqualified, since he was certainly no Aaronite, supposed even that his duties at the Sanctuary in Shiloh under the direction of Eli did not exceed the strictly Levitical functions,⁷ built an altar at Ramah, his ordinary residence;⁸ he "blessed the sacrifices" presented by the people;⁹ and he offered a heifer in the house of Jesse.¹⁰ Saul and David consulted the Ark¹¹ and the Urim and Thummim,¹² though possibly under the direction of a priest.¹³ When transferring the Ark from the house of Obed-Edom in Gath to Jerusalem, David, dressed in the linen ephod, presented holocausts and thank-offerings, and blessed the people in the name of God;¹⁴ and he sacrificed again, at the time of the pestilence, on the threshing-floor of Araunah.¹⁵ David's sons, and Zabud the son of the prophet Nathan, were priests.¹⁶ Ahitophel performed the sacrifices in his native town Giloh.¹⁷ Solomon offered a thousand holocausts on the great height at Gibeon;¹⁸ later he presented holocausts and thank-offerings before the Ark at Jerusalem;¹⁹ he himself, though

¹ Judg. VI. 26. ² Judg. XIII. 19, 20.

³ Judg. XVII. 5.

⁴ 1 Sam. VII. 1, 2.

⁵ 1 Sam. VII. 9, 10.

⁶ 1 Sam. XIII. 9—14.

⁷ Comp., however, 1 Sam. III. 3.

⁸ 1 Sam. VII. 17. ⁹ 1 Sam. IX. 12, 13.

¹⁰ 1 Sam. XVI. 2, 5.

¹¹ 1 Sam. XIV. 37; XXIII. 2.

¹² 1 Sam. XXVIII. 6.

¹³ 1 Sam. XIV. 36; comp. 1 Sam. XXIII. 9; XXX. 7.

¹⁴ 2 Sam. VI. 14, 17, 18.

¹⁵ 2 Sam. XXIV. 25.

¹⁶ 2 Sam. VIII. 18; 1 Ki. IV. 5; but 1 Chr. XVIII. 17 has instead of *priests* the words: *the first at the king's hand* (Engl. Vers. *chief about the king*).

¹⁷ 2 Sam. XV. 12.

¹⁸ 1 Ki. III. 2—4; comp., however, 2 Chr. I. 3, 13; see Comm. on Gen. p. 506.

¹⁹ 1 Ki. III. 15.

priests were present and assisted him,²⁰ consecrated the Temple, sacrificed, blessed the people, and prayed in their name;²¹ and then three times every year he offered sacrifices and burnt incense in the Temple.²² The pious king Uzziah (B. C. 811 to 759) did not hesitate to do the same.²³ Ahaz offered sacrifices and libations on the new altar which he caused to be constructed on a model sent from Damascus.²⁴ But on the other hand, we find priests employed in warfare. Abiathar was one of David's zealous followers at the time of his earlier adventures. More than 8,000 armed Levites and priests were, according to the Chronist, among his supporters in his war for the royalty over Israel.²⁵ Zadok was in his youth a valiant hero.²⁶ His son Ahimaaz, who took an active interest in the struggles of his time, was chiefly distinguished by swiftness and resolute action.²⁷ Benaiah, the son of the priest Jehoiada, was a captain of the royal guard and a general in the reign of David and Solomon.²⁸ Azariah, the son of the chief priest Zadok, was, by the latter sovereign, appointed to a political office.²⁹ The priest Jehoiada directed the revolt which caused the downfall and death of Athaliah, and the elevation and accession of Joash.³⁰ The same military spirit and genius were preserved in the tribe of Levi, shone with greatest lustre in the later periods of Hebrew history, and were rendered famous by the patriotic and brilliant exploits of the priestly Maccabees and the adroit manoeuvres of the priest Josephus.³¹

In fact, all the Levitical ordinances of the Pentateuch are so continually contravened, almost during the whole period from Joshua down to the completion of the Temple and considerably beyond it, that their existence during this time cannot be admitted. The discrepancies prove irrefutably that the priesthood was then freely permitted to all Israelites, especially such as were distinguished by birth or social position.

We now proceed, lastly, to attempt

V. A HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE ORDER OF PRIESTHOOD AMONG THE HEBREWS.

1. At first, and as long as primitive customs prevailed among the Hebrews, the head of each family performed the sacerdotal functions.

²⁰ 1 Ki. VIII. 3—6, 10, 11.

²¹ 1 Ki. VIII. 5—66.

²² 1 Ki. IX. 25; comp. XIX. 21.

²³ 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

²⁴ 2 Ki. XVI. 12, 13; see pp. 34, 35.

²⁵ 1 Chr. XII. 26—28; comp. 2 Chr. XX. 21, 22; see also XIII. 12.

²⁶ 1 Chr. XII. 28, comp. 1 Chr. XXVI. 6—8; 2 Chr. XXVI. 17.

²⁷ 2 Sam. XVIII. 19 *sqq.*

²⁸ 1 Chr. XXVII. 5; 1 Ki. II. 25, 35; IV. 1; comp. 2 Sam. VIII. 18. XX. 23.

²⁹ 1 Ki. IV. 2, 4; comp. II. 35.

³⁰ 2 Ki. XI. 2; 2 Chr. XXIII; comp. also XIII. 12, 14.

³¹ Comp. 2 Macc. VIII. 1. See, in general, Comm. on Gen. pp. 565—598.

This was the more easily feasible because religious acts and rituals were then of the simplest and plainest nature. Such practice is recorded in the history of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who, wherever an occasion required it, built altars, offered sacrifices, and directed purifications for themselves and their households.¹ It is related in the narrative of the exodus of their descendants from Egypt, when the chief of every house performed all the rites connected with the paschal sacrifice.² It is stated with regard to the "young men of the children of Israel", who assisted Moses in the ceremonies of the covenant concluded between God and the people after the proclamation of the fundamental laws,³ whether they were the firstborn or any of the sons deemed most fit for the task and appointed by the father.⁴ It is recorded with regard to Jesse,⁵ Ahitophel,⁶ and others.⁷ Long before the installation of the Levites into their clerical offices we find mention of "priests who come near the Lord",⁸ who manifestly belonged to all tribes of Israel alike, and were probably not all firstborn. Thus the Ephraimite Joshua remained constantly in the tent of Moses which served as the "Tent of Meeting", ministered to him,⁹ and accompanied him even on Mount Sinai,¹⁰ while Aaron stayed in the camp with the Israelites.¹¹ Even the services of women were permitted.¹² Moreover, the priestly dignity was combined with that of military leadership and royalty, and generals and kings were commonly also supreme judges, as Gideon and Samuel, Saul, David, and Solomon. The Hebrews shared these practices with most of the other ancient nations. Thus Melchizedek, king of Salem, was High-priest,¹³ and was, therefore, later regarded by the Jews as the type of the Messiah, by the Christians as the type of Christ.¹⁴ Jethro, the Midianite, was both emir and priest.¹⁵ In the heroic times, the Greek kings were at once military leaders, judges, and pontiffs. The same was the case with the Italic and Roman princes and kings, and later with the emperors. In the time of the Re-

¹ Gen. XII. 7, 8; XIII. 18; XXI. 33; XXVI. 25; XXXI. 54; XXXIII. 20; XXXV. 1—4; XLVI. 1; comp. IV. 3, 4; VIII. 20; see pp. 15—17.

² Exod. XII. 7, 22; comp. also III. 13; V. 3; X. 25.

³ Exod. XXIV. 5, 6.

⁴ Comp. Judg. XVII. 5; also Exod. XXIV. 11. ⁵ 1 Sam. XX. 6.

⁶ 2 Sam. XV. 12.

⁷ Comp. Job I. 5; XLII. 8 (for the Book of Job, though composed at a

late period, describes patriarchal life and manners); Gen. VIII. 20; etc.; see p. 28.

⁸ Exod. XIX. 22, 24.

⁹ Exod. XXXIII. 7, 11.

¹⁰ Exod. XXIV. 13.

¹¹ Comp., however, Exod. XIX. 24; XXIV. 1. ¹² See *supra* p. 352.

¹³ Gen. XIV. 18; Ps. CX. 4.

¹⁴ Hebr. VI. 20; VII. 1—3; see pp. 150—153.

¹⁵ Exod. II. 16; III. 1; XVIII. 1, 12.

public, the functions that had been discharged by the king, passed to the *rex sacrorum*: the name was designed to recall the primitive arrangement, although the "rex" was wholly stripped of political power, excluded from all offices of state, and elected by the colleges of pontiffs and augurs.

2. These customs were, on the whole, preserved up to the early period of the Hebrew monarchy. But there lived, scattered throughout the territory of the commonwealth, the tribe of Levi, weakened by temerity and execrated for cruelty, without social influence and territorial possession, unsettled, roaming, and helpless. This was still the position of the Levites not only in the later part of the period of the Judges, when, unable to punish the Benjamites for a brutal crime, they were obliged to invoke the aid of all the other tribes;¹⁶ but it was their condition in the earlier time of the divided empire as depicted in the last address of Jacob, "Simeon and Levi are brethren; an instrument of violence is their burning rage, into their council my soul shall not come; in their assembly my glory shall not join: for in their anger they slew men, and in their self-will they hamstrung oxen. Cursed be their anger, for it is fierce, and their wrath, for it is cruel: I will disperse them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel."¹⁷

Yet a portion of this tribe, represented by the glorious names of Moses and Aaron, had, at some early period of Hebrew history, distinguished itself by ardent and pious zeal in the cause of religion.¹⁸ Levites were therefore even in the time of the Judges not only admitted but preferred for priestly offices, both in the pure worship of Jehovah and that of pagan deities.¹⁹ It was they who chiefly carried the Ark of the Covenant.²⁰ They taught and judged the people, obtained influence as advisers of the kings, and acquired the control of the treasures of the Temple. Gradually they devoted themselves entirely to priestly pursuits, which at once secured subsistence to themselves and relieved the chiefs of families from duties often burdensome and inconveniently interfering with their general occupations. They were at first not numerous, and they acted without connection, organisation, or systematic distribution. The Danites had at one time no more than one priest;²¹ in Shiloh, Eli officiated with his two sons, assisted by Samuel,²² and later Ahiah.²³ But they gradually increased, since at Nob

¹⁶ Judg. XIX. 29 *sqq.*

¹⁷ Gen. XLIX. 5—7; see Comm. on Gen. pp. 498—499.

¹⁸ Deut. XXXIII. 8, 9; Ex. XXXII. 27—29; Num. XXV. 6—13; comp. XVII. 11—13.

¹⁹ See Judg. XVII. 10, 11, XVIII. 19; 1 Ki. XII. 31, 32; III. 33.

²⁰ 1 Ki. II. 26; see *supra* p. 65.

²¹ Judg. XVIII. 19, 30.

²² 1 Sam. II. 18.

²³ 1 Sam. XIV. 3, 15.

there were at one time at least 85;¹ and they were then divided into various classes according to the different branches of the service. Nor was their power at first considerable, for Saul could venture to command the massacre of large numbers without meeting with any opposition.² Their services were particularly in requisition at the national Sanctuary, first at the Tabernacle, where we find them officiating in Shiloh,³ at Nob,⁴ and elsewhere;⁵ but more exclusively still they served at the Temple; and it may be that, from the time of Solomon, after the establishment of a magnificent worship in Jerusalem, Levites were there employed in such large numbers that the whole tribe, at least gradually, could be looked upon as dedicated to the priestly service, which circumstance must have appeared the less surprising because not a few ancient nations had a separate sacerdotal tribe or caste. Thus the Levites assumed, in the course of time, the rights of spiritual primogeniture, and boldly represented themselves, in religious matters, as substitutes for the Israelites.⁶ But this was, not unjustly, regarded as pretentious arrogance by the Reubenites, the oldest of the Hebrew tribes, which naturally claimed its religious prerogatives.⁷ A struggle ensued from which the Levites came forth victorious.⁸ David still was anointed as king by the *prophet* Samuel,⁹ but Solomon, although the prophet Nathan was present and took a subordinate part in the transaction, by the *priest* Zadok, whose sanction was necessary to render the authority of the new prince legitimate.¹⁰ Priestly influence had, therefore, in the interval perceptibly advanced. But the dignity was, even at Solomon's time, not yet hereditary; for Azariah, the son of the priest Zadok, was a scribe of the king,¹¹ while, on the other hand, Zabud, the son of the prophet Nathan, was a priest.¹² Indeed, from the time of David, priests occupied high and responsible civil offices and even military posts, which secured to them considerable influence upon important matters of state;¹³ nay they gained the confidence both of the kings and the people in a manner that they could act as mediators when both stood opposed to each other in hostility.¹⁴ They were so highly honoured, in the time of Joel, that this prophet expected from their intercession with God certain rescue from the locust plague;¹⁵ they were revered in the time of Hosea, who branded the opposition of the people to their guidance as a punishable crime,¹⁶ and no less so in the time of Isaiah

¹ 1 Sam. XXII. 18. ² 1 Sam. XXII. 18.

⁹ 1 Sam. XVI. 12, 13.

³ 1 Sam. I. 3; II. 12 *sqq.*; etc.

¹⁰ 1 Ki. I. 34, 39, 45. ¹¹ 1 Ki. IV. 2.

⁴ 1 Sam. XXI. 1—10.

¹² 1 Ki. IV. 5; see p. 395.

⁵ See pp. 27—29.

¹³ 1 Ki. I. 7, 8, 39; see *supra* *ibid.*

⁶ See *supra*, p. 358. ⁷ Deut. XI. 6.

¹⁴ 2 Sam. XIX. 11. ¹⁵ Joel II. 17.

⁸ Num. XVI. 1 *sqq.*

¹⁶ Hos. IV. 10.

or of king Ahaz over whom the priest Uriah had considerable influence.¹⁷ They were frequently consulted, employed as teachers, and requested to decide on religious doctrines and rites.¹⁸ Their authority was indeed not uniform; thus the priest Amaziah was entirely subject to the power of the idolatrous king Jeroboam II, acted in the spirit of the latter, and thereby called forth the vehement indignation of the prophet Amos.¹⁹ Moreover, both priests and Levites were often intensely hated by the people on account of moral depravity, time-serving selfishness, and greedy avarice; they thus merited the severest denunciations and threats of indignant prophets. They were described by them as venal, mercenary, and fraudulent, as capable of every act of baseness and violence, and allowing the people to live in ignorance and vice; they were taxed with betraying their allegiance to God, and indulging in their iniquity even in the Temple. While they persecuted and massacred such pure-minded teachers, who held up the mirror to their perverseness, they frequently made common cause with false seers and leaders. Nor did they display fearless and death-despising courage, as many prophets did, when idolatrous kings like Manasseh introduced heathen abominations and undermined the very elements of the theocracy.

3. Now, having gained the foundation of power, they could attempt measures for further aggrandisement. Their efforts were equally directed towards securing an easy competence and establishing spiritual authority. Their first demands in the former respect were comparatively reasonable; and when they began to fix them in writing, in the Book of Deuteronomy, or about the end of the seventh century (B. C. 620); they seem still to have felt the expediency or necessity of caution and moderation. They received the money of all expiatory offerings.²⁰ Under theocratic kings such as Hezekiah, they were supplied with tithes and firstfruits in abundance, and thus began to see their claims recognised. But they were bolder in their pretensions with regard to the latter or spiritual point. They demanded unconditional obedience to their judicial decisions under penalty of death,²¹ and they rose against all opponents with conscious defiance; for in the so-called blessing of Moses they are mentioned in the following terms, "Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one, whom Thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom Thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah; who said to his father and to his mother, I have not seen him, neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children: for they have observed Thy word and kept Thy covenant; they shall teach Jacob

¹⁷ Isai. VIII. 2; comp. 2 Ki. XVI. 10—16.

²⁰ 2 Ki. XII. 17, see p. 274.

¹⁸ Mic. III. 11,

¹⁹ Am. VII. 9, 17.

²¹ Dent. XVII. 8—13.

Thy judgments, and Israel Thy Law; they shall put incense before Thee, and whole burnt-sacrifice upon Thy altar: bless, o Lord, his substance, and accept the work of his hands; smite through the loins of those that rise against him, and of those that hate him, that they rise no more."¹ They perseveringly and dexterously aimed at the establishment of a hierarchy. So much had their pretensions increased within the period that intervened between the date of Jacob's and of Moses' last address.² But it is more than doubtful whether they had even then any chance of seeing their demands really acceded to. For on the one hand, they were classed together with the poor and the helpless, and like them recommended to the compassionate regard of the prosperous.³ And on the other hand, even the pious king Uzziah (B. C. 800) deemed it feasible to enter the Holy of the Temple and to burn incense on the golden altar, although this was later represented as nefarious audacity;⁴ king Ahaz (743—728) directed new arrangements to be made in the Temple service, to which the priests submitted without resistance;⁵ the reforms introduced after the discovery of the "Book of the Law" were exclusively superintended by king Josiah, upon whom alone the Hebrew historian bestows praise for the execution of the important measures;⁶ and the second Isaiah, writing in the latter part of the Babylonian exile, could venture to describe that time as supremely happy and glorious, when non-Levites, returning from their dispersion into foreign lands, would be freely admitted to the priesthood.⁷ The priestly claims were the theories of gifted and ambitious men of the tribe of Levi, and were by them consistently based upon its alleged election by God for exercising spiritual supremacy in Israel. The progress of their influence was retarded by the innumerable forms of idolatry to which the whole nation, including many of their own tribe,⁸ clung with incredible tenacity, from the comparatively venial aberration of the worship of Jehovah through images of the ephod and of teraphim, to the ruthless iniquities of the rites of Moloch. Yet, undaunted by the opposition they had to encounter, especially on the part of liberal and intrepid prophets, they pursued their schemes with wonderful pertinacity and firmness.

4. For a long time, all the members of the tribe of Levi had, on the whole, performed the same priestly functions and enjoyed the same

¹ Deut. XXXIII. 8—11.

² Or between about 950 and 800; for the blessing of Moses was written before the abduction of the ten tribes, since it speaks of Joseph as a royal and ruling chief (Deut. XXXIII. 13—17).

³ See *supra* p. 369.

⁴ 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

⁵ 2 Ki. XVI. 10—16; comp. also XXIII. 4.

⁶ 2 Ki. XXIII. 1 *sqq.*, 25.

⁷ Isai. LXVI. 21.

⁸ Ezek. XLIV. 10—13; XLVIII. 11.

worldly privileges.⁹ But the various ministrations were so widely different in their nature and importance, that it was deemed advisable to mark them by decided distinctions, and to entrust them to different divisions of the tribe. It was considered inappropriate that the chief office of the priesthood, that of mediation between God and the Israelites, should be exercised by the same class of men who performed the less significant and the menial services of the Sanctuary. Now, Aaron, the elder brother of the great deliverer, leader, and legislator Moses, was by national tradition believed to have been the first High-priest appointed already in Moses' time; and indeed some of his descendants are, in the historical Books, mentioned as having filled the same dignity for several generations, to have consulted the will of God by means of the Ark,¹⁰ and to have acted as supreme judges. All these circumstances tended to secure to his family distinction and reverence. Therefore, the priesthood in the stricter sense, with all its high prerogatives, was reserved to Aaron's lineal issue, while the other branches of the tribe of Levi, or the Levites more properly so called, were charged with the lower duties of the sacred service. The desire of the non-Aaronites, as Korah, to participate in the priestly office, was then deemed a presumption as iniquitous as formerly the analogous claim of the Reubenites, and therefore deemed worthy of the same awful punishment.¹¹ And now, the Aaronites or priests alone were represented as elected by God,¹² and were by anointment supposed to be filled with the Divine spirit, which enabled them to bless and to judge, to advise and to teach; whereas the Levites, acting as their subordinate assistants, were merely considered as substitutes for the firstborn Israelites, who could properly be claimed by God.¹³ While, therefore, in reality, the members of the tribe of Levi officiated in the name and by permission of the *Israelites*, they now presumed to hold their office from *God*, who was said to have singled them out and sanctified them. Thus the ideal hierarchy was completed. At the general census of the people, the Levites were not numbered,¹⁴ partly in order to separate the holy ministers of God from the vulgar mass, and partly because they did not stand in need of that gift of atonement which was demanded of every Israelite at each census.¹⁵ Now, as the priests were chiefly required at the common Sanctuary in Jerusalem, those members of the tribe who lived in its vicinity, or in the towns of Judah, Simeon, and Benjamin, were traced to the line of

⁹ See *supra* p. 369.

¹⁰ See *supra* pp. 23, 34.

¹¹ Num. XVI. 1—32; comp. especially vers. 8—10; XXVI. 9—11.

¹² Comp. Num. XVI. 1 *sqq.*; XVII. 17—25.

¹³ Num. III. 12, 13, 41, 45; VIII. 16—19; see p. 601.

¹⁴ Num. I. 47—54; compare also XXVI. 62.

¹⁵ Exod. XXX. 11—16.

Aaron and declared to be priests, while the other portions remained distributed over the other provinces.

5. Moreover, the priests and Levites had now the courage and confidence to claim, at least theoretically, much more considerable emoluments, which, had they been really granted to them, would have made their position highly commanding from a worldly no less than a spiritual point of view; and they exacted them in a manner which not only rendered them independent of the people, but raised them infinitely above it; for they were made the direct and proud recipients of God's own bounty.¹ They introduced or proposed essential alterations most favourable to their order in the precepts regarding the tithes, the first-born, and the portions falling to their share at the various sacrifices; they demanded for their abodes 48 towns with the surrounding districts which was evidently an attempt at greater concentration, although this was unable to prevent the complete dismemberment of the tribe; and they now represented their dispersion, the natural and inevitable result of historical causes, as a legislative measure wisely commanded by God and designedly adopted for special religious ends; though even as such it was far from answering the purpose for which it was ostensibly devised, as has above been pointed out.² Yet, though many members of the tribe were notorious for hypocrisy, deceit, violence, and every iniquity which deserved and received the severest castigation, the instances of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are alone sufficient to prove that some at least were animated by noble aspirations and worked ardently for the spiritual improvement of the people; and when the exiled Jews obtained permission to return to the holy land, the priests predominantly availed themselves of this privilege, and more than 4,000 returned with Zerubbabel alone.³ Thus the priests became the expounders of the Law, the guides and, in some respects, the prophets, while the people, wholly excluded from all participation in the sacred rituals, and having become anything rather than "a kingdom of priests," lost all their natural religious privileges, which they could at no future time hope to regain, since the priesthood was for ever made hereditary in one family. And now the dignity of the High-priest, in whom the holiness of the tribe and its sacred mission culminated, was created, or at least invested with supreme significance and authority; the High-priest was not only the representative of the theocracy, but equivalent to it in spiritual glory.

6. These notions and pretensions are found systematically set forth in the middle Books of the Pentateuch, especially in parts of Le-

¹ See p. 366.

² See p. 371.

³ Comp. 2 Chr. XXIV. 20; Ezra II. 36—38; Neh. VII. 39—42.

viticus and Numbers written after the Babylonian captivity. "As long as the royal power was opposed to the priesthood, the hierarchy could not thrive; but when the former ceased at the time of the exile, the latter lifted its mighty head, and soon afterwards the towering colossus stood immovable." Yet even then these demands were but very imperfectly acted upon, since from that time down to the capture of Jerusalem by Titus we find incessant deviations from the Levitical precepts of the Pentateuch. Both Levites and priests lived together in Judah and Benjamin, and in Jerusalem itself.⁴ Even High-priests married foreign wives.⁵ They tore their garments on hearing a blasphemy⁶ or on receiving an account of a national calamity.⁷ They became the creatures and tools of the monarchs by whom they were arbitrarily installed or deposed, especially when the dignity was, through bribery or violence, obtained by worthless or very youthful persons.⁸ Occasionally, two or more High-priests occupied the office at the same time,⁹ a practice opposed to its very essence.¹⁰ In the period of the Maccabees, the High-priesthood was held by Jonathan and Simon, the sons of Mattathias, of the family of Jarib or Joarib,¹¹ of which it is uncertain whether it belonged to the line of Eleazar or Ithamar. We hear of removals and even of murders of High-priests; and Josephus observes distinctly, "At first the High-priests held their offices to the end of their lives, although afterwards they had successors during their life-time." Antiochus Eupator deposed the High-priest Onias Menelaus, and appointed in his place Jacimus, "who was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of the family of Onias." After the death of Jacimus, the Jews were for seven years without a High-priest. Agrippa II permitted the musical Levites to wear priestly dress. The Jews frequently refused the payment of the Levitical imposts as burdensome, and had to be roused by popular leaders to a sense of their obligations.¹² We find mention made of "poor priests" who glean in the fields together with poor Israelites, and of "a cereal sin-offering of priests," that is, a tenth part of an ephah of flour presented as a sin-offering in cases of such extreme poverty that the worshipper could not even afford two pigeons or turtle-doves, much less a lamb.¹³ Nor does Philo draw a very glowing picture of the worldly condition of the priests; he not only alludes to priests in difficulty, but he plainly observes, "The neglect of some

⁴ See *supra* p. 392. ⁵ Neh. XIII. 28.

⁶ Matth. XXVI. 65. ⁷ 1 Macc. XI. 71.

⁸ Comp. 1 Macc. VII. 9; 2 Macc. IV. 7, 24; XIV. 3, 7, 13.

⁹ Annas and Caiaphas, Luke III. 2; John XI. 49 and XVIII. 13.

¹⁰ See *supra* p. 354.

¹¹ 1 Macc. XIV. 17, 29, 30, 35, 41; II. 1.

¹² Neh. XIII. 12.

¹³ Lev. V. 11; see p. 280.

persons is the cause of poverty to the ministers of God;" and he speaks of a future time when he hopes the latter will be blessed with abundance of the necessaries of life. During the procuratorship of Festus and Albinus, priests are related to have died of want, because the avaricious High-priests Ishmael and Ananias deprived them, by violence, of the *tithes*, as if they had no other source of revenue whatever.

7. Yet when the Pentateuch was generally diffused and thoroughly studied, it could not fail to secure for the priests much of the authority and power which it claimed in their behalf. Armed by this legislative code which they had themselves composed or devised, but had surrounded with a glorious prestige by the fiction of a supernatural origin at so early a time as that of the great mythical hero and lawgiver Moses, the priests had found the means of enthralling the entire life of the nation and of individuals by laws and rituals which rendered their services indispensable both on all grave and all minor occasions and emergencies. Accordingly, we find that after the Babylonian exile the hierarchy unfolded itself more decisively and took deeper root. All circumstances were favourable to its development. The wonderful deliverance from captivity through Cyrus, the hope of the realisation of splendid prophetic promises after the fulfilment of predictions of fearful tribulations, the growing aversion to heathens and paganism, and, not least, the uncertain political condition of the country, all this rendered the people disposed not only to tolerate but to court and to accept priestly advice. Zerubbabel was, at his return to Palestine, accompanied by 5,292 priests, 341 Levites, and 392 Nethinim, or nearly the seventh part of all immigrants, who, besides servants and singers, amounted only to 42,360 souls.¹ The priests were obliged to prove their pedigree, and to show that they really belonged to the holy tribe.² They were compelled to dismiss their foreign wives,³ some of whom were married even to sons of High-priests.⁴ While the workmen were engaged in erecting the new Temple, the priests were present in their holy vestments, and blew the trumpets, whereas the Levites sang the hymns of David to the sound of musical instruments,⁵ and took part in the solemnities held at the consecration of the new walls of the town.⁶ The High-priest was the chief of the Sanhedrin;⁷ as such he exercised spiritual jurisdiction over all Jews, even those who did not dwell in Palestine; and he could not be opposed or contradicted with

¹ Ezra II. 36—65. ² Ezra II. 61—63. under Nehemiah (Neh. III. 1, 17, 18,

³ Ezr. IX. 1; X. 15, 18—24. 22, 26; V. 11, 12).

⁴ Neh. XIII. 28.

⁶ Neh. XI. 27—43. ⁷ Matth. XXXVI.

⁵ Ezr. III. 10, 11; it was different 57; Acts V. 21; VII. 1; XXIII. 2.

impunity.⁸ The Asmoneans were at once High-priests and civil rulers. Combining clerical with worldly power, they were called priest-kings after the order of Melchizedek.⁹ Judas, called Aristobulus, was High-priest and king, and wore a diadem; and after the death of Herod, "High-priests were entrusted with the dominion over the nation;" and they were often supposed to be endowed with the gift of prophecy; thus Hyrcanus was called ruler, High-priest, and prophet. Yet they were not raised above the law; the Mishnah declared, "the High-priest can be a judge and be judged, he may serve as witness, and others may bear witness against him;" he was subject to almost all the levirate regulations (or those of the *yavam*), except that he was not permitted to marry his deceased brother's widow; and he had even to suffer the punishment of stripes, if he had forfeited it by some offence. The priests and Levites were divided into classes and their duties clearly regulated and defined.¹⁰ For large numbers of them were required for the complicated and symbolical rituals of the Pentateuch, and their multitude was regarded as a blessing for the people.¹¹ The Levites themselves were deemed too holy to be charged with the low and menial offices entrusted to them in the Law; and they were therefore assisted in their task by servants who were regarded as the property of the Temple.¹² Tithes and firstfruits, the firstborn, and other imposts, were delivered up conscientiously,¹³ and often with exaggerated minuteness.¹⁴ Store-rooms were, in the precincts of the Temple, set apart for the contributions,¹⁵ which stood under the careful control and administration of appointed officials.¹⁶ Thus the priesthood enjoyed authority, honour, and influence;¹⁷ then Malachi could declare, with regard to the priest, what in some respects is the absolute reverse of the terms used in Jacob's address, "The Law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips; he walked with Me in peace and equity, and turned many away from iniquity; for the priest's lips should keep knowledge, and people should seek the Law at his mouth; for he is a messenger of the Lord of hosts;"¹⁸ they formed a kind of aristocratic caste; Christ himself, the mediator, was distinguished by the name priest or High-priest;¹⁹ and the word *cohen* assumed, in the kindred

⁸ Acts IX. 1, 2, 14; XXIII. 4.

¹⁴ Matth. XXIII. 23; Luke XI. 42;

⁹ Comp. Ps. CX. 4; see *supra* p. 106.

see p. 372.

¹⁰ See *supra* pp. 345, 360.

¹⁵ Comp. 2 Chr. XXXI. 11; Neh. X. 38; XII. 11; XIII. 5, 12; Mal. III. 10.

¹¹ Jer. XXXIII. 18, 21, 22.

¹⁶ Neh. XII. 11; XIII. 12.

¹² See *supra* p. 360.

¹⁷ Sir. VII. 31—35.

¹³ Neh. X. 36—40; XII. 44—47; XIII.

¹⁸ Mal. II. 6, 7; comp. 2 Chr. XVII.

5, 12; 2 Chr. XXXI. 11; comp. Mal. III.

7—9.

8, 10; Ezek. XLIV. 28—30; Judith XI.

¹⁹ See p. 112.

13; Tobit I. 7, 8.

dialects, the meaning of *prince* or *noble*. The very literature of the Jews was thenceforth visibly coloured by the spirit of the Law. Even Ezekiel, living in the earlier period of the Babylonian exile, described the ideal priesthood of the future, on the whole, in harmony with the precepts of the Pentateuch.¹ But the Chronist could attempt to rewrite all the annals of his nation from a Levitical point of view, and to alter, nay palpably to falsify, the facts recorded by anterior, more truthful, and less biassed historians; he could, for instance, relate that when king Uzziah, though severely rebuked by the priests, did not desist from burning incense upon the altar, he was smitten with leprosy on the spot, and was never healed to the day of his death,² though Uzziah's great predecessor Solomon had done the same act with perfect impunity. Finally, the Levites killed even the paschal lambs instead of the Israelites,³ and thus deprived the latter of the last vestige of their original prerogatives.

Yet the exposition of the Law was not the exclusive privilege of any single class. It was the common right of all who possessed acumen, ability, or learning. Thus the scribes⁴ and scholars formed gradually a more and more influential order honoured merely for their knowledge and piety. This was the more important as the main work of the nation for many centuries after the return from exile centred in the literary and legal development of the Scriptures. Among the doctors of the Mishnah were men from all tribes. Hence the priests could not maintain an intellectual preponderance, nor secure a dangerous superiority over the minds of the Jews. The demolition of the Temple by the Romans naturally deprived the priests and Levites of all spiritual power and nearly of all revenues. As the right of teaching is independent of descent, and the office of Rabbi may be held by any Jew of a certain moral and scholastic qualification, they enjoyed from that time to the present day only a few unimportant privileges in the Synagogue and the social life of the Jewish communities.

¹ Ezek. XLIV. 15—31.

² 2 Chr. XXVI. 16—21.

³ 2 Chr. XXX. 17; XXXV. 10—14.

⁴ Comp. 1 Chr. XXIV. 6; 2 Chr. XXXIV. 13.

A. CONSECRATION OF THE SANCTUARY AND OF AARON AND HIS SONS.

CHAPTER VIII.

SUMMARY.—Moses carries out the commands previously received (Ex. XXIX) concerning the consecration of Aaron and his sons, and of the Tabernacle and its utensils. He directs Aaron and his four sons to bathe themselves; he then clothes them with their official garments, anoints the Tabernacle and its vessels, and Aaron himself (vers. 1—13); he next presents a bullock for a sin-offering; puts some of the blood upon the horns of the brazen altar, and burns the flesh partly upon it, and partly without the camp (vers. 14—17); then he offers a ram for a holocaust (vers. 18—21), and lastly, a ram specially for the consecration: for he puts some of its blood on the right ear, right hand, and right foot, of Aaron and his sons, and sprinkles the rest on the altar around; he places the fat and the fat parts, together with the right shoulder and three kinds of unleavened cakes, on Aaron's and his sons' hands, waves, and then burns them upon the altar, while he appropriates to himself the breast; he sprinkles some of the mingled oil and blood taken from the altar upon the priests and their garments; after which the priests eat the meat in the Court of the Tabernacle (vers. 22—32). The same ceremonies are repeated for seven days, during which time Aaron and his sons are forbidden to leave the Court (vers. 33—36).

1. And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2. Take Aaron and his sons with him, and the garments, and the anointing oil, and the bullock for the sin-offering,

1—5. Commands had been given for constructing the Tabernacle and its utensils; Aaron and his sons had been appointed priests, and their official vestments described; the ceremonies to be observed at their consecration had been minutely specified, together with the ingredients and the preparation of the anointing oil. After the historical episode of the golden calf, the successful execution of some of these commands had been related — of those concerning the Tabernacle and its utensils, the anointing oil, and

the priestly garments. Then God ordered to rear up the Sanctuary, to arrange the holy implements in their due places, to anoint them, and lastly, to wash, to clothe, and to anoint Aaron and his sons. Moses had faithfully carried out the injunctions which he had received, except those regarding the anointing of the Tabernacle and the consecration of Aaron and his sons. But before advancing to record their accomplishment, also, the narrative pauses in order to insert precepts and ordinances indispensable to the effectual performance of these last

and the two rams, and the basket of unleavened bread; 3. And assemble all the congregation to the door of the Tent of Meeting. 4. And Moses did as the Lord had commanded him; and the congregation was assembled to the door of the Tent of Meeting. 5. And Moses said to the congregation, This *is* the thing which the Lord has commanded to be done.

commands. For the consecration of the priests, from which the anointing of the Tabernacle was inseparable, was to be accompanied by all the principal kinds of sacrifice. It seemed, therefore, desirable to premise a comprehensive code of the sacrificial laws; such a code was presented in the seven first chapters of Leviticus; and now the narrative returns to the point where it was broken off at the end of Exodus, and at once proceeds to the historical account of the initiation of the holy functionaries at the national Sanctuary. A general connection between the second and the third Book of the Pentateuch can, therefore, not be disputed; and the arrangement of the parts must be regarded as essentially logical. This conclusion is confirmed by the manner, in which the writer here describes the execution, which plainly refers to the corresponding injunctions in Exodus. Yet it would be rash to contend that this was the position of the respective portions in the original documents. The command in Exodus (XXIX) is so detailed that it can hardly be declared unintelligible or supposed to require extraneous elucidation; it alludes to the various sacrifices as matters entirely familiar to Moses; without additional or particular directions, it states, "it is a sin-offering", or "it is a burnt-sacrifice", or "it is a ram of consecration"; it exhibits the whole of the ceremonial law in full operation, as has even been admitted by champions of a different opinion; it would indeed have been to Moses no more

than an aggregate of obscure phrases, were it not framed on the supposition of his perfect acquaintance with the sacrificial laws. Its authors could, therefore, not possibly have deemed it necessary to interpose between the behest and the achievement a long and varied account of the ritual of sacrifices. Hence it must be inferred, what indeed is sufficiently manifest from our observations on the preceding chapters, that these laws were inserted in their place — and we must concede, inserted on the whole judiciously — by the revisers of the two Books, who could find no better arrangement for the multifarious and often incongruous matter at their disposal. Moreover, it cannot be denied that the second Book concludes, in some respects, abruptly. For after all the orders had been given, the text summarily states, "And Moses did according to all that the Lord had commanded him; thus he did" (Exod. XL. 16); and yet the consummation of the charge concerning the anointing of the Tabernacle and the consecration of the priests, is there not related, but is reserved for a much later place, where it seems to stand severed from its natural connection. It is most probable that the *narrative*, forming the groundwork of the composition, was originally continuous, but that the *laws*, which also constituted documents complete in themselves, were inserted where the context seemed to require or to admit them.

Moses provided himself with all the objects which he knew to be necessary

6. And Moses made Aaron and his sons approach, and washed them with water. 7. And he put upon him the tunic, and girded him with the girdle, and clothed him with the robe, and put the ephod upon him, and girded him with the band of the ephod, and dressed

for the ceremonial — the holy garments of Aaron and his sons, one bullock and two rams, and a basket containing three kinds of unleavened cakes; and then he proceeded with Aaron and his four sons, Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, to the door of the Tabernacle to commence his solemn task.

6—13. The consecration of the priests was accomplished by a double series of acts, each consisting of three distinct ceremonies. The first series comprised the washing, the clothing, and the anointing of the priests; the second the presentation of the three chief kinds of animal sacrifice — a sin-offering, a holocaust, and a thank-offering — though in a form partly modified from those prescribed for ordinary occasions. Either series included both preliminary or general, and special or characteristic rites. For the first of the six acts — the washing — was designed partly as a common preparation and partly as an emblem of that purity so pre-eminently demanded by the priestly office; the second — the clothing — constituted the real investiture with the sacerdotal dignity, and visibly marked out Aaron and his sons for their sacred mission; the third — the anointing — was intended to typify that they were endowed with the holy spirit of God, and thus supernaturally fitted for their august functions; the fourth and the fifth, or the two first of the second series — the sin-offering and the burnt-offering — were again general preparations usually accompanying solemn rituals, and expressive of that feeling of sinfulness and

submissive obedience which is particularly desirable in human mediators between their fellow-creatures and God; while the sixth act — the thank-offering — formed a peculiar and most essential part of the ceremonies, so that this sacrifice was most emphatically called “the offering of the consecration.” The three preliminary acts symbolised the *duties* and *requirements*, the three others the *distinctions*, the *endowments*, and the *privileges*, of the priesthood; and the six, in their combination, suggested everything that characterised the sacerdotal office and its ministers.

Holy actions required a state of perfect purity. They were, therefore, usually commenced by washing the garments or bathing the body. The Hebrews were enjoined to do the former when the revelations of Mount Sinai were announced as impending; the latter formed probably one of the chief rites to be observed by the stranger who adopted the faith of the Israelites, so that the Talmudical rule arose, “circumcision without baptism is unavailing”; and both ablution and change of garments were ordered by Jacob when he purified his household, directed its members to remove all idols, and pledged them to the true and sole worship of God. While ordinarily, or previous to every official function in the Sanctuary, the priest was commanded to wash his hands and feet with the water of the laver in the Court, the High-priest, on the Day of Atonement, was charged to bathe his whole body before he commenced his solemn duties. How much more indispensable must the

him with it. 8. And he put the breast-plate upon him: and he placed on the breast-plate the Urim and the Thummim. 9. And he put the mitre upon his head, and put upon the mitre, on its forefront, the golden plate, the holy crown, as the Lord had commanded

same complete lustration have appeared when the first High-priest and the first priests were initiated into their holy ministrations, and were to be marked as men singled out for perpetual purity and elevation of mind, and as instruments of peace and atonement. How this lustration was accomplished by Moses, and before the entire congregation, is not noticed in the text; it is hardly probable, that the whole people were supposed to witness it; and the Court was sufficiently extensive to admit of an arrangement suitable for the requirements of the case. Such acts of cleanliness are so natural, that we should expect to find them, on similar occasions, among other nations also, even if they were not recorded by distinct historical testimonies, as, for instance, with regard to the initiation into the mysteries of Isis, which was necessarily preceded by careful ablutions. The rites ordained for the consecration of the *Levites* differed, indeed, in many respects, from those prescribed for the consecration of the *priests*, since the ceremonials were designed to reflect, in a significant manner, the difference between the internal nature of the office of either; yet the *Levites* had not only to clean their bodies, but also to wash their garments; in the former respect, they were equal to the priests, but, in the latter, they were inferior; for as they received no distinct or official vestments, they were required to clean their ordinary clothes; their initiation was a *cleansing*, not a *sanctifying*; they were ordered to be pure in their external appearance and in their thoughts, because their

life was connected with the Sanctuary, but they were not dressed in peculiar and symbolical garments, because their services, subordinate and menial, bore no relation to the work of grace and atonement.

The clothing of Aaron and his sons was, therefore, no indifferent or unessential act; it was a part of the actual induction into their sacred offices; it invested them with the visible emblems of their holiness and their functions, and marked them as distinct from the rest of the nation; justly, therefore, observed the Talmud, "when the priests are clothed in their garments, their priesthood is upon them, when they are not clothed in their garments, their priesthood is not upon them". It is on account of the importance of this act, that all the articles of the High-priest's dress, as they were put by Moses on Aaron, are separately enumerated, and are thus evidently intended to recall their significant meaning — the tunic and the girdle, the robe and the ephod, the breast-plate with the Urim and Thummim, and the mitre with the golden plate; the drawers alone are not mentioned, because, as has been plausibly supposed, Aaron put them on himself immediately after his ablution; and in the same manner, the garments of Aaron's sons are specified.

The washing typifies the removal of uncleanness, whether physical or moral, and the clothing is the outward badge of the priest's avocation; therefore, the former implies essentially a negative element, and the latter is of an external nature appealing to the senses: then the anointing, the third

Moses. 10. And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the Tabernacle and all that *was* therein, and sanctified them. 11. And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all its vessels, both the laver and its base, to sanctify them.

act of the first series, supervenes as a positive element; it adds the endowment of the priest with the spirit of God; it tends to enlighten his mind and to ennoble his heart, in accordance with the meaning of his vestments. For oil typifies the holy spirit, and the sanctity which it ensures. It will, therefore, be understood why the anointing was used chiefly to mark the gradation between the various classes of the priesthood. For while the High-priest was distinguished by a pouring out of oil upon his head, the seat of reason and intellectual life, and hence the noblest part of the human organism, and by a pouring out — not a sprinkling — so copious that it could poetically be described as flowing down his beard (Ps. CXXXIII. 2), and denoted the fulness and abundance of the Divine spirit required by, and granted to, the spiritual chief of the nation, the common priests were more sparingly anointed, and the Levites not at all: for the High-priest was the embodiment of the entire sum of theocratic holiness; the common priests represented merely individuals; and the Levites were but the servants of the priests. Moreover, while every new High-priest was to be anointed in the same manner as Aaron himself (Exod. XXIX. 29, 30; Lev. VI. 13, 15), the anointing of his sons was supposed to suffice for the ordinary priests in all future ages, when the consecration of the chief was considered to involve that of the whole order, and descent alone was deemed sufficient to secure sacerdotal rights. — This seems to have been the law, if we take

the ordinances of the Pentateuch as a whole. Yet the subject is not without difficulties, since the statutes do not agree among themselves. First, it is indeed surprising, that the anointing of Aaron's sons is neither mentioned in the commands concerning the consecration, in Exodus, nor in our chapter. The omission can hardly be accidental in descriptions so detailed and so accurate even with respect to minor points; it can only be explained by the supposition that the author of these portions considered the anointing of the common priests not to have taken place in Moses' time. On the other hand, it is elsewhere stated not only that Aaron's sons were to be anointed (Exod. XXVIII. 41; XXX. 30), but that they were to be anointed in the very same manner as Aaron himself (Exod. XL. 15); they were consequently called "anointed priests" (Num. III. 3), as the High-priest is designated "*the* anointed priest"; and they are said, like their father, "to have the anointing oil of the Lord upon them" (Lev. X. 7). It is insufficient to urge, in explanation of these discrepancies, that the High-priest was anointed by oil being poured upon his *head*, the other priests merely by putting oil with the finger upon the *forehead*, or by partially sprinkling it upon their body; for this would, on the one hand, not be a mode of anointing *identical* with regard to High-priest and priests (Exod. XL. 15), and it would, on the other hand, render the silence in our portion and in the corresponding chapter of Exodus still more surprising, since a difference so remarkable in the procedure of anointing

12. And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him, to sanctify him. 13. And Moses made Aaron's sons approach, and put tunics upon them,

would certainly have required particular notice. Nor ought it to be asserted that the sprinkling of the *garments* with the anointing oil which applied both to Aaron and his sons (ver. 30), harmonizes the contradictory passages; that ceremony was entirely distinct from the proper act of anointment; and — what is even more essential — the oil was not sprinkled alone, but mingled with the blood of the ram of consecration; and the blood formed at least an equally important ingredient. The identity of the mode of anointing the High-priest and the common priests is, therefore, far from established.

The differences, though not to be reconciled, may at least be thus accounted for. First, it must be observed that at the time, when the passages under discussion were committed to writing, the question with regard to the anointing of the common priests had lost all practical importance, since it was generally agreed, that, after their first consecration by Moses, they required no anointing; and the ordinary practice of all ages confirmed this view. It was, therefore, only a matter of tradition or of speculative probability whether Moses anointed Aaron's sons or not. Now, on this point, either the sources or the opinions of the various writers differed. For a long time, all the Levites alike were admitted to priestly offices, as has been demonstrated above (p. 369); those who wrote at the periods when this usage prevailed, must naturally have considered the anointing of Aaron's sons superfluous, since these were the ancestors of but a very small minority of the priests. But when, later, the priesthood was exclusively reserved to Aaron's

family, that is, to the progeny of Eleazar and Ithamar, it was deemed important to hallow them through the consecration of their sires by the hand of Moses himself. Therefore, on the whole, earlier documents omit, later ones mention the anointing of Aaron's sons. Again, for long periods the office of High-priest, which seems to be the culminating point of the institutions of Hebrew hierarchy, was less conspicuous or pre-eminent; it was, in a spiritual point of view, hardly superior to that of ordinary priests; and, therefore, the anointing of Aaron and of his sons was supposed to have been entirely identical (Exod. XL. 15). However, simultaneously with the gradual separation between the priests and Levites, the distinction between the High-priest and the common priests gained ground; and as that distinction could be marked most strikingly by the significant act of anointment, Aaron was represented as anointed, while his sons were not; and this is obviously the point of view prevailing in our chapter (ver. 12). Two considerations were in conflict: the holiness of the priests, as the supposed descendants of Eleazar and Ithamar, seemed to demand the anointment of the latter; but the greater holiness of the High-priest appeared to require the restriction of that ceremony to Aaron alone; and this dilemma engendered a diversity of views and statements. Thus even minor points reflect the entire history of the spiritual development of the Hebrews, and support the results derived from general and comprehensive surveys.

The oil used for so solemn a rite was not to be the bare product of na-

and girded them with girdles, and put turbans upon them, as the Lord had commanded Moses.

14. And he [Moses] caused the bullock for the sin-offering to be brought near; and Aaron and his sons

ture, but was to be enhanced in value and significance by the admixture of four fragrant substances, which number was to mark the completeness of the act, and the perfection of the priests' endowment with the Divine spirit.

Together with the appointed mediators, it was deemed essential to hallow the place where they were to perform their all-important work; therefore, with the oil used for the consecration of the priests, Moses anointed first the Tabernacle in the stricter sense, that is, the Holy and the Holy of Holies, and then the utensils of the Court, especially the brazen altar on which the sacrifices were to be burnt, and which, therefore, was the chief instrument of atonement (vers. 10, 11). That altar was sprinkled with the holy oil *seven* times, then anointed with all its vessels, and thus sanctified (comp. XVI. 9).

A passage in Apuleius describing the initiation of "Lucius" as a priest of Isis, is highly interesting as a parallel, and evidently contains the origin or model of impressive customs observed even in some modern societies or fraternities: the very first step was his *ablution*; then he was taken into the temple of the goddess where he received secret instructions; next, after ten days of strict preparation, during which he was to abstain from luxurious food, especially all meat and wine, he was, in the night of the eleventh day, clothed in a new linen garment, and the chief ceremonies began; "*I approached the confines of death*", he relates, "and having trod on the threshold of Proserpine, I returned *having been borne through all the elements*"; thence those who have passed through the rites were

called "as it were born again"; and he continues, "At midnight I saw the sun shining with its brilliant light, and I approached the presence of the gods beneath, and the gods of heaven, and stood near and worshipped them." In the morning he was dressed in "twelve stoles", the chief of which was "the Olympic stole", of linen elegantly coloured, with a precious scarf falling from the shoulders behind the neck down to the ankles, all covered with sacred and symbolical figures, as Indian serpents, Hyperborean griffins, and winged birds; then "arrayed like the sun", with a burning torch in his right hand, a chaplet round his head, from which the shining leaves of the palm-tree projected like rays of light, and so placed as to resemble a statue, he was shown to the multitude; this he regarded as his "natal day", and celebrated it with festive banquets; the same rites were passed through on the next day, after which he was privileged to view the holy image of the goddess; lastly he poured out his feelings in an ardent prayer of praise and thanksgiving, and embraced the High-priest who had initiated him, and whom he thenceforth regarded as his "parent". In opposition to ceremonies like these, Philo observes, and no doubt in harmony with the principles of the Pentateuch, "The lawgiver entirely removes out of his sacred code of laws all ordinances respecting initiations and mysteries, and all such trickery and buffoonery".

14—21. The second or sacrificial series of ceremonies begins with a sin-offering, and then proceeds to a holocaust. The first of these introductory

laid their hands upon the head of the bullock for the sin-offering; 15. And Moses slew *it*, and took the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar; and he poured the *other* blood at the bottom of the altar, and sanctified it, and expiated it. 16. And Moses took all the fat, that *was* upon the bowels, and the great lobe of the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and

acts corresponds with the preliminary rite of bathing in the first series, to which it is on the one side kindred, on the other opposed; for it is indeed negative in its character, in as much as it aims at the removal of sin; but it does not express this object merely by an external symbol, but accomplishes it by a sacrifice which secures Divine grace and forgiveness: the purification is, by the sin-offering, not only aimed at, but effected; and it is effected in a much deeper sense than it can even be aimed at by the lustration. However, the sin-offering killed on this exceptional occasion strictly resembled no sacrifice of the same class, as ordinarily presented. For commonly, either the blood of the sin-offering was partially brought into the Holy, and then the entire victim was burnt; or the blood did not come beyond the Court, and then certain parts of the victim were allowed to be eaten. But the blood of the sin-offering here commanded for the consecration of Aaron and his sons was wholly disposed of at the brazen altar in the Court (ver. 15), and yet the animal was to be completely delivered up to the flames (ver. 17). Why, on the one hand, was no part of the blood taken into the Sanctuary? or why, on the other hand, could the flesh not be eaten? To begin with the latter point, it will be easily understood, that there was no suitable person to receive and to consume the flesh. The priests, to whose share it ordinarily fell, could

not eat it, because they were, in this instance, not the atoning mediators, but the objects of atonement themselves; nor could Moses partake of it, because it was "most holy", and could, therefore, be permitted to priests exclusively, and not even to him who, on that extraordinary occasion, and by the special command of God, performed priestly functions. Less obvious is the explanation of the other point. It might appear, at first sight, particularly appropriate to take a part of the blood of expiation into the Holy, to put it there on the altar of burnt-incense, and to sprinkle it before God, since a more solemn opportunity for the exercise of the most imposing rites can scarcely be imagined than the initiation of the permanent intercessors between God and His chosen people. If, nevertheless, in this most essential respect, the less sacred ceremonial was observed, and the blood was disposed of at the brazen altar alone, the reason can only be analogous to that which involved the clue to the former question, namely, that Moses, the *Levite*, though he anointed all implements of the Sanctuary, was on no account, and not even once and exceptionally, to be permitted, in connection with sacrifices, to enter the Holy, which was reserved for the *priests* alone, and which it was a heinous crime and an impious rebellion, on the part of any "stranger" to defile by his presence. Moreover, the blood was brought

burnt *it* upon the altar. 17. But the bullock, both his hide, his flesh, and his dung, he burnt with fire without the camp, as the Lord had commanded Moses. 18. And he made the ram for the burnt-offering come near; and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram. 19. And Moses killed *it*; and sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about. 20. And Moses cut the ram into its pieces, and he burnt the head, and the pieces, and the fat. 21. And Moses washed the bowels and the legs in water; and he burnt the whole ram

into the Holy in two cases only — if the sacrifice was presented in the name of the whole nation or of the High-priest, because the former *is* the sum of all theocratic holiness, and the latter *represents* it; but he represents it only *in consequence* of his consecration; therefore, while the consecration was not completed, and while he was not fully qualified for his elevated office, he could neither claim its high prerogatives, nor did he bear all its heavy responsibilities in a manner that his sin should require so powerful an expiation. Therefore, Aaron's sin-offering was not even invested with its full solemnity, when he himself presented his first initiatory sacrifice, irrespective of a peculiar transgression or of periodical atonement (IX. 9). Yet that particular sin-offering was to be connected with a particular object; it was not merely designed to purify the priests, but also to sanctify the altar, where they were thenceforth charged to approach the presence of God; it was not simply an expiatory sacrifice, but most properly an offering of initiation: for as the *sin* of the people defiled the *Sanctuary* and its utensils, it was necessary not only to remove the former, but also to sanctify the latter. Therefore, the blood was not simply "sprinkled round about upon the altar", as was the case with holocausts and the thank-

offerings; nor was it merely "put upon the horns" of the altar with the finger, as was done with the sin-offerings of the less solemn kind; but "Moses took the blood and put it upon the horns of the altar round about with his finger, and purified the altar" (ver. 15): the horns of the altar were not only to be carefully touched with the blood by the finger, but they were at all sides to be so entirely covered with the blood, that this ceremony might be understood to mean not merely the atonement of those, for whom the sacrifice was presented, but also the sanctification of the altar itself. Now the meaning of the rituals observed at this sin-offering will be clear. Moses brought the bullock to the Court of the Tabernacle; Aaron and his sons placed their right hands on the head of the victim, because they were, in this instance, not the priests, but the offerers. Moses killed the animal, because he, the chosen mediator of the Covenant, through whom Israel became the people of God and a holy nation, was to perform as many functions as were compatible with his position; he disposed of the blood in the manner described, and burnt the fat and the fat parts on the altar in the Court, while all that remained of the animal he directed to be delivered up to the flames without the camp (vers. 14—17).

The last preliminary was a holo-

upon the altar: it *was* a burnt-sacrifice for a sweet odour, an offering made by fire to the Lord, as the Lord had commanded Moses.

22. And he made the other ram come near, the ram of consecration; and Aaron and his sons laid their hands upon the head of the ram. 23. And Moses slew *it*, and took of its blood, and put *it* upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, and upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon

caust; it was even more important than the sin-offering; it was not merely negative in its nature; for it typified the complete and absolute abandonment of all human and selfish aims, and the unconditional submission to the Divine will and guidance; it followed, therefore, appropriately after the sin-offering, by which Aaron and his sons had become worthy of being accepted as the pure servants of God; and Moses might well hope, that the animal then rising in the flames of the altar, would indeed be "a burnt-sacrifice for a sweet odour to the Lord".

22—32. And now followed the concluding ceremony, in which the whole ritual culminated; it was the proper and distinctive "sacrifice of consecration"; it defined and qualified all the general acts which had preceded. External and inward purification, atonement and free devotion of all powers and thoughts to God, investiture with the characteristic garments, and endowment with the holy spirit — all these duties and qualifications were necessarily to be symbolised, before the priests could be introduced to the rights and privileges of their office. In form, that sacrifice was a thank-offering; it was, therefore, evidently designed to express the humble gratitude of Aaron and his sons for having, without any title or merit, been selected for functions so exalted and for prerogatives so uncommon; but it was connected with rites which once more and

comprehensively pointed to the peculiar nature of their mission. Moses brought the animal, a ram like the burnt-offering, to the door of the Tabernacle; Aaron and his sons, of course, imposed their hands upon its head; and when Moses had killed it, he put some of its blood upon the tip of Aaron's right ear, upon the thumb of his right hand, and upon the great toe of his right foot; and he then repeated the same ceremony with Aaron's sons. The significance of these acts is self-evident: they were to remind the priests, that henceforth it was their duty pre-eminently, to listen to the commands of God, to act in accordance with His will, since even their consecration was a "filling of the hand", and to walk in His ways; the general piety emblematically enjoined by the holocaust, was thus distinctly specified in its chief manifestations, and was clearly brought home to the minds of the elected ministers. The *right* members of the body were chosen for this peculiar ceremony, because the right side was regarded as the more honoured, more important, and more auspicious, and therefore included the left; and the *extremities* only, and not the *entire* members were marked with the blood, because the act was symbolical, and the most conspicuous part sufficed to point to the whole and to represent it. The blood of the ram of consecration was, therefore, the blood of pledge and covenant; it bound the priests to the

the great toe of his right foot. 24. And Moses made Aaron's sons come near, and put of the blood upon the tip of their right ears, and upon the thumbs of their right hands, and upon the great toes of their right feet; and Moses sprinkled the blood upon the altar round about. 25. And he took the fat, and the fat tail, and all the fat that *was* upon the bowels, and the great lobe

authority of God as their Lord and sole Master. It was, hence, not superfluous even after the oil with which they had been anointed. For the oil bestowed upon them, supernaturally, enlightenment, and wisdom, and holiness of heart; but the blood typified their own personal efforts in which they vowed to be untiring in virtuous and godly conduct; the one raised them above the level of ordinary humanity, the latter reminded them most forcibly of their human obligations; the former, in fact, was freely and graciously granted to them by God, the latter involved a mutual compact. In view of this paramount importance of the consecration-offering, it might well be asked, why the animal selected for it was a ram, and not, like the sin-offering, a bullock, which was regarded as the noblest victim. We may venture the supposition that as the ram was the ordinary, and perhaps the most primitive, sacrificial animal, it was deemed particularly appropriate for a ceremony designed to convey the ordinary duties and privileges of priesthood, since it recalled more plainly than any other animal, the usual service of the altar. A distinction from the sin-offering might have appeared the more desirable, because the sin-offering was a preparatory, the thank-offering the characteristic sacrifice of the ceremonial.

After Moses had sprinkled the remaining blood "on the altar round about", as was the custom in all thank-offerings, he proceeded to another and very remarkable ceremony meant to

illustrate another side of the priestly mission. He took the fat, and the fat parts, and the right shoulder of the victim, put upon this flesh and fat one cake of each of the three unleavened kinds which he had brought with him in a basket, placed the whole upon the hands of Aaron and his sons, and consecrated it to God by the peculiar rite of waving (pp. 199—201); after which he "took all of it from their hands, and burnt it on the altar upon the burnt-offering; it was a consecration, for a sweet odour, an offering made by fire to the Lord" (ver. 28) while he himself received, for his own portion, the breast of the victim, after he had waved it also. Now, what was the meaning of this "consecration"? It could not denote that God presented the priests, for the future, with the portions so hallowed; for on the one hand, the breast which fell to the share of the priests, was not consecrated, while, on the other hand, the fat and fat parts, which were always burnt, were among the waved objects. Nor could it symbolically promise and guarantee to the priests that sacrifices would never be wanting among the Hebrews; nor did it exactly refer to the gifts which the priests would have to present to God, because the right shoulder was not generally burnt on the altar. That ceremony cannot, indeed, be explained by the ordinary sacrificial practice, because it is entirely exceptional and singular in character. Aaron and his sons could not receive the right shoulder and the breast, their usual

of the liver, and the two kidneys, and their fat, and the right shoulder; 26. 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 put *them* on the fat *and the fat* parts, and upon the right shoulder. 27. And he placed all *these things* upon

perquisites in thank-offerings, because the ram was not sacrificed for others, but in their own name, and because they were, at that time, not even fully authorised as priests — they were virtually not more than private individuals. Those parts might, therefore, have naturally been assigned to Moses. But though Moses, on this one occasion, *officiated* as priest, he *was* no priest; a distinction was to be made between him and the consecrated functionaries of the Sanctuary; and he received, therefore, but one of the parts, while the other — the right shoulder, which was the proper gift set aside for the priests — was included in the objects to be burnt on the altar. Though Moses was not permitted to partake of the sin-offering, it might be supposed that he was allowed to eat of the thank-offering, because the former was so sacred that its blood was, in certain cases, brought into the Holy, while the latter bore, ordinarily, a more social and more homely character. But not so on this occasion. For that which remained of the offering of consecration after the waved portions had been burnt, and after Moses had taken the breast for himself, was to be eaten by Aaron and his sons alone, and not in company with invited guests; it was not even to be shared by their families. The meal was to recall the solemnity of the sin-offering rather, than the light conviviality of the thank-offering. This is explicitly stated in the words, "And Aaron and his sons shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate and

to hallow them; but a stranger shall not eat thereof, for they are holy" (Exod. XXIX. 33). That Aaron and his sons were allowed to consume the flesh, will not be found surprising, if the character of the sacrifice as one of covenant and unity with God is considered. But it was also to be eaten in the Court of the Tabernacle itself, and not merely in a clean place; and the remainder was to be burnt on the very same day, as was the case with the praise-offerings, and nothing was to be reserved for the following day, as was permitted in the ordinary thank-offerings. Moreover, the cereal offering included no leavened bread, as was the case in the usual thank-offerings (VII. 13), because it formed a part of the sacrifice of covenant, from which everything leavened was to be kept aloof, as likewise in the laws of the paschal lamb, which, in later times, was virtually also a thank-offering (pp. 190, 191). Everywhere the solemnity of the sacrifice is evident. Thus much is certain that the rites connected with the ram of consecration were intended to convey that thenceforth the family of Aaron, and that family alone, should be privileged and charged to perform the service of the altar, and to offer the sacrifices in the name of the chosen people.

The altar, a principal object in the Tabernacle, had been anointed with oil; it had also been sprinkled with the blood of the holocaust and of the ram of consecration; it had thus been marked both as a place of Divine holiness and as an emblem of solemn covenant concluded between God and

Aaron's hands and upon his sons' hands, and waved them *for* a wave-offering before the Lord. 28. And Moses took them from their hands, and burnt *them* on the altar upon the burnt-offering: they *were* consecrations for a sweet odour; it *was* an offering made by fire to the Lord. 29. And Moses took the breast and waved it *for* a wave-offering before the Lord; it was the portion of Moses from the ram of consecration, as the Lord had commanded Moses. 30. And Moses took of the

His appointed ministers; in a similar manner, the High-priest, and through him the whole order of priests, had been anointed with oil, and had been marked with the blood of consecration in some of the most important parts of the body allowing a symbolical reference to moral and religious conduct. But not even these acts, so clearly corresponding with each other, were deemed sufficient to express the intimate connection between the priests and the altar, and to enforce the idea that the former were not only sanctified, but allied to God. A still more striking ceremony was performed. The oil and the blood that mingled upon the altar, were sprinkled upon Aaron and his garments, and upon his sons and their garments: the sanctification and the alliance were to be exhibited, not as two separate ends, but as one and the same object coinciding by their reciprocal bearing; the priests were sanctified only in order to be allied to God, and they could be so allied only by being sanctified. They were to be holy not merely as religious functionaries but in all their relations of life; therefore, the blood and the oil were sprinkled both upon their official garments and their persons; the garments were thus consecrated as holy and priestly vestments exclusively devoted to religious service, and not to be profaned to other purposes; while the persons were sealed as entirely and unreservedly claimed by God, and

raised above the human standard. Thus the ceremonial is aptly brought to a conclusion by a significant act which judiciously combines and concentrates the most essential of the preceding rites.—It follows, from these remarks, that the oil and the blood were of equal importance, and that neither the one nor the other was subordinate. It follows also that both were not, as in some other cases, separately sprinkled upon the priests and their vestments, but in the compound form they had assumed by mixing upon the altar; else the separation would unquestionably have been stated in the text, as it was stated in those instances alluded to; moreover, it would have been impossible to mention, in the command of Exodus (XXIX. 21), first the blood and then the oil, and in our chapter (ver. 30) first the oil and then the blood; since in the case of their being sprinkled separately, the order in which this was done, would have been significant. Nor did the ceremony refer exclusively, or even predominantly, to the garments; it aimed at the sanctification of the garments and the persons alike. Nor can it be considered singular, that the marking of the ear, the hand, and the foot preceded the sprinkling of the altar with the mingled oil and blood, a circumstance which has occasioned needless speculations: for the proper act of expiation was the sin-offering, the first of the sacrificial series; after

anointing oil and of the blood which *was* upon the altar, and sprinkled *it* upon Aaron *and* upon his garments, and upon his sons und upon his sons' garments with him; and he sanctified Aaron *and* his garments, and his sons and his sons' garments with him. 31. And Moses said to Aaron and to his sons, Boil the flesh *at* the door of the Tent of Meeting, and there eat it with the bread that *is* in the basket of consecration, as I have been commanded, saying, Aaron and his sons shall eat it. 32. And that which remains of the flesh, and of the bread you shall burn with fire.

33. And you shall not go out of the door of the Tent of Meeting, *for* seven days, until the days of your

the confession of absolute allegiance conveyed by the holocaust, the ceremonies of the ram of consecration appropriately commenced with the marking of the members, at once the most striking and the most specific act denoting the priests' readiness and zeal, which they could then promise with purified minds; and the ritual is terminated by a most comprehensive and suggestive act, recalling the priestly privileges and duties. — We may here refer to the analogous, though more immoderate ceremonies of the "Taurobolium," which sacrifice was, among other occasions, presented at the initiation of the High-priest of Cybele. It has been described as "a baptism of blood", and was believed to effect spiritual regeneration. The High-priest, gorgeously dressed in a toga of silk and a golden crown, entered a large pit over which were placed boards loosely joined and perforated with holes. A bull covered with garlands and flowers was led upon the boards, and there slaughtered so that the blood fell through the chinks and holes in showers upon the priest, who not only received it eagerly upon his body and clothes, but "held back his head and face to let it flow on his cheeks, his ears,

lips, and nostrils, nay, he allowed the eyes to be wetted, and even moistened his tongue with it, and some he swallowed." When he came forth in such horrible state, he was received with congratulations by the people, who adored him at a distance, because they now considered him as entirely purified by the blood of expiation.

33—36. In order to endow the ceremonial of consecration with the utmost solemnity of which it was capable, it was to be repeated, in exactly the same manner, for *seven* successive days, during which Aaron and his sons were forbidden to leave the holy precincts of the Tabernacle, whether by day or by night. If this were not clear from our text, "And you shall not go out of the door of the Tent of Meeting for seven days, until the days of your consecration be at an end; for during seven days shall you be consecrated" (ver. 33), it is raised beyond all doubt by the wording of the commands in Exodus, "For seven days shall he of Aaron's sons who will be priest in his stead put the garments on" (XXIX. 30); and "For seven days shalt thou make an atonement for the altar and hallow it" (ver. 37); nay, it is expressly stated, "Seven days shalt thou consecrate

consecration be at an end; for *during* seven days you shall be consecrated. 34. As has been done this day, *so* the Lord has commanded to do, to make an atonement for you. 35. And you shall abide *at* the door of the Tent of Meeting day and night *for* seven days, and

them" (ver. 35), which naturally necessitates seven times the "ram of intiation"—"and thou shalt offer *every day* a bullock for a sin-offering of atonement" (ver. 36); the other acts, both those which precede, and those which follow, are then matters of course; and the re-iterated expiation of the altar is specially mentioned (vers. 36, 37). Indeed, if any deviations from the ritual described had been intended, the text, so elaborate and so minute, would not have failed to specify them; it is scarcely possible to understand the assertion that the two rams were offered on the first day only, since a repetition of these sacrifices would have been without aim and object: for what was more important and more characteristic than the ram of consecration, with its varied and most significant rites? And if it is certain from the plain statement of our passage that the sin-offering — the mere negative element in the sacrificial series — was presented seven times, it is impossible to doubt that the two other sacrifices, positive and specific in their import, were deemed equally indispensable; and this view is corroborated by Ezekiel's account of the initiation of future priests (XLIII. 25, 26), an account presenting various other parallels of great interest (vers. 22—27). Seven is the number of *sanctification*; therefore, every chief act was to be repeated seven times; for to *consecrate* is to *sanctify* (see p. 344); but seven is also the number of *covenant*; the ceremonial was to express the perpetual covenant concluded between God and the house of Aaron; its meaning is, therefore, well

expressed in the words of Simch, "Moses consecrated him (Aaron), and anointed him with holy oil; this was appointed to him by an everlasting covenant, and to his seed, so long as the heavens should remain, that they should minister to Him, and execute the office of priesthood, and bless the people in His name" (XLV. 15).

It needs hardly to be observed, that the ritual executed in the manner specified and explained, everywhere betrays its very late origin. It exhibits, as has been admitted on all sides, the whole of the ceremonial law in full operation; it alludes, as to a well-known and familiar matter, to sin-offerings, the most recent class of sacrifices, which was not even in the time of the Deuteronomist legally fixed; and it bespeaks that stage of Levitical organisation which, as we have proved, characterises the most advanced phase in the spiritual life of the Hebrews. We will not urge that history has preserved to us no instance, nor even any indirect mention of or remote allusion to any pontifical consecration approaching in its mode that which is here ordered for all successive High-priests; nor do we attach much importance to the fact, that in some passages of the Pentateuch where the rites of consecration are referred to, no animal sacrifice whatever is named, but that it is simply stated, "And thou shalt clothe with the sacred garments, Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him; and thou shalt anoint them, and consecrate them, that they may serve Me as priests" (Exod. XXVIII. 11); or "And thou shalt bring Aaron and his sons to the door of the Tent of Meeting, and

you shall keep the charge of the Lord, lest you die; for so have I been commanded. — 36. And Aaron and his sons did all the things which the Lord had commanded through Moses.

wash them with water; and thou shalt clothe Aaron in the holy garments, and anoint him, and sanctify him, that he may serve Me as priest; and thou shalt bring his sons, and clothe them with tunics; and thou shalt anoint them, as thou hast anointed their father, that they may serve Me as priests" (Exod. XL. 12—15): we do not consider such omission altogether decisive or cogent, for it may be designed in passages preceding the statement of the sacrificial legislation. But we are justified in laying stress upon the following point. In a previous section, partially consisting of some undoubtedly old portions (ch. VI), a ritual is enjoined to be observed on the day of the High-priest's anointment, as "an eternal statute" (VI. 12—15). Now that ritual, though evidently not stated with completeness, contains features entirely different from those described in our chapter. A cereal offering is ordained to be prepared in a peculiar

manner; while no animal sacrifice is mentioned. The High-priest himself, and not Moses, was evidently meant to present the offering. It is preposterous to find in this passage an allusion to "the impending consecration of the priests" as if an internal connection existed between that ordinance and our chapter. Even if we were inclined to ignore the *argumentum ex silentio*, we are compelled to conclude from what is plainly stated, that, at earlier periods, the consecration of even the chief priest was accomplished in a most simple manner, by anointment, and by a cereal oblation presented in the morning and the evening; while gradually, as the Levitical principles and theories were unfolded, the ceremony assumed larger proportions, and was at last invested with every significant symbol which the new system was able to devise.

The initiation of the *Levites* will be described and explained in its due place (Num. VIII. 5—22).

CHAPTER IX.

SUMMARY.—On the eighth day, Aaron, by the direction of Moses, sacrificed a sin- and a burnt-offering for himself and his sons, and a sin-, a burnt-, and a thank-offering for the people, and added to them the necessary cereal oblations. In both cases, the sin-offering was presented in the same manner as that brought on the days of consecration, that is, the blood came on the brazen altar of the Court only, and yet the flesh was burnt entirely (vers. 8—11, 15). In the thank-offerings, both the breasts and right shoulders of the victims were waved, a deviation from the ordinary ritual suggested by the peculiar nature of the occasion (ver. 21). Then Aaron blessed the people (ver. 22), and went with Moses into the Holy, and both blessed the people again; after which God appeared in His glory, and sent fire from heaven which consumed the sacrifices on the altar: the people, at once rejoiced and awed by the miracle, worshipped God (vers. 23, 24).

1. And it was on the eighth day *that* Moses called

1, 2. After the priests had been installed into their office, it was deemed

desirable at once to exhibit them in the full activity of their ministrations.

Aaron and his sons, and the elders of Israel. 2. And he said to Aaron, Take for thyself a young calf for a sin-offering, and a ram for a burnt-offering, *both* without blemish, and offer *them* before the Lord. 3. And to the children of Israel thou shalt speak, saying, Take a kid of the goats for a sin-offering, and a calf and a lamb, *both* of the first year *and* without blemish, for a burnt-offering, 4. Also a bullock and a ram for a thank-offering, to sacrifice before the Lord; and a bloodless

No time was to be lost to prove how essential their services were for the welfare of the theocracy, and how eagerly the new officials themselves longed to perform their noble functions. Therefore, as a natural continuation in the description of the inaugural rites, follows an accurate account of the sacrifices which they presented on the first day of their priesthood, which was the eighth after the commencement of the consecration. As, in spite of their election and anointment, the sense of human sinfulness and frailty which they shared with those for whom they interceded, was to be kept alive in their minds, the offerings at which they officiated in the name of the people, were preceded by offerings in their own behalf. And these sacrifices were a sin-offering and a holocaust, both recalling moral insufficiency and dependence; they did not include a thank-offering, because such stern and humiliating feelings were to be mingled with no element which, however distantly and indirectly, might foster the sentiments of pride and self-complacency. In order to distinguish the sacrifices of the eighth day from the more solemn ones of the week of consecration, the sin-offering was no bullock, which is the *victima maxima*, but a young calf, pointing indeed to that solemnity, but inferior to it in degree; though the holocaust consisted, as in the previous ceremonies, of a ram. In reality, Aaron and his sons might

seem to require, on the eighth day, no particular expiation, since they had passed the preceding seven days exclusively in acts of atonement and holiness; but the principle that they could not possibly be the mediators for the forgiveness of the people, unless they had first secured it for themselves, was to be strikingly enforced in their very first acts of public administration.

3. 4. An offering more grand and more comprehensive than that of the priests, was prescribed for the people; for it was intended as the first active manifestation of the holy community at the national and sanctified altar through hallowed intercessors; it partook, therefore, also of the character of an initiatory sacrifice. It comprised all the chief classes — the sin-, the burnt-, and the thank-offering —, coupled with a cereal oblation, and it included all the ordinary sacrificial animals. The sin-offering consisted of a kid of the goats usually set apart for public sacrifices of that kind (p. 62); but each of the two other offerings was composed of two animals, evidently to enhance their importance and their effect — the holocaust, of a calf and a lamb, and the thank-offering, of a bullock and a ram. This last point is significant: for while the sacrifice of the priests was without any thank-offering, that of the people included one of an imposing nature, for which the two greatest and most

offering mingled with oil; for to day the Lord will appear to you.

5. And they brought *that* which Moses commanded before the Tent of Meeting: and all the congregation drew near, and stood before the Lord. 6. And Moses

valued victims were chosen. For the people were pre-eminently to harbour and to manifest the feeling of gratitude; they had advanced a most decided step towards their lofty and spiritual goal; they had witnessed the fulfilment of an essential point of the promises they had received; they had now obtained the certainty that, whatever their worldly destinies, their higher interests and those which constitute true happiness, peace of mind and the grace of God, were for ever secured, and established upon imperishable foundations. Yet, though an occasion for deep gratitude, it was not an opportunity for festive exultation. The joy was tempered by solemnity. For the new covenant was, on that very day, to be supernaturally ratified. God Himself and His glory were to appear in the midst of the people, and thus palpably to prove to them that He indeed had ordained and sanctioned the Tabernacle, the sacrifices, and the priests, and that He was ready to accept the offerings that would be presented in that holy place through His chosen ministers (see on vers. 22—24). Therefore, the thank-offering, though stately from the *species*, was limited in the *number* of the victims; it was small compared with the eucharistic sacrifices offered on emergencies like the dedication of the altar; and for a kindred reason, the holocaust was more simple than that of the new-moons and festivals. The convivial repasts were to be moderate and of no protracted duration. All arrangements prescribed were thoughtfully adapted to the character of the occasion.

5—21. The whole congregation as-

sembled in the Court of the Tabernacle and before it. They stood thus "before the Lord", in His holy presence. Moses explained to them the ceremonies about to be performed, that they might understand the important effects which these rites were designed to work for their own spiritual condition and that of their religious guides. They were to be adequately prepared for appreciating the Divine manifestation that was expected. Then Moses solemnly called upon Aaron to approach the altar and to commence the sacrifices (ver. 7). Now, in these sacrifices, Aaron, the High-priest, performed all the significant and truly sacerdotal functions. He occupied a position so conspicuous that through him the general command concerning the offerings was addressed to the people (ver. 4); and to him the general execution was confided so far, that Moses no longer watched the details, while these were in course of performance (comp. IX. 16). Nay, he was immediately afterwards honoured with a direct communication from God, while his sons assisted him in all those ministrations which were later committed to the Levites. Thus the holocaust and the sin-offering could be called *his* sacrifices (ver. 7), though they were intended for his sons likewise. But the atonement which he was to obtain through the offerings, was not so important for the sake of himself, but on account of the people to whose benefit it would redound: for the High-priest's purity involved the purity of the nation, as the High-priest's guilt implied the nation's guilt, and in him the holiness of the community was concen-

said, This *is* the thing which the Lord has commanded *that* you should do, in order that the glory of the Lord may appear to you. 7. And Moses said to Aaron, Approach to the altar, and offer thy sin-offering and thy burnt-offering, and make an atonement for thyself and for the people; and offer the sacrifice of the people, and make an atonement for them, as the Lord has commanded.

8. And Aaron went to the altar and slew the calf of the sin-offering, which *was* for himself. 9. And the sons of Aaron brought the blood to him; and he dipped his finger in the blood, and put *it* upon the horns of the altar, and poured out the *other* blood at the bottom of the altar. 10. But the fat, and the kidneys, and the

trated and reflected. Hence Moses commanded Aaron, "Offer thy sin-offering, and thy burnt-offering, *and make an atonement for thyself and for the people*" and then the expiation of the Israelites was to be solicited anew by sacrifices offered for them specially (ver. 7).

The priests' sin-offering presented on the eighth day did not materially differ from that of the seven preceding days. In neither case, was any of the blood brought into the Holy; it was wholly disposed of at the *brazen* altar, though the flesh was burnt entirely. For not even on the eighth day had Aaron's dignity reached its full independence and glory; it still remained, to a certain degree, under the control of Moses, who gave commands to his brother, as he had received them from God. Therefore Aaron was not permitted to pass beyond the Court; he was not yet fully qualified to appear in the immediate presence of God. Yet, in some respects, the sin-offering of the eighth day was less solemn than that of the preceding week; the victims were not quite identical; and blood was indeed put with the finger on the horns of the brazen

altar, but not "round about" the horns; the reason is obviously that on the previous occasions, the blood of the sin-offering served not only for the expiation of the priests but, at the same time, for the sanctification of the altar, wherefore a complete marking of the horns was deemed necessary as a fit symbol. Then followed the holocaust, probably accompanied by the usual cereal oblation, though this is not mentioned in the account. As it was the first burnt-offering after the consecration, the text is explicit in describing the manner, in which it was to be sacrificed, in order to obviate any possible impurity; the head and the other principal members were to be first delivered up to the flames, and formed the proper holocaust, and then only the bowels and the legs were added, after they had been carefully washed (see p. 161). The sin-offering, with which the sacrifices for the people commenced, was presented with exactly the same ceremonies as that which the priests offered for themselves: a part of the blood was put on the horns of the brazen altar, and the rest poured out at its base; yet all the flesh was burnt. For as the priests were not yet,

great lobe of the liver of the sin-offering, he burnt upon the altar, as the Lord had commanded Moses. 11. And the flesh and the hide he burnt with fire without the camp. 12. And he slew the burnt-offering, and Aaron's sons presented to him the blood, and he sprinkled it round about upon the altar. 13. And they presented the burnt-offering to him, with its pieces and the head; and he burnt *them* upon the altar. 14. And he washed the bowels and the legs, and burnt *them* upon the burnt-offering on the altar.

15. And he brought the people's offering, and took the goat, which *was* the sin-offering for the people, and

to the full extent, the free mediators, so was the people not yet the free theocratic community; therefore, no blood of the sin-offering came into the Holy. However, not even the priests were allowed to eat of the flesh, because, whatever the ceremonial, it was the sin-offering of the *people*, among whom the priests were also concluded; and naturally nobody could partake of the flesh of his own sin-offering. For as the sacrifice of the High-priest was, at the same time, a sacrifice of the people, so the sacrifice of the people was, *eo ipso*, a sacrifice of the High-priest and of the priests; the connection between the one and the other was so intimate and so clearly organic, that it was impossible to speak of a sacrifice of the people in contradistinction to that of the priests; the latter formed an indispensable part of the former. Hence this expiatory sacrifice stood midway between that ordinarily presented for the whole people and that of an individual Israelite.

Now, all these things were executed under the immediate command of Moses, and in such a manner as to secure not only his satisfaction, but also the approbation of God, who appeared in a wonderful vision to express His sanction (ver. 23). And yet it is later stated that Moses

was greatly incensed at Aaron and his sons for not having eaten the flesh of the sin-offering, as they ought to have done, since the blood of the victim had not been brought into the Holy; and that he was only appeased when Aaron pleaded exceptional circumstances in extenuation of the otherwise unjustifiable omission (X. 16—20). It is, therefore, impossible to doubt that we have here two different views on the same subject by two writers — the one taking the whole nature of the initiation into account, and therefore regarding the exclusion of the blood from the Holy as an incidental point which does not destroy the character of the offering as one of the whole people; the other strictly insisting upon the fact of that exclusion, and applying to it a general and formal rule: the view of the former is more comprehensive and more developed, that of the latter limited and rigid. The narrative in our chapter manifestly embodies the later and more matured conceptions (see also on X. 16—20).

After the holocaust had been presented with the prescribed rites, and in conjunction with the legal *minchah*, the last act followed — the thank-offering, in which evidently the ceremonial of the day was meant to culminate. The fat and the fat parts of

slew it, and offered it as a sin-offering like the first. 16. And he brought the burnt-offering, and offered it according to the law. 17. And he brought the bloodless offering, and took a handful of it, and burnt *it* upon the altar, besides the burnt-sacrifice of the morning. 18. And he slew the bullock and the ram *for* a sacrifice of thank-offering, which *was* for the people; and Aaron's sons presented to him the blood, and he sprinkled it upon the altar round about. 19. And the fat *and the fat* parts of the bullock and of the ram — the fat tail, and that which covers *the bowels*, and the kidneys, and the great lobe of the liver — 20. They put the fat *and the fat parts* upon the breasts, and he burnt the fat *and the fat parts* upon the altar. 21. And the breasts and the right shoulders Aaron waved *for* a wave-offering before the Lord, as Moses had commanded.

22. And Aaron lifted up his hands towards the people,

both the bullock and the ram were, of course, burnt on the altar, but before this was done, they were placed on the breasts of the two animals, which were priestly portions, strikingly to intimate that these parts were burnt in the name of the priests. Then both the breasts and the right shoulders were sanctified by Aaron with the rite of waving, and surrendered to him and his sons. Ordinarily, the breast alone was waved; but on this peculiar occasion, the right shoulder was included in the same act: for it was deemed desirable to mark all the priestly portions as hallowed, because given up by God to His appointed servants by a free act of grace. A cereal oblation, though again not mentioned, most probably accompanied the thank-offering.

22—24. Now Aaron and his sons were indeed fully invested with all the symbols of their office; they were thoroughly qualified even for its highest functions; and Aaron, filled with the spirit of God in consequence of his anointment, and purified from

sin by repeated expiatory offerings, could, for the first time, raise his hands and bless the people in the name of God. Thus his ministrations in the Court were completed on that momentous day, and he could "descend" from the elevation leading to the altar not by steps, but by a gently sloping dam of earth, on which he had performed the rites of the various sacrifices. But it remained for him to burn incense on the golden altar; and it was for this purpose probably, that he entered the Holy, not however alone, but together with Moses, who had been the mediating link between him and God (ver. 23). But it is surprising, according to the stricter views of the Pentateuch, that Moses should have been permitted to step into the Holy, which was scrupulously reserved for Aaron and his descendants alone. We are hence entitled to infer that this statement dates from a time, when the distinction between priests and Levites was not yet rigidly enforced, and when all the members of the tribe of Levi were

and blessed them; and he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the thank-offering. 23. And Moses and Aaron went into the Tent of Meeting, and came out, and blessed the people:

admitted to priestly functions (p. 369). The later date of the concluding verses of this chapter is confirmed by other reasons. We will lay no stress on the circumstance, that the people are blessed again by Moses and Aaron (ver. 23), after they had been duly blessed by Aaron (ver. 22), to whom this privilege was later exclusively assigned: but it is impossible not to see the discrepancies implied in the following words, "And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat and the fat parts: and the whole people saw it, and they shouted, and fell upon their faces" (ver. 24). These statements are in contradiction both with those immediately preceding and those before recorded. For the burnt-offering sacrificed on the eighth day had been actually burnt, as is distinctly remarked and even twice repeated (vers. 13, 14); moreover, the thank-offerings had been presented *after* the holocaust, and their fat and fat parts also had been burnt upon the altar: how then was it possible that after all this a fire should "consume upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat and fat parts"? Again, on a previous occasion, the command had been given to keep a perpetual fire upon the brazen altar (VI. 5, 6); it must be supposed that this command had at once been complied with; for one of its chief objects was that the altar should always be in readiness for the regular morning and evening holocausts (VI. 2, 5); and these were indeed supposed to have been duly offered at the time of the consecration (compare ver. 17). If, therefore, a pure fire, miraculously

sent from heaven, was at all desirable, it should have been sent when the service of the brazen altar was *commenced*, and not after it had for some time been in full operation, and had been employed in the most solemn sacrifices of consecration. Thus the narrative is not only encumbered with a mythical element, but it is so encumbered purposely and contradictorily: the simplicity of the conceptions maintained in previous sections is abandoned, and partially replaced by crude and heathen notions (see p. 530). Under these circumstances, we are justified in asking, whether the words, "And the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people" (ver. 23), occupy their right place? Probably, they formed indeed part of the original narrative of the chapter, because they are alluded and pointed to in earlier verses (4, 6), which we have no decisive criteria for declaring as interpolations; but they may have concluded the chapter, in this manner, "And Aaron lifted up his hands towards the people, and blessed them; and he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the thank-offering: and the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people" — it may be, in the form of a cloud, as He is frequently described to have shown Himself. Thus the account of the eighth day would be complete and well-finished. But when the revisers intended to add the miracle of the heaven-sent fire, they deemed it, not injudiciously, to be an apt illustration of the promised vision, and arranged the matter accordingly: "the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people, and there came a fire out from before the Lord".

and the glory of the Lord appeared to all the people. 24. And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat *and the fat parts*. And the whole people saw it, and they shouted, and fell on their faces.

For indeed the "glory" or "goodness" of God manifested itself, according to Biblical and ancient notions generally, like "a devouring fire", or "a burning fire" not consuming its object, or a brilliant light shedding a halo around, filling sacred spots, and revealing the Divine presence, whether to destroy, to threaten, or to encourage, and as the nature of fire was held to be kindred to the nature of God, the Jews and Neoplatonicians developed, in the course of time, the idea of a *logos* — a ray emanating from God as from the essence of light; and Philo could declare not only that "God is the first light", the "archetype of every other light", or rather that the real model was "His own most perfect word, the light", but even, "The invisible Divine reason, perceptible only by intellect, was called the image of God; and the

image of this image is that light, perceptible only by the intellect, which is the image of the Divine reason." But, in whatever form the author of the main narrative understood the vision to have taken place, it could not, as we have shown, assume the form of fire sent from heaven in order to burn the holocaust and the fat on the altar: this feature is evidently derived from an older, because less pure and simple, document, or from a general tradition which not unfrequently represented such heaven-sent fire as a certain mark of God's favour and a striking proof of His omnipotence. When, therefore, the people saw the miracle, they at once recognised the Divine presence, and acknowledged the Divine power: "they shouted" in awe, and "fell on their faces" in deep submission and gratitude.

CHAPTER X.

SUMMARY.—Nadab and Abihu, the two eldest sons of Aaron, burnt incense in an unlawful manner, for which offence they were killed by a heavenly fire. Moses reproved Aaron for his negligence in superintending his sons; and when the bodies had been buried by relatives, Aaron and his two surviving sons were forbidden to evince any demonstration of grief and mourning, as this would be incompatible with the nature of their office (vers. 1—7). Then follow a few ordinances regarding the duties of the priests (ver. 8—11). Aaron and his two sons were commanded to consume their portions of the thank-offerings and of the cereal oblations which had been presented on the "eighth day" (vers. 12—15); and finally, Moses argued with Aaron and his sons because the latter had burnt the flesh of the people's sin offering entirely, instead of eating the priestly portions of it: but he was satisfied with the reasons urged by his brother in justification (vers. 16—20).

1. And Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, took

1—7. There lived in the reminiscence of the people a tradition of an offence committed by Nadab and Abihu, Aaron's two eldest sons, against

either *of them* his censer, and put fire therein, and put incense thereon, and presented before the Lord a strange offering made by fire, which He had not commanded them. 2. And there went out fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord. 3. Then Moses said to Aaron, *This is it* that the Lord spoke, saying, I will be sanctified through those that are near

the strict laws concerning the burning of incense, and of the rapid and fearful retribution which befell them in consequence (comp. XVI. 1; Num. III. 4; XXVI. 61; 1 Chr. XXIV. 2). The compilers of Leviticus considered that they could find no more appropriate place for that legend than immediately after the consecration of the priests and the Divine vision that had sanctioned it: the crime was the more striking after acts of such solemnity, and the terrible punishment was more justified after such singular manifestations of grace; the holy ceremonies and the Divine goodness on the one hand, and the profane levity of those who had been so signally distinguished on the other hand, appeared to form a strong and impressive contrast, which indeed makes itself felt in the almost dramatic progress of the narrative. This appears to have been the sole guiding principle in the arrangement of the portions; and it seems impossible to discover or to prove an internal connection and a pragmatic continuity. It has been contended that Nadab and Abihu, filled with joy and perhaps elevated by wine (ver. 9), wished to accompany the grateful shouting of the people with an incense-offering, and thus to enhance the homage of God; or that, terrified by the heaven-sent fire (IX. 24), and regarding it as a mark of Divine wrath, they considered a fumigation desirable to appease God and to save the people: but these combinations are fanciful and untenable; the conjecture that Nadab and

Abihu had indulged in wine, is derived from a later passage which stands in no connection with ours (ver. 9); and it was absolutely impossible that they should have looked upon the heavenly fire as a manifestation of Divine anger.

God had commanded that Aaron alone was to burn incense in the Holy, on the golden altar, every morning and every evening; that the incense should be prepared in a peculiar manner from certain fixed ingredients; and that it was to be kindled by the holy flame taken from the brazen altar. All these commands were contravened by Aaron's sons: they had no right at all to perform the fumigation; and they seem to have used ordinary incense, and to have burnt it in the Court, in unhallowed vessels, and at an irregular time. Thus they presented a "strange" or unlawful offering, recklessly defying God's explicit injunctions. Therefore, the text states, "There went out fire from before the Lord, and devoured them, and they died before the Lord" (ver. 2), that is, in the Court of the Tabernacle (comp. ver. 4). It is scarcely legitimate to enquire, how the author pictured to himself the occurrence which he touches rather than describes, whether he understood lightning, or a flame descending from heaven similar to that which had fallen upon the altar, or a sudden and uncontrollable spreading of the blaze on the altar, or a fire in any other form. It is irrelevant to press the literal sense of mythical embellishments. It is suf-

Me, and before all the people I will be glorified. And Aaron remained silent. 4. And Moses called Mishael and Elzaphan, the sons of Uzziel the uncle of Aaron, and said to them, Come near, carry your relations from before the Sanctuary out of the camp. 5. So they went near, and carried them in their tunics out of the camp, as Moses had said. 6. And Moses said to Aaron and

sufficient to know that similar direct intercessions of God by means of fire were deemed possible (comp. Num. XI. 1; XVI. 35; 2 Ki. I. 10, 12; Job I. 16). Thus much is certain that the writer did not consider the fire to have *consumed* the two men, whose bodies and very garments were left intact (vers. 4, 5); and in this sense we must understand the words that the fire "devoured" or "burnt" them. It appeared that the afflicted father might expect an explanation of the fearful punishment sent as an example and a caution. Moses was unable to offer him comfort; on the contrary, he could not help implicating in the guilt Aaron himself, who ought to have watched and directed his heedless sons; and Aaron acquiesced in the reproof: he was silent; he withheld those loud and passionate wails natural on such mournful occasions. The warning could not be more striking nor more conspicuous. The men so suddenly carried off by an awful death, had just been included in the most solemn rites which pointed them out as the special favourites of the Deity. They had before been deemed worthy of beholding the Divine presence (Exod. XXIV. 1, 11). They belonged to those who were to be "near God", enjoying His light and His glory. But this distinction, so far from being a shield and protection, singled them out the more strongly for Divine retribution; for, said Moses to his brother, "This is it that the Lord spoke, I will be sanctified through those that are near Me, and before all

the people I will be glorified" (ver. 3). The guardians of the Law were expected to set the example of the most unswerving obedience. The choicer their privileges, the more uncompromising were their duties. Aaron felt the justice of the sentence; and merging his human feelings in the spiritual requirements of his mission, he yielded in meekness and resignation. The event was to be rendered instrumental for teaching the lesson it implies, thoroughly and emphatically. It was indeed, under all circumstances, defilement in the *High-priest* to touch the corpses of even his children; but ordinarily, priests were permitted to approach the bodies of their brothers: yet, in this instance, when Nadab and Abihu were to be buried, and taken from the Court of the Sanctuary to a place without the camp, not Eleazar and Ithamar, but some more distant relatives were charged with the task. Nor was the choice even of these relatives without significance. It fell upon Mishael and Elzaphan, the children of Uzziel. Why were the sons of the elder brothers Izhar or Hebron, likewise Aaron's uncles, passed over, and the sons of the younger Uzziel selected? One of Izhar's sons was Korah, who later rose in impious rebellion against Aaron's priesthood, while of Hebron no children are mentioned. As Nadab and Abihu had been killed for the vindication of the Sanctuary and its laws, they were to be brought to their last resting place by men whose piety was

to Eleazar and to Ithamar, his sons, Do not let your heads be dishevelled, nor rend your clothes, lest you die, and lest He be wrath upon all the congregation; but let your brethren, the whole house of Israel, bewail the burning which the Lord has caused. 7. And you shall not go out from the door of the Tent of Meeting, lest you die: for the anointing oil of the Lord is upon you. And they did according to the word of Moses.

unquestioned. Again, neither their father nor their surviving brothers were to show any outward mark of grief. The High-priest and the priests, ordinarily subjected to different rules of mourning, were this time placed on the same rigid footing. Neither the one nor the other were to neglect their hair or rend their garments, which were ordinary manifestations of affliction and despair. They were not to leave the holy Tabernacle, the seat of serenity and peace, which no sorrow could approach or disturb. Their disobedience in this respect was threatened to cause not only their own death, but also disaster to the Community with which they were identified. An exhibition of sadness and dejection on their part was considered not merely as a weakness but a crime; for it tended to prove that they were unworthy of their great spiritual office, and that their human were stronger than their heavenly ties; whereas it was the duty of the true priest "to say to his father and to his mother, I have not seen them, nor to acknowledge his brothers, nor to know his children; but to observe the word of God, and to keep His covenant" (Deut. XXXIII. 9). For "the anointing oil of the Lord was upon them", by which they were raised above the level of human cares and anxieties (comp. XXI. 10, 12). But while the natural mourners were to display the utmost indifference, the whole *people* was invited to bewail the calamity which had befallen some

of their appointed mediators; for the "holy nation" was to be reminded, in the most impressive manner possible, of the awful sanctity of the public worship. — The classical parallels of Minos who, on hearing of the death of his son Androgeus, completed the sacrifice to the graces in which he was engaged, merely taking off his crown and ordering the music to cease; of the High-priest or consul Horatius Pulvillus who, while occupied in the dedication of a temple to Jupiter, received the news of his son's death, and yet completed the ceremony unmoved; and of Xenophon who, when informed during a sacrifice of the death of his eldest son Gryllus in the battle of Mantinea, laid aside his wreath, but resumed it when he learnt that his son had died bravely and victorious; these and similar parallels do not altogether coincide with our narrative; for in the two former cases, the father merely delayed the expression of his sorrow till after the sacred act, and in the third, he conquered his grief not by stronger feelings of religion but of patriotism.

We need hardly point out the extreme rigour and severity which our narrative breathes; it shows the Levitical spirit in all its relentless sternness, insisting upon a literal submission to its injunctions with inflexible tyranny: the story is meant to serve as a terrible warning to all who dare to deviate from the minutest behests of the priestly legislation, and

8. And the Lord spoke to Aaron, saying, 9. Do not drink wine nor strong drink, thou, nor thy sons with thee, when you go into the Tent of Meeting, lest you

it reflects the most advanced stage of hierarchical pretension.

8—11. "Wine is a mocker, strong drink is boisterous, and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise" (Prov. XX. 1); this view of the effects of wine taken in excess, though, in moderation, it "gladdens the heart of man" (Ps. CIV. 15), recurs in various forms (Hos. IV. 11; VII. 5; Isai. V. 11, 12; XIX. 14; etc.). It gave rise to the law that neither High-priest nor priest was to partake of wine or strong drink when they entered the Tabernacle for the performance of their sacred functions; death was to be the penalty of contravention; and the ordinance was to remain in force for all future times. Composure and perfect concentration of thoughts, the utmost nicety in the prescribed observances, and a dignified appearance — these requirements so essential during the ministrations, were deemed incompatible with the enjoyment of wine, which was forbidden entirely because even a little may mislead to intemperance, and because experience had shown the frequent licentiousness of the priests and its fatal consequences; "they also have erred through wine" exclaimed Isaiah (XXVIII. 7), "and go astray through strong drink, the priest and the prophet have erred through strong drink; they are consumed by the wine, they go astray through strong drink; they err in vision, they stumble in judgment". Philo insists upon the prohibition with great ardour and decision; wine, he observes, was most wisely interdicted to the priest during his sacred functions, on account of four results which it produces — "hesitation, forgetfulness, sleep, and folly"; nay it effects "destruction of reason"; and he adds a

strong denunciation of wine in general, "we must look upon the use of it as a most unprofitable thing for all the purposes of life, in as much as it weighs down the soul, dims the outward senses, and enervates the body". A similar law existed in reference to the Egyptian priests, and those about to be initiated into the mysteries of Isis during the time of preparation; also among the Persian Magi and the Pythagoreans. The effects of wine are described by Porphyry nearly in the same manner as by Philo, "it causes injury to the nerves, brings on fulness of the head, and excites amatory desires". The worshippers at Heliopolis on no account brought wine into the temple, not even for libations; they avoided it during their purifications; for it was regarded as the blood of those who had fought against the gods, had fallen, and mingled with the earth, whence the vine took its origin. Athenæus remarks on the authority of Pylarchus, "Among the Greeks, those who sacrifice to the sun make their libations of honey, as they never bring wine to the altars of the gods, saying that it is proper that the god who keeps the whole universe in order, and regulates everything, and is always going round and superintending the whole, should in no respect be connected with drunkenness". Among several Greek tribes the custom obtained that whoever intended to consult an oracle or to perform any other sacred act, was to abstain from all food on that day, but from wine for three days previously. Plato advised that no man, when in camp, should taste wine, but exist upon water alone, so also no slave, whether male or female, no magistrate during his

die: *it shall be* a statute for ever throughout your generations: 10. And that you may distinguish between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; 11. And that you may teach the children of Israel all the statutes, which the Lord has spoken to them through Moses.

12. And Moses spoke to Aaron and to Eleazar and to Ithamar, his sons that were left, Take the bloodless offering that is left of the offerings of the Lord made

year of office, neither pilots, nor judges while engaged in their duties, nor members of the council when about to deliberate upon matters of moment. This, however, was the only dietary restriction imposed upon the Hebrew priests as such, nor was even wine forbidden to them ordinarily. The same precepts with respect to food applied to both priests and people, for they reflected as clearly as any other branch of the legislation, the holiness of the people as "a kingdom of priests". Not so among other nations, where priests and people were, in this respect also, separated by a wide chasm. Thus, for instance, the Egyptian priests had a distinct code regulating their food; they were not allowed to eat fish; they hardly looked upon beans, which they considered an unclean pulse; they abstained from the flesh of sheep and pigs, which they supposed to produce superfluous humours; they shunned, in fact, the flesh of all quadrupeds not horned, and those with uncloven or many-cleft hoofs; some of them avoided all animal food in general, and even eggs, and in times of lustration also salt and bread.

To the injunction regarding the abstinence from wine, a few other remarks are added to characterise the duties of the Hebrew priests: these were the authorities to be appealed to in all matters of religion and purification; and it was their duty to instruct the people in all Divine ordinances sup-

posed to have been communicated through Moses.

Nobody can seriously contend that a real connection exists either between these verses (8—11) and the preceding episode concerning the death of Nadab and Abihu, or between these verses themselves. It is scarcely necessary to refute the playful view too frequently advanced both by ancient and recent writers that "possibly Nadab and Abihu drank wine with the thank-offering, and in their excitement or drunkenness presented the unlawful fumigation"; and a simple perusal of the passage under discussion suffices to show that a special injunction (regarding the wine) is loosely coupled with comprehensive principles summarising some of the most characteristic duties of the priests. We cannot, therefore, but conclude that these verses, introduced as they are by a separate heading (ver. 8), form a little fragment by themselves, put into this place without any perceptible reason or right, and properly requiring a very different position, if the Book were judiciously arranged (see the Introduction); in fact, if they are preserved in their integrity, they must be pronounced as unskillfully, and even illogically written, and recall the lax and negligent style of a late period, which the restriction to the Aaronites of the mission of teaching, instead of being extended to all the Levites, bespeaks no less intelligibly.

12—15. The burnt-offerings of the priests and of the people, and probably also the thank-offerings of the latter,

by fire, and eat it unleavened before the altar; for it *is* most holy. 13. And you shall eat it in the holy place, because it *is* thy due and thy sons' due of the sacrifices of the Lord made by fire; for so I am commanded. 14. And the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder shall you eat in a clean place; thou, and thy sons, and thy daughters with thee; for as thy due, and thy sons' due they have been given out of the sacrifices of thank-offerings of the children of Israel. 15. The heave-shoulder and the wave-breast shall they bring with the offerings made by fire of the fat *and the fat parts*, to wave *them for* a wave-offering before the Lord; and it shall be thine and thy

that had been presented on the eighth day, were accompanied by bloodless oblations, though these are not expressly mentioned except in the first case. But of the flour a handful, and of the unleavened cakes one of each kind only was burnt on the altar as a memorial; the remainder of the flour was to be baked into unleavened bread, and eaten, together with the other cakes, "beside the altar", that is, in the Court of the Tabernacle, because those remains belonged to the class of "most holy" things, and were for ever assigned to the male descendants of Aaron as a part of their fixed dues. In a similar manner, Aaron and his sons were to consume the breasts and right shoulders of the two thank-offerings, since these portions were granted to them as a perpetual revenue from the thank-offerings of the Hebrews. Now, both the breasts and the right shoulders had, at that peculiar sacrifice of the eighth day, been "waved"; the writer, therefore, enjoined as a general command, that the same parts should be waved in *all* thank-offerings together with the fat. The universal and permanent applicability of the ordinance cannot be questioned both on account of the context and the wording. But a previous law demanded the waving of the breast only, while

the shoulder was either simply to be "taken off" as a gift for the priest, or consecrated by another rite, that of "heaving" (see p. 139). Which of the two statutes was in force? or which possesses greater authority and probability? It may be assumed as a natural principle, that the older sacrificial practice was characterised by greater simplicity, while nice distinctions and more complicated regulations were adopted in the course of time, as the Levitical system was developed and accepted. Now, it is not easy to explain, why just the breast alone should be "waved", while the shoulder, the other and no less important priestly appurtenance, was not included in the rite. Antiquarians have in vain attempted to discover a satisfactory reason, and so obscure is the subject that uncertainty prevails even with regard to the exact manipulation to which the shoulder was subjected (See I. c.). It is, therefore, probable that, at first, both the breast and right shoulder were waved; but that, later, a distinction in the treatment of both was deemed desirable, whatever the reason which suggested the modification. Hence we have a right to consider the injunction of our passage, based as it is upon a supposed ceremonial observed in the time of Moses himself, as embodying

sons' with thee, by a statute for ever, as the Lord has commanded.

16. And Moses searched after the goat of the sin-offering, and, behold, it was burnt. And he was angry with Eleazar and with Ithamar, the sons of Aaron *who were* left, saying, 17. Wherefore have you not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place? for it *is* most holy, and *God* has given it you to remove the iniquity of the

the older practice, whereas the refining alteration was introduced at a subsequent period.

16—20. While the narrative appears to continue the record of incidents connected with the celebrations of the eighth day, it involves itself into a contradiction which we have above pointed out, and which well characterises the nature of the compilation (see notes on IX. 5—21).—The priests abstained from eating of the sin-offering of the people, because they had been commanded to burn it entirely. But another writer believed it to be an invariable rule that the priests were bound to eat the flesh of those expiatory sacrifices of which the blood had not been brought into the Holy (VI. 22, 23): for the meal was, in such cases, an essential and an official part of the expiatory rites; it bore no social character; it was not even shared by the families of the priests (see pp. 143, 144); the sin-offering was incomplete without it; for it implied the declaration that the sacrifice had indeed achieved its appointed end of atonement; since, as Philo observes, God would not have invited His servants and ministers to partake of the repast, unless perfect forgiveness had been granted. Therefore Moses asked Aaron's sons reproachfully, "Wherefore have you not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place? for it is most holy, and God has given it you to remove the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord"

(ver. 17). For as the victim, by its death, symbolically took upon itself the deserved punishment, but not the guilt, of the offerer, it could be eaten, as a clean and pure animal, by the priests who had been instrumental in transferring that retribution from the worshipper to the animal, that is, in effecting the expiation. — If the blood came into the Sanctuary, it was of itself deemed sufficiently effectual to work that end, while it hallowed the entire animal to such a degree that not even the priests could partake of it. — Moses addressed his remonstrances to Nadab and Ithamar alone (ver. 16); but though he did not mention Aaron, evidently out of respect for the supreme dignity with which he had just been invested, he naturally included him in the expression of his displeasure. Aaron feeling this, and perhaps aware that his responsibility was even greater than that of his sons, undertook the reply on their behalf and his own. His sons, he observed, could hardly be deemed fit to eat of the people's sin-offering on a day when they had shown by a holocaust and a sin-offering, how much they stood in need of atonement themselves, and how far they were removed from that holiness which so solemn a meal required; and he, Aaron himself, plunged into grief by the sudden and awful death of his two eldest sons, was not in a condition of mind, and as a mourner scarcely qualified, to partake of a sacrificial meal, were it even one of so solemn a character as that

congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord. 18. Behold, the blood of it was not brought into the Holy within: you should indeed have eaten it in the holy *place*, as I commanded. 19. And Aaron said to Moses, Behold, this day have they offered their sin-offering and their burnt-offering before the Lord; and

connected with a sin-offering. To some extent, the reason assigned on behalf of Aaron applied to his sons also—for they had lost their brothers; and the reason assigned on behalf of his sons applied to Aaron likewise—for the holocaust and the sin-offering had been presented for him as well: but in Nadab and Abihu the moral insufficiency, in Aaron the bereavement was felt more strongly; and the excuse was framed accordingly. "And", concludes the text, "when Moses heard that, he was content" (ver. 20). But this remark excites surprise in more than one respect. Granted even that the apologies, though opposed to the precepts of the sacrificial code, were prompted by a spirit of piety and humility, and granted moreover, that the plea brought forward for exonerating the brothers is acceptable, since the eighth day may be considered as completing the initiation; it must be asked, how Moses could acquiesce in the justification ventured by Aaron for himself? Had Aaron not, immediately before, been most emphatically warned not to give way to his natural feelings and instincts, but absolutely to sacrifice them to his spiritual office? (vers. 6—8). How then could Moses approve of Aaron's declaration that he was unable to eat of a sin-offering, afflicted as he was by a domestic calamity, especially as he was in a state of perfect purity, since he had never left the holy precincts? And had not Aaron been distinctly invited to eat of the thank-offerings and of the bloodless oblation, without offering any objection? (vers. 12—14).

Again, what position does Moses occupy in this remonstrance? He is, at first, of opinion that the priests ought by all means to have eaten the flesh of the people's sin-offering; when he finds they have not done so, he is seized with wrath, and gives vent to it in vehement and bitter terms arraigning the priests for desertion of their most important duty; but when he hears Aaron's exculpatory arguments, he at once retracts his opinion and declares himself satisfied. It must strike every attentive reader that the spirit of this passage is utterly foreign to that which pervades the rest of the narrative. While everywhere else Moses acts clearly as the mouthpiece and agent of God, and is, therefore, infallible in his views and arrangements, he evidently acts here on his own account, appears irritable, and is liable to mistaken opinions which he is compelled to renounce, and his brother is enabled to correct—an instance of passionate and rash condemnation on his part, on account of misconstruction of the motives, similar to that related later, when the Reubenites and Gadites desired abodes in the east of the Jordan (Num. XXXII. 6 *sqq.*). This difference in the tenour of the composition is highly interesting; for it leads to the conclusion that the account of this dispute must have originated at an earlier time, when the human individuality of Moses as law-giver and spiritual guide was still preserved by tradition in distinct and well-marked features, and had not, as happened in the course of ages, faded

such things have befallen me: now *if* I ate the sin-offering to-day, would it be accepted in the sight of the Lord? And Moses heard *it*, and was content.

into the dim and shadowy outlines of a mere instrument and messenger of supernatural revelations; it must have originated very long indeed before

Moses could be made to say, "The Lord has sent me to do all these works; for I have not done them of my own mind" (Num. XVI. 28).



BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

A
HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL COMMENTARY ON
THE OLD TESTAMENT WITH A NEW
TRANSLATION:

Vol. I. GENESIS.—Hebrew and English, *price 18 shillings*; Abridged or English Edition adapted to the general Reader, *price 12 shillings*.

Vol. II. EXODUS.—Hebrew and English, *price 15 shillings*; Abridged Edition, *price 12 shillings*.


A
HEBREW GRAMMAR
WITH EXERCISES,
IN TWO PARTS.


Part I. The Outlines of the Language, with Exercises, being a practical Introduction to the study of Hebrew. Revised Edition. *Price 12 sh. 6 d.*

Part II. The exceptional Forms and Constructions, preceded by an Essay on the History of Hebrew Grammar. *Price 12 sh. 6 d.*

A KEY to the Exercises of the First Part. *Price 5 sh.*

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, AND DYER.







BS1255.K14 v.1
A historical and critical commentary on
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00049 4643

DATE DUE

MAR 17 1995			

